

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

**I. PRELIMINARIES:**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT BY ROLL CALL:** Chair Langdon Plumer, Clerk, John Grueter, Gwen English, Nancy Belanger Select Board Representative, Alternate Mary 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.

**III. NEW BUSINESS:**

1. The application of Willey Creek Company for site plan review, lot line adjustment and Wetlands and Shoreland conditional use permits for the proposed relocation of Building D of the Ray Farm Condominium development and associated site improvements off of Ray Farmstead Road. The subject properties are located in the C-3, Epping Road Highway Commercial zoning district and are identified as Tax Map Parcel #47-8 and #47-8.1. PB Case #22-3.

Chair Plumer announced that the Board has received a letter from the applicant requesting a continuance.

***Ms. English motioned to approve the request of Willey Creek Company, Planning Board Case #22-3 for a continuance to the April 24, 2025 Planning Board meeting at 7 PM in the Nowak Room at Exeter Town Offices. Mr. Grueter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.***

Chair Plumer advised the two remaining applicants and the abutters that the Board would hear each of their applications for one and a half hours, until 8:30 PM for the application of Green & Company and until 10 PM for Stonearch Dev.

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

43 units on Haven Lane, along with associated site improvements. The subject property is located at 76  
44 Portsmouth Avenue, in the C-2, Highway Commercial zoning district, Tax Map Parcel #65-118. PB Case  
45 #24-8.

46

47 Chair Plumer read the Public Hearing Notice out loud.

48

49 Mr. Sharples reviewed that the application was proposed to the Board on December 19<sup>th</sup> and numerous  
50 comments and concerns were raised by the Board and abutters. A site walk was held on January 9, 2025  
51 and the applicant was scheduled to return to the Board at their January 23, 2025 meeting. The  
52 applicant appeared at the Conservation Commission's January 14, 2025 meeting and requested a  
53 continuance to reassess the project design and the Commission's concerns. The applicant appeared at  
54 the Commission's February 11, 2025 meeting to present their redesigned plans and the Commission  
55 voted that they had no objection to the application with two conditions of approval. Mr. Sharples  
56 referenced a memo from the Commission dated February 12, 2025. The applicant submitted revised  
57 plans and supporting documents dated February 14, 2025 to the Planning Board. Staff is in process of  
58 reviewing the redesigned plans and documents. There was another Technical Review Committee  
59 meeting this morning with a host of comments. Plans will be revised and resubmitted. The TRC will  
60 issue another comment letter and Underwood Engineers (UEI) gave approval this morning issuing their  
61 third comment letter.

62

63 Alternate, Marty Kennedy, recused himself from this application and left the meeting table to sit with  
64 the public as he did traffic consulting work for the Town.

65

66 Attorney John Bosum of DTC Lawyers presented the application on behalf of Green & Company. He  
67 indicated the application was for site plan review and wetlands conditional use permit in the mixed-use  
68 neighborhood development or MUND. He noted the traffic engineer was present as well as Jenna Green  
69 and John O'Neil.

70

71 Attorney Bosum reviewed the project changes that elapsed, reducing the number of units to 36 one-  
72 bedrooms in the first phase after hearing concerns from abutters concerning traffic and building height  
73 and from the site walk. He noted the Conservation Commission on February 11 had no objection to the  
74 conditional use permit after reviewing the revised plans which are before the Board this evening. He  
75 noted that while the proposal could be a large hotel or car dealership and generate more traffic the  
76 design proposed a nice transition o townhomes on Haven to taller structures on Portsmouth Avenue.  
77 He reviewed the density of the rear of the parcel as one unit for 7,200 SF compared to Jady Hill with one  
78 unit for 8,000 SF and noted MUND has no density requirement.

79

80 Paige Libbey of Jones & Beach Engineers, Inc. indicated that the second access to Haven was added and  
81 looped. A building was moved across the road out of the wetland buffer. Parking will be across the  
82 street for three buildings to reduce buffer impact. There will be green space behind the mail house for  
83 recreational purposes. There will be pedestrian access to Portsmouth Avenue. There are two crossings  
84 requiring state wetlands approval and drainage and utilities. She noted the section of porous pavement,  
85 filtration drip edges for treatment of roof runoff and the landscaping plan with 8' fence on the property  
86 line of adjacent abutters with buffered plantings. She noted two waivers are requested one for

87 driveway radius for the right of way not wide enough which meets Haven which is wider; and one  
88 waiver for grading within five feet of the property line. She discussed restoration after construction.

89  
90 Ms. Libbey reviewed the traffic memo submitted in January which was reviewed by VHB and that the  
91 engineer indicated the number of trips per hour proposed met the minimum number of trips and felt a  
92 traffic study would not tell them more than they know now, and the expense could be put toward  
93 intersection improvements where there are already issues at Alumni and Green Hill Road. The applicant  
94 would contribute to the DPW road improvement and lights could be better coordinated. Ms. Libbey  
95 indicated that in phase two there will be a reduction in some cases or so slight that a traffic study is not  
96 warranted. Kim, the traffic engineer, reviewed the number of trips per peak hour in the morning on a  
97 weekday and on Saturday and noted no notable or significant impact or different flow or impact on  
98 safety. He referenced the numbers in table one to one car per six minutes one way and going the other.  
99 All turn left, a low volume with some going down Bonny, starting on Haven and splitting out.

100  
101 Mr. Grueter asked who had the stop sign – at the end of Bonny Drive. Ms. Belanger asked if the second  
102 loop could be gated since it is for emergency. Ms. Libbey will reach out to the fire department. Ms.  
103 Belanger indicated she would be concerned with that waiver.

104  
105 Ms. English asked about stormwater and Unit 6 at Building 2 which was no longer there. Ms. Libbey  
106 explained the building was pulled closer to the roadway to reduce buffer impact. Space was lost for the  
107 fifth unit and swapped.

108  
109 Ms. English asked about parking and Ms. Libbey noted there was excess parking, more than required  
110 and some had spaces in front of the garage.

111  
112 Ms. English asked about building 4 being close to a ditch that floods and whether that was moved or  
113 reduced. Ms. Libbey indicated there was originally another unit but shifted back and pulled away. She  
114 indicated pedestrian access was added, drainage connection and the large culvert runs parallel to the  
115 stream.

116  
117 Chair Plumer asked if the culvert was upgraded as discussed. Ms. Libbey indicated there was a blocked  
118 culvert on the adjacent Thirsty Moose property and they have contacted the owner to get the culvert  
119 upgraded.

120  
121 Mr. Grueter asked about trash removal and Chair Plumer noted it would be stored in the garage until  
122 picked up.

123  
124 Mr. Grueter asked about the retaining wall and Ms. Libbey confirmed it would be part of phase 1.

125  
126 Ms. English asked the rationale of not having the roadway access on Portsmouth Avenue and Ms. Libbey  
127 explained there were concerns about traffic cutting through the Jady Hill neighborhood to downtown.

128  
129 Ms. English asked about height reduction of the buildings as the plans say 40.’ Ms. Libbey indicated the  
130 plans will be revised to show 35.’

131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174

Ms. English asked if there were architectural drawings of the town homes and Ms. Libbey indicated no. Ms. English and Mr. Grueter noted those would be nice to see.

Chair Plumer noted that a pocket neighborhood was being created and compared the aesthetics of building 3 to a New Jersey motel. He asked if that could be more in character with the neighborhood and if building 1 could be staggered to give the town homes some personality. He questioned if a unit could be taken out of building 3 so that there is more elbow room and if there could be more green space.

Ms. English stated that there are buildings in the 75' setback a couple of units almost entirely, some half. She stated that it was too much, at capacity. She questioned if a couple of units could be eliminated, and the height adjusted with unit 1 and 34 that are closer to Haven so they would have a lower profile. She noted there are no two stories home on Bonny Drive. Chair Plumer noted the same for Building 6. Ms. English indicated she was not in favor of that much infringement on the setbacks. Only one parking space is required per unit.

Ms. Libbey indicated the buffer was discussed at length with the Conservation Commission and Gove Environmental discussed the function and values of the eastern wetland. Impervious surface was reduced by 70%. Those wetlands were determined to have very limited function and value. Ms. English noted she appreciated the changes but did not agree that the buffers serve a purpose.

Ms. Belanger asked about the pedestrian bridge and the leased building on Portsmouth Avenue's parking lot. Ms. Libbey indicated that the portion of the property was leased and there will not be public parking there. Mr. Green indicated that Federated Auto leases the space and their parking lot was the biggest issue with the adjacent Thirsty Moose restaurant, and they don't want anyone using their parking lot for other than their own business and are on top of enforcing that.

Mr. Grueter asked about the 10% requirement of MUND for affordable housing. Mr. Sharples indicated note 6 shows 4 units in phase one and four units in phase two, proportionally for each phase and in total.

Chair Plumer announced there had been letters received from the Thomases at 28 Haven Lane, email from the Boudreau and Gaudette at 11 Bonny, from Michael Hauck and Danielle Frank at 3 Haven, Daniel Halleren at 32 Haven, Rachel Gross at 9, Joan Hayes and a detailed letter from Ryan O'Brien at 20 Haven with comments the Board has heard before. He asked that the public comment be limited to new concerns and not repeat what the Board has heard already, in the interest of time.

Craig Boudreau of 11 Bonny Drive showed his house and asked why the proposed fence could continue. Ms. Libbey indicated the tree line would remain. Mr. Boudreau indicated concerns people will park in front of his home and cut through because there is no fence. Chair Plumer noted it is private property. Mr. Boudreau indicated people cut through all the time and noted the number of places where fence is being put and asked for the same.

175 (inaudible) showed a photo of the lot buffer taken out and expressed concerns with noise and the lost  
176 view.

177  
178 Ryan O'Brien read a letter on behalf of Inga Newcomb of 14 Haven Lane that she doesn't want to live on  
179 a busy road and wants to keep the green buffer and single building above the residences with no access.  
180 She wanted access to be on Portsmouth Avenue.

181  
182 Mr. O'Brien expressed concerns with density, the homes being built in a depression, water, long-term  
183 problems and wanted to know who will be liable and responsible when the sewer backs up. He noted  
184 concerns with MUND conditions, using MUND to create a disconnected neighborhood and the delay of  
185 phase 2 with the commercial phase done years later. He expressed generally concerns with the MUND  
186 component itself allowing bigger and closer direct conflict in opposition to the intent of the master plan  
187 which promotes protection of light and air and would like to see the ordinance changed. He discussed  
188 the shadow cast on buildings by the higher buildings and would like mature trees to remain to break up  
189 the line of buildings so abutters don't see clear through to Portsmouth Ave.

190  
191 Diane of 5 Bonny Drive expressed concerns with traffic and deliveries.

192  
193 Michael Hauck expressed concerns with buffers and screening and noise and light pollution. Ms. Frank  
194 expressed concerns with fencing, shrubs and wanting 4" caliper trees to the height of the building  
195 included in the condo documents for maintenance. She noted two petitions were handed in from 9  
196 abutting owners and 70 residents of the Jady Hill community concerning noise during construction for so  
197 many hours and with property values, traffic, loss of forest and reduced quality of life.

198  
199 Chair Plumer asked about construction times and Mr. Sharples indicated that is set by the Select Board,  
200 Chapter 7 and the Planning Board has no authority to restrict construction times and all properties must  
201 be treated equally.

202  
203 Mr. Francheski of 36 Haven Lane expressed concerns with stormwater in heavy rain, water damage and  
204 the road pitching to his house. He commented that if the road is extended the stormwater will no  
205 longer go to the ravine.

206  
207 Christine Tindle of 12 Bonny Drive expressed concerns with traffic and no stop sign on Haven the blind  
208 turn and four way stop. She requested stop signs at both ends of Bonny Drive and will take concerns for  
209 the speed limit and speed bumps to the Select Board.

210  
211 Mr. Sharples indicated at this point the application is on day 70 and an extension needs to be agreed to  
212 by the applicant.

213  
214 Ms. Belanger discussed having a traffic study and expressed concerns about if the Federated Auto  
215 business lease was transferred. Mr. Sharples noted a traffic study would not address parking. She felt  
216 the huge, underutilized parking lot could affect Portsmouth Avenue and have more impact on Jady Hill  
217 which the Board is being asked to approve ten years from now and how MUND could be approved in  
218 phase two is not happening.

219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262

Chair Plumer agreed he had concerns with approving something not being built for ten years. Ms. English agreed and questioned what happens if there is a MUND with no commercial. Ms. Libbey indicated there is commercial use there now. Mr. Sharples recommended living in the regulations and not thinking hypothetically and agreed there is commercial use there now.

Michael Green addressed the traffic memo and low volume and while he agreed intersections need stop signs and turning lights this was discussed at TRC and the Board has not yet seen those comments. There are existing issues not caused by this development. He noted he originally had tow 50' buildings and is now at 34 units doing 10% affordable and he keeps hearing take away, take away but there is a limit. The units have been decreased significantly from 80 to 34 with significantly less impact to traffic and people.

Mr. Sharples noted that this morning the traffic engineer called VHB (the 3<sup>rd</sup> party review) and spoke to Jason Plourde and agreed the analysis is not warranted, beyond existing problems and spending \$25,000 on a study would be better invested solving issues that exist today. Ms. Belanger indicated she was surprised TRC had no concern with that many units and it seems low. Mr. Sharples explained the IT standards are based on average trips. Ms. Belanger questioned if Jason would be available for the next meeting. Mr. Sharples will reach out to him.

***Ms. Belanger motioned to table Planning Board Case #24-8 to the March 13, 2025 Planning Board meeting at 7 PM in the Nowak Room. Ms. English seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 4-0-0.***

3. 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.

C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district  
Tax Map Parcel #73-14  
PB Case #24-17.

Mr. Kennedy returned to the meeting table and Chair Plumer activated the alternates.

Chair Plumer read out loud the Public Hearing Notice.

Mr. Sharples noted that the applicant appeared before the Board at the January 23, 2025 meeting to present their plans for the redevelopment of the property. Public comment was opened, and a site walk was held on February 6, 2025 and the applicant indicated they were developing a landscaping plan prior to the Feb. 13, 2025 meeting which was not completed so an extension was requested to allow them time to address issues raised during the site walk and the UEI comments. The applicant submitted plans and supporting documents dated Feb. 19, 2025. Staff is still reviewing materials. The applicant is requesting three waivers. Numerous letters and emails were received and were provided to the Board.

263 Christian Smith of Beals Assoc. presented the application. He reviewed changes to the plans and moted  
264 all units have two parking spaces in front of the garages. The is less impervious pavement. He reviewed  
265 the stormwater catch basin and engineer request from the town for an 8" pipe. He reviewed drainage  
266 calculations. He referenced the landscape design plan and showed the plan with a vinyl fence, existing  
267 mature trees and two stormwater ponds, pervious pavement and walkway.

268  
269 Chair Plumer asked about stormwater from the buildings and Mr. Smith explained the layer of pervious  
270 pavement.

271  
272 Ms. Belanger asked about fencing at the cemetery and Mr. Sharples indicated the cemetery had a 6'  
273 fence on their side.

274  
275 Ms. English asked about the two colors of the fence, gray and white. Mr. Sharples explained that the  
276 abutter of lot 106 preferred that color.

277  
278 Chair Plumer asked if the driveway closed to the property line could be taken out. Ms. English and Ms.  
279 Belanger agreed. Mr. Kennedy questioned if they would still need the waiver. Mr. Smith indicated there  
280 would still be grading within 5.' Mr. Kennedy asked if the distance could be shown on the plan. Mr.  
281 Grueter asked if sidewalks could reach both ends of the parking lot. Mr. Smith indicated the landscape  
282 designer wanted to save a couple of trees and add more plantings.

283  
284 Ms. English asked about the entry and Mr. Smith indicated from the garage most often.

285  
286 Chair Plumer asked if the town homes could be individualized, staged to give it a neighborhood feel  
287 and get away from the hotel look. Mr. Smith indicated the only difficulty would be with the front  
288 building. Mr. Grueter asked if a unit could be removed and building two and three turned to face each  
289 other to have a bigger grass area. He noted the side of the building might be better to look at than the  
290 garage. Mr. Sharples indicated it may violate the setbacks.

291  
292 Chair Plumer opened the hearing to questions and comments from the public at 9:21 PM.

293  
294 Jim of 5 Gill Street expressed concerns with the history of the neighborhood, design, density, traffic and  
295 character of the neighborhood. He opposed the three waivers and asked to keep the driveway away  
296 from his property.

297  
298 Charlie French of 9 Gill Street expressed concerns with the scale of the project and density with the  
299 surrounding neighborhood and character, with screening and noted flipping the buildings would put the  
300 road closer with less screening.

301  
302 Jeff of 111 Front Street expressed concerns with there being any waivers and with the scale, with  
303 parking and density and history of the lot. He recommended taking away 4-5 units. He expressed  
304 concerns with zoning and how this parcel became commercially zoned. He reviewed the history of the  
305 zoning ,and research by the Planning Office. He noted there was a warrant article approved in 1988 to  
306 make properties with multiple zoning into one zone and there is no information on how this became

307 commercial, the tax card says R-2, there is no legal decision. He questioned whether the town homes  
308 would be condominiums or apartments. He expressed concerns with parking.

309

310 Ms. Belanger indicated there was commercial use, an art gallery, a grocery store, some residential use,  
311 some commercial. Ms. English noted the town planner at the time lives across from the library and he  
312 could be asked.

313

314 David H. of 114 Front Street expressed concerns with the size of the project and asked if it could be  
315 shrunk to fit in with the neighborhood. He expressed concerns with density and fire hazards and asked  
316 if the fire department signed off on it. He expressed concerns with headlights into his home 20' away  
317 and the character of the neighborhood with a towering 35' building. He expressed concerns with traffic  
318 and would like a traffic analysis. He indicated Front Street is a nightmare and snow blocks the view now.

319

320 Bill Campbell of 7 Riverwoods Drive asked if there were a workforce component – no. He referenced a  
321 Seacoast article which stated the project would fit in nicely with the stately homes there. He noted the  
322 master plan intent to have density be reasonable and 17 units on 1.6 acres not being in character of the  
323 town.

324

325 Dana of 9 Gill Street expressed concerns with conversations and promises made by the developer at the  
326 site walk not being kept, with regard to the 6' cedar fence she was promised.

327

328 Rory Morissette of 12 & 14 Parker expressed concerns with the size of the project, traffic, snow piles,  
329 pipes, heavy rain water, pooling, grading, density and stated that he also understood there would be a  
330 cedar fence. He noted school was close by. He stated there were never any commercial businesses  
331 there when he was growing up.

332

333 (unidentified) stated that he did talk about fencing and would need to remove trees. He indicated he  
334 worked with all abutters, and referenced the Academy buildings which have a similar federal design. He  
335 noted he worked with Julie Gilman at the Heritage Committee. Mr. Grueter disagreed and noted the  
336 Committee only talked about saving the existing historical Merrill House.

337

338 S. Nelson of Gill Street expressed concerns with density, traffic and the proximity of the driveway.

339

340 Mr. Sharples explained the difference between a traffic memo and a traffic analysis which does actual  
341 traffic counts and concludes what if any improvements could be made.

342

343 Adele Robertson of 106 Front Street expressed concerns with church, on Sunday and the time of year  
344 factored in to when school is open.

345

346 Marie Carr of 4 Cross Road indicated she is not an abutter, but that Nancy Merrill wrote the book on  
347 Exeter. She expressed concerns with density and questioned if the home in front could be preserved  
348 and a larger home built in back.

349



350 Mr. Sharples recommended the Board providing the applicant a feel on the three waivers before  
351 continuing the hearing to the next available date.

352  
353 Mr. Smith addressed pavement width of 22' and the bulk of impervious, grading within 5,' and the  
354 conventional pavement use the first 150' with catch basin and pipe. He referenced the support media  
355 beneath including filtration and stone which is designed to support vehicle traffic and was reviewed by  
356 the TRC and fire department.

357  
358 Mr. Kennedy questioned the wavier for 5' and the proximity of the driveway and property line. Ms.  
359 Belanger agreed. Mr. Sharples explained there are instances when there is a low volume, of little or no  
360 impact when the town engineer will allow the connection to drainage and Mr. Smith feels it is fair  
361 because of the town engineer recommending the conventional pavement at the drive entrance/exit. Mr.  
362 Grueter agreed the measurements should be double-checked and provided.

363  
364 ***Ms. Belanger motioned to table Planning Board Case #24-17 to the March 13, 2025 meeting of the***  
365 ***Planning Board at the Nowak Room at 7 PM. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. A vote was taken,***  
366 ***all were in favor, the motion passed 6-0-0.***

367  
368 **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

369  
370 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

371  
372 February 13, 2025

373  
374 Ms. Belanger, Mr. Kennedy, and Ms. English recommended edits.

375  
376 ***Ms. Belanger motioned to approve the February 13, 2025 meeting minutes, as amended. Ms. English***  
377 ***seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed 6-0-0.***

378  
379  
380 **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

- 381
- 382 • Master Plan Discussion
  - 383
  - 384 • Field Modifications
  - 385
  - 386 • Bond and/or Letter of Credit Reductions and Release
  - 387

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

389 **VII. CHAIRPERSON'S ITEMS**

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

391 Ms. Belanger reported that the Select Board is looking at the parking situation at Pickpocket Road.

392 **IX. ADJOURN**

393 Ms. Belanger motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:30 PM. Mr. Grueter seconded the  
394 motion. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

395 Respectfully submitted.

396 Daniel Hoijer,  
397 Recording Secretary (Via Exeter TV)