



TOWN OF EXETER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

10 FRONT STREET • EXETER, NH • 03833-3792 • (603) 778-0591 • FAX 772-4709
www.exeternh.gov

LEGAL NOTICE EXETER PLANNING BOARD AGENDA

The Exeter Planning Board will meet on Thursday, November 20, 2025, at 7:00 P.M. in the Nowak Room of the Town Office Building located at 10 Front Street, Exeter, New Hampshire, to consider the following:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 6, 2025

NEW BUSINESS: PUBLIC HEARINGS

There being no new business and/or public hearings scheduled, the Board will hold an administrative work session for the purpose of discussing potential zoning amendments proposed for the 2026 Town warrant.

OTHER BUSINESS

- Master Plan Discussion
- Land Use Regulations Review
- Field Modifications
- Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Releases

EXETER PLANNING BOARD

Langdon J. Plumer, Chairman

*Posted 11/07/25: Exeter Town Office and Town of Exeter website
Revised: 11/18/25, 11/19/25*

**TOWN OF EXETER
PLANNING BOARD
NOWAK ROOM
10 FRONT STREET
NOVEMBER 6, 2025
DRAFT MINUTES
7:00 PM**

I. PRELIMINARIES:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL: Chair Langdon Plumer, Vice-Chair Aaron Brown, Gwen English, Jennifer Martel (@7:39 PM), Marty Kennedy, and Alternate Dean Hubbard, Alternate Sam McLeod and Select Board Representative Nancy Belanger.

STAFF PRESENT: Interim Town Planner Carol Ogilvie

II. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Plumer called the meeting to order at 7 PM, introduced the members, and activated alternates Dean Hubbard and Sam McLeod.

III. NEW BUSINESS:

1. The application of Hoyle Tanner & Associates (on behalf of Society of the Cincinnati in the State of New Hampshire) for a lot line adjustment of the common boundary line between the properties located at 164 Water Street and 1 Governor's Lane.
C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district
Tax Map Parcels #72-206 and #72-215
Planning Board Case #25-9

Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice.

Ms. Ogilvie noted that the application was for a lot-line adjustment from one parcel to the other to put the Tavern which sits with the property line down the middle, onto its own lot. Both lots are owned by the same owner. The applicant provided plans and supporting documents which the staff reviewed and she reported the case is complete and ready for review purposes.

Vice-Chair Brown motioned to open Planning Board Case #25-9. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Laura Chadbourne of McLane, Middleton noted Michael Todd, the surveyor from Hoyle Tanner was present. She noted the Folsom Tavern is on Map 27-206 and American Independence Museum on 72-215.

Michael Todd noted a portion is being transferred from 72-215. Parcel A is 1/3 acre and both are in the C-1 zone. The lot exceeds zoning requirements for the district.

Vice-Chair Brown asked how this situation was created and Attorney Chadbourne explained the history of the original location of the tavern, in the center of town, across from the band stand and the tavern being moved several times to where it sits today. The adjustment is 15,000 SF.

Chair Plumer opened the hearing to comments and questions from the public at 7:18 PM and being none closed the hearing to public comment, and the Board entered deliberations.

Vice-Chair Brown motioned that the request of Hoyle Tanner for a lot line adjustment, Planning Board Case #25-9 be approved. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

2. The conceptual application of Chinburg Development LLC for a preliminary conceptual review of a redevelopment proposal for the property at 65 – 67 ½ Main Street to include demolition of the existing structures and proposed construction of new single-family detached units.

R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district

Tax Map Parcel #63-256

Planning Board Case #25-10

Chair Plumer read the public hearing notice. Ms. Ogilvie explained that this was a conceptual review and no action will be taken.

Shawna Sammis representing the applicant, noted they purchased the .84-acre property which has three existing buildings and seven multi-family units. She described the location across from the Shell Station and the two small carriage house style buildings in back. She posted the proposed rendering and passed out copies to the Board. She noted the architect is Winter Holben. Initial conversations were had with Town Planner and the Interim Town Planner. She noted the existing development would be removed and detached condos will be redeveloped with the seven units grandfathered. The proposal they are leaning to is to have two facing the drive and four clustered in the back.

Karen Fisher of 61 Main Street stated that the levels seem high and wants to be sure they comply with the regulations in the district for height. Ms. Sammis noted the highest point of the roof is proposed below 35.' The redevelopment will feel less dense visually than the Townhouses on Main.

Sally Ward of 72 Park Street expressed concerns with historical significance and character and the loss of the currently seven rentals to be replaced with six condo single-family homes. She expressed concerns with affordability with those rental units being eliminated and replaced with those that are not affordable. She questioned where those seven residents will go, what they can afford and the cumulative effect. She noted property two doors down and potential radical changes affecting neighborhoods like behind Thirsty Moose in not a positive way.

85 Ms. Sammis explained that the units were not savable economically because of the rear foundations.
86 The building facing the street has no historic value. She noted the market rate of high end homes and
87 empathized with Ms. Ward's comment. She explained the downstream effect of providing housing so
88 that when someone buys, they sell something in the mid 5s and makes a space for someone else to buy
89 that home.

90
91 Vice-Chair Brown agreed there is a need for housing and also that the Town of Exeter has done a good
92 job with quite a bit of diversity of housing.

93
94 Sally Oxnard of Greenleaf Drive expressed concerns with the stunning amount of destruction in Exeter
95 the last few years and significant damage to the tree canopy. She expressed hopes that they will work
96 with the Board and Conservation Commission to leave some trees, to work with what is there.

97
98 Ms. Sammis noted 50% of the lot is going to be kept as open space and they will do the best they can to
99 maintain the tree canopy but two trees are dead or diseased and need to come down.

100
101 Ms. Martel arrived at 7:39 PM. Mr. McLeod stepped back as an alternate.

102
103 Vice-Chair Brown noted that Ms. English takes pains to ensure with every project that landscaping is
104 looked at, and trees. There is a professional landscaper on the Board and they take it very seriously.
105 There has been a lot of infill development recently because of the lack of open land and there is some
106 benefit to not adding more roads and infrastructure that residents have to maintain.

107
108 Donald Fisher of 61 Main Street asked the timeline. Ms. Sammis noted after the survey is done, the
109 design phase will take a few months before construction begins. He noted some trees are partially on
110 his property.

111
112 Chair Plumer noted he would like to see some architectural features to make the development more
113 appealing and not as boxey.

114
115 Ms. Belanger asked about fire department comments and Ms. Sammis noted they reviewed separation
116 between buildings, sprinklers and turnaround for the fire trucks.

117
118 Ms. English commented that it feels too modern for that site and would like to see a more New England
119 style home.

120
121 Ms. Martel noted she would like to see some street trees throughout the site especially facing Main
122 Street.

123
124 Vice-Chair Brown noted the architectural design should pay a little more attention to the character of
125 Exeter and noted buyers will pay for that.

Ms. English asked about a site walk. Chair Plumer noted one would be scheduled after plan submission. Vice-Chair Brown recommended meeting with abutters ahead to hear their concerns. Ms. Sammis indicated they intended to do that for this application.

Ms. Belanger addressing the public's concerns recommended coming to a Select Board meeting because the Master Plan is being updated for 2027 and that is when those comments can be most important.

3. The continued public hearing on the application of Caley Associates for site plan review and a Shoreland Conditional Use Permit for the proposed redevelopment of the property at 97 Portsmouth Avenue. The developer is proposing to demolish the existing Blue Ribbon Dry Cleaners building on the site and construct a multi-use building to include commercial space, amenities, and 14 residential units with parking and associated site improvements.

C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district

Tax Map Parcel #65-125

Planning Board Case #25-3

Chair Plumer read the public hearing notice.

Ms. Ogilvie noted the new submittal since the last meeting on October 23, 2025 with the plan revisions and additions that were agreed upon.

Christian Smith from Beals Associates and Attorney Josh Lanzetta were present on behalf of the applicant and noted the revised plan set was submitted with the requested changes.

Christian Smith reviewed the changes to those plans. He referenced sheet 4 for the offloading. He noted the café would not be receiving large deliveries the way a restaurant would. He noted a dolly would transport the loads from a small box truck or pick up truck. He noted a walkway was added to the back to porous pavers and noted the 5.5% slope 35' in ADA compliant. He relocated the handicapped stall to the front for van access and gained a stall in back. He reorganized the crosswalk and provided the two conduits for EV charging stations in the future (sheet 6). He revised the landscape plan (sheet 8). He provided side by side MUND criteria (sheet 4).

Ms. English stated that MUND landscaping should be all seasonal. Chair Plumer noted the evergreens shown on the plan. Ms. English read section 4a that they should be designed to remain functional and attractive with evergreens and deciduous, flowering and evergreen varieties. Ms. Martel noted a nice mix of evergreens, deciduous and berries. She questioned the two trees in the lawn area and noted she was not overly familiar with silverbell but it sounded like a shrub and needs to be a tree but it appears to be a tall flowering shrub and really pretty.

Chair Plumer asked about the bike stand. Mr. Smith showed the location by the 8' sidewalk with space for six bicycles next to the sidewalk.

Ms. Martel asked about the 3' path around the building. Mr. Smith noted most people coming up would use that facility. She asked if it were wheelchair accessible and he answered yes. Mr. Kennedy disagreed

171 and noted there is a 5' minimum. Mr. Smith noted he could slide the building 2' forward and make the
172 access 5.' Ms. Martel noted she liked the idea of shifting it over and having an option. Mr. Smith noted
173 he would add the detail to the plan. Ms. Martel noted 5% is the maximum without a handrail. Mr. Smith
174 noted the accessible ramp. Ms. Martel disagreed that could be called accessible. Mr. Smith agreed to
175 add ½%.

176
177 Ms. Martel noted space needed not to be on the sidewalk for the bike rack and asked what materials
178 would be underneath and he answered washed stones. Vice-Chair Brown noted the size was 1/3 of
179 what it should be.

180
181 Ms. Martel questioned the ADA parking space and access to the patio which she noted would push a
182 person to walk into the road and asked if there could be a second curb cut. Mr. Smith noted the curb
183 protects pedestrians in the walkway from vehicles and is a different elevation. Mr. Smith agreed that if
184 the Board wanted a secondary access there was no problem.

185
186 Ms. English asked about the other ADA space that was promised in back as well. Chair Plumer referred
187 to line 244 of the draft meeting minutes.

188
189 Ms. English asked about the number of pole lamps and Mr. Smith referenced the lighting plan which
190 showed three that do not exceed 20.' She recommended keeping in mind the lamp specifications. Mr.
191 Smith noted none exceed 12' but will have the engineer look at those. Mr. Hubbard asked about the
192 profile of the lights, in the rear versus the front, and Mr. Smith noted they have a different top fixture
193 and cast different foot candles of illumination and they were trying to eliminate overspill.

194
195 Mr. Hubbard asked about the 8' sidewalk and the different elevation between sidewalk and parking.
196 Mr. Smith noted a standard 4" reveal and Mr. Hubbard asked about moving it closer to the road.

197
198 Mr. Kennedy stated that he was not convinced the site operates well and stated that it does not meet
199 the intent or requirements of MUND to have an active, safe, walkable neighborhood. He requested
200 separation between pedestrian and vehicle traffic and noted the seven parking spaces out front with
201 pedestrians and vehicles in the driveway. He noted the MUND requires parking areas to be located in
202 the back or side. He questioned the morning peak of 2 cars in and 2 cars going out and the unrealistic
203 demand that would put on the bank's spaces and the overall intensity of the use with pedestrians
204 walking behind cars pulling out of those seven spaces and the vehicle trips on the site. He referenced
205 the ITE trip generation manual and noted it was not appropriate to be used for a coffee shop and
206 estimates 104 trips in peak morning hours with 52 entering and 52 leaving with people walking back and
207 forth, the opposite of what the MUND is trying to accomplish to separate pedestrians and vehicles. He
208 noted he can't support the project.

209
210 Vice-Chair Brown noted the ordinance did not list coffee shops, so they used restaurant.

211
212 Chair Plumer opened the hearing to the public at 8:50 PM.

Attorney Todd Fahey representing BankProv appreciated Mr. Kennedy's comments and asked the Board to consider the global picture beyond MUND, safety, traffic, pedestrians and the overburdening of the BankProv lot. The proposal is chaotic, and they are trying to do too much on the lot and need to make it smaller and comply with the spirit of the MUND and not affect the safety of the bank.

Attorney Chris Hilson of DTC lawyers representing REL, Margarita's Plaza reiterated his client's objection and agreed there is too much on the lot. The landscaping plan is meager to the lot size. He argued that the abutters oppose the project and there hasn't been any meaningful changes.

Mary Nelson of Exeter noted that a pedestrian was hit at the Dollar General parking lot last week and that she doesn't want building on every green space and every tree taken down or to do away with the historical flavor of the town. She referenced the density of Front Street and Jady Hill.

Michael Segal of McLane Manor questioned the number of units and parking spaces.

Attorney Lanzetta objected to Attorney Hilson and Attorney Fahey's statements as being the same arguments made at the last three hearings. To address Mr. Kennedy's comments, he argued that he is incorrect in his assessment and that when an engineer submits a plan it warrants that it is designed safe and complies with standards and metrics. He disagreed with the comments made and stated that they can't use conjecture, they have to use math and apply the ordinance. The project is safe and complies with the ordinance, a safe, walkable, active site was provided. He argued that the building cannot slide forward. He argued that because of the actions of the former planning board members who voted to change the layout the property cannot change, or they would be sued by the bank. It is reasonable to leave the building where it is and that's what we've done. He defended his traffic engineer and noted he has a PhD in traffic science and used what is in the ordinance. A business where meals and refreshments are sold to customers is exactly what we are proposing here. He noted the seat count was applied properly. He disagreed that changes have not been made. He disagreed that square feet is relevant under the ordinance but the seat count. He noted the applicant provided an application that complies with the ordinance and state law and did the best they can knowing this building has to be located where it is because of an ingress/egress forced upon it, despite the objection of the owner, by the members of the planning board who approved it in the past. They are not forcing access or parking on any other lot with what is proposed. They have applied the correct standard with expert stamping letters and plans and safety.

Mr. Smith questioned the contemplating of 104 vehicle trips in peak morning hours as baffling because this is not a Dunkin Donuts and will be largely used by the residents. He noted the ITE projecting based on stand alone coffee shops may have drive through lanes or more seats. He deferred to the traffic engineer the applicant utilized and requested to have their engineer respond to Mr. Kennedy's comments. The engineer would lose his license if he lied or misrepresented the proposal. The standard applied is the exact standard for a restaurant in Exeter just as seat count is correct, not square footage.

Mr. Smith noted that he went through technical review with all department heads and that includes the code enforcement officer. Vice-Chair Brown stated that his is not the ultimate authority otherwise there wouldn't be a Board.

Mr. Kennedy stated he has known their traffic engineer for decades, but he has applied the wrong code on this and requested he check and stated he guaranteed he would tell you.

Chair Plumer closed the hearing to public comment and questions at 9:16 PM.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he stood by what he said. There is no drive through in what he referenced but the use generates a quick turnaround. He disagreed with the intensity of the use and the parking spaces in the front which MUND says you can't have and with people crossing the driveway. Chair Plumer agreed that seems awkward.

Ms. English expressed concerns with vehicles and pedestrians. She stated that the architectural standards have fallen short too and a lot was missing.

Chair Plumer asked about the stop sign at the front of Blue Ribbon where the sidewalk is shown and asked if it would remain there. Mr. Smith indicated it is proposed.

Vice-Chair Brown indicated he did not agree the spirit of the MUND was met with this configuration. He understood the challenges of the site and did not understand why the building can't be moved forward when redeveloped and why all parking can't be out back. Ms. Martel agreed and asked if the Board is saying this parcel does not meet MUND. Ms. English noted it doesn't mean they can't build.

Ms. Belanger agreed and added that she is concerned about the loading area still and too much is proposed.

Ms. Ogilvie reviewed the specific reasons she noted during the Board's discussions why the application did not meet their approval:

- Parking in front of the building
- Building design and materials
- Non-functional loading area
- Pedestrian Safety
- Plan does not meet spirit and intent of MUND.

Attorney Lanzer commented that the applicant is willing to update a light fixture of change a planting.

- Shifting bike rack
- Shifting kiosk
- ADA access location in front
- Regarding of path by .5%
- Working with staff on architecture.

Attorney Hilson objected to public comment being reopened without everyone having the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Ogilvie read from her notes that the Board's objections to the site plan not meeting the spirit and intent of the MUND including but not limited to the reasons stated in the record and does not meet the requirements of the ordinance including but not limited to the location of parking and concerns with pedestrian safety.

Mr. Kennedy motioned that the site plan approval request Caley Associates, Planning Board Case #25-3 of be denied for the reasons stated by the Interim Town Planner. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and all were in favor of denial. The motion passed unanimously 7-0-0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 23, 2025

Ms. English recommended edits to Line 60 to add Laura Spector; and to Line 134 to delete the balance of the line after sun.

Mr. Kennedy recommended editing line 76 to reflect that his statement asked if the Planning Board needed to determine if MUND applies. Chair Plumer recommended the recording secretary review the video.

Vice-Chair Brown recommended an edit to line 124 to change parking plan to landscaping plan.

Ms. English motioned to approve the minutes of October 23, 2025, as amended. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. A vote was taken, Ms. Belanger abstained, the motion passed 6-0-1.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- Substation Conceptual Review

Interim Town Manager Melissa Roy and Finance Director Corey Stevens appeared before the Board to ask about the substation project CIP. She noted the government use is exempt to some of the local land use regulations and a formal public hearing.

Vice-Chair Brown noted it would be beneficial to the public to know what is going on. Ms. Martel agreed. Ms. Roy indicated the parcel is in the industrial zone and the abutters are commercial businesses, and they are working with them in the preconstruction meeting.

Mr. Stevens noted the 60 days needed to do site work and to know the unknown. Ms. Roy asked about coming before the Board in January for a conceptual review. Vice-Chair Brown felt it they could forgo the formal public hearing.

Ms. Martel noted to cut costs the precast concrete pavers in the parking lot could be porous but with cheaper materials. Ms. Roy noted she believed that has already been changed.

The Board agreed that they would be first on the agenda for January 8, 2026.

Ms. Belanger noted they are coming to the Select Board on Monday night.

Vice-Chair Brown motioned that the Planning Board votes not to have a formal hearing for #47-4-11 and will do a presentation with us at the January 8, 2026 meeting. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, Ms. Belanger abstained. The motion passed 6-0-1.

- Master Plan Discussion
- Field Modifications
- Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release
- Other

VI. TOWN PLANNER'S ITEMS

Ms. Ogilvie noted the draft amendments would be ready for the December 11th meeting and the public hearing would be on January 8, 2026.

VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS

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

IX. DJOURN

Vice-Chair Brown motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:11 PM. Ms. Belanger seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted.

Daniel Hoijer,
Recording Secretary (Via Exeter TV)



Barbara Mcevoy <bmcevoy@exeternh.gov>

October 23, 2025 minutes tape review requested

1 message

Daniel Hoijer <dhoijer13@gmail.com>

Sat, Nov 8, 2025 at 2:42 PM

To: Pam McElroy <pmcelroy@exeternh.gov>, Langdon Plumer <langplumer@gmail.com>, Barbara McEvoy <bmcevoy@exeternh.gov>

Concerning the comments by Mr. Kennedy on line 76 of the October 23, 2025 meeting, let the Board know I reviewed the tape and they can be found at 26:07.

Dan

#1. Amend Article 2 Definitions by deleting 2.2.3 Accessory Dwelling Unit and replacing it with the following definition:

~~2.2.3 **Accessory Dwelling Unit:** A dwelling unit subordinate to a detached one-family dwelling, located either in the principal dwelling or its accessory structure and as delineated in Article 4, Section 4.2 Schedule 1: Permitted Uses, Note #2.~~

2.2.3 Accessory Dwelling Unit: A residential living unit that is located on a lot containing a single-family dwelling that provides independent living facilities for one or more persons, including provisions for sleeping, eating, cooking, and sanitation, on the same parcel of land as the principal dwelling unit it accompanies and as delineated in Article 4, Section 4.2 Schedule 1: Permitted Uses, Note #2. Accessory dwelling units may be constructed at the same time as the principal dwelling unit.

2.2.3.1 “Attached unit” means a unit that is within or physically connected to the principal dwelling unit, or completely contained within a preexisting detached structure.

2.2.3.2 “Detached unit” means a unit that is neither within nor physically connected to the principal dwelling unit, nor completely contained within a preexisting detached structure.

#2. Amend Article 5, Section 5.6.6 Off-Street Parking Schedule as follows:

Dwelling Units	2 1 for each single-family unit
	2 for each multi-family unit of 2+bedrooms
	1 for each multi-family unit of 1 bedroom/studio

Amendments #1 & #2 are necessary in order to comply with recent state legislation.

#3. Amend Section 9. Of the Shoreland Protection Ordinance by adding new paragraph F and renumbering accordingly, as follows:

9.3.4 Use Regulations

F. Permitted Uses: The following uses, to the extent permitted in the underlying zoning district, shall be permitted in the Shoreland Protection District as specified, provided that the proposed use will not cause increases in surface or groundwater contamination, contribute to soil erosion, or cause a degradation of the shoreland.

1. Agriculture, including grazing, hay production, truck gardening and silage production provided the activity does not impact a prime wetland’s 100’ buffer.
2. Forestry and tree farming to include the construction of access roads for said purpose provided that the activity does not impact a prime wetland’s 100-foot buffer.
3. Wildlife habitat development and management.
4. Recreational uses consistent with the purpose and intent of this article.

5. Conservation area and nature trails.
6. The construction of well water supplies.

This amendment is requested by staff in order to ensure that the Shoreland ordinance provides the same level of clarity regarding what is allowed as the Wetlands ordinance

#4: Amend Article 4 – District Regulations, 4.2 Schedule 1: Permitted Uses, by changing animal boarding/kennels from a permitted use in District C-2, C-3, and CT-1 to a use allowed by Special Exception.

This amendment is requested by staff, based on observed conflicts when this use is allowed by right and the property abuts a residential zoning district or residential use.

#5. Amend the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations by adding to Section 7.5 and 7.6 the requirement to show the location of a mail kiosk, as follows:

7.5.16 & 7.6.18 Location and description of a mail kiosk as required by and compliant with USPS regulations.

This amendment is necessary in order to comply with recent requirements of the United States Postal Service.

#6. Amend the Subdivision and Site Plan Review Regulations by adding a new paragraph to Section 7.2 Professional Standards, as follows:

Section 7.2.3 Landscape plans, as required, shall be prepared and stamped by a registered professional landscape architect licensed in the State of New Hampshire.

This amendment is recommended by the Planning Board, in order to assure that professional standards are being met in applicable cases.