



TOWN OF
NEWMARKET
NEW HAMPSHIRE

PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, July 8, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Town Hall, Council Chambers

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Present: Val Shelton (Chair), Zachary Shollar (Vice Chair), Jane Ford, Jamie Bruton, Bill Arcieri (Alternate), Bart McDonough (Director of Planning & Community Development)

Absent: Scott Blackstone (Town Council – Ex officio), Jeff Goldknopf, Michael Scully, Eric Botterman (Alternate)

The Chair opened the regular meeting at 7:08 PM.

The voting members this evening will be: **Val Shelton, Zachary Shollar, Jamie Bruton, Jane Ford, and Bill Arcieri** (*in place of Jeff Goldknopf*).

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Comments

(None)

3. Review & Approval of Minutes

a. June 10, 2025

Action

Motion: Zach Shollar motioned to approve the June 10, 2025, minutes as written.

Second: Jane Ford

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 5-0-0

4. Regular Business

a. Pursuant to RSA 676:4, 32-155 Wetland Protection Overlay District and Appendix B - Site Plans of the Municipal Code of the Town of Newmarket, New Hampshire, notice is hereby given that a design review application, requested by applicant 200 New Road LLC, will be reviewed for a proposed residential development comprising 23 single-family, age-restricted units with associated utilities and infrastructure while disturbing 3,600+- square feet of wetlands and their associated buffers for the purposes of connecting the development with municipal water by extending an existing water line located on Forbs Road and connecting the proposed road of the development to New Road. Properties involved in this application are located at 200 New Road, Tax Map R3, Lot 56 within the B-2 zoning district and wetland protection overlay district.

The Chair read the above into the record, and referred to [Section 2.02 – Design review](#) in the zoning ordinance, and read the section into the record.

Joe Coronati, Jones & Beach Engineers, introduced himself with **Rob Graham**, owner, and **Atty. Kevin Baum**. The supporting documents can be found at the following link:
<https://newmarketnh.portal.civicclerk.com/event/1561/files/attachment/6317>.

Mr. Coronati continued to proceed with an overview of the proposal at 200 New Road, beginning with sheet C1 of the existing conditions. The area is currently wooded, and was previously part of a larger project when an industrial park was being contemplated in the area. That did not happen due to issues with crossing the rail bed, and therefore the property has been vacant since. It is zoned for industrial use where the majority of the surrounding uses are residential with a weight-limited bridge. A variance was granted in June to allow the use of age-restricted housing on the property.

Mr. Coronati continued to present the overview plan page of the proposal, showing the proposed 23 single-family condominiums. It was explained that the age restriction will be on 80% of the homes, as is typical with the state requirement. The building construction plans may differ from home to home, but they are planned to all have a first floor primary bedroom with a second bedroom and office upstairs. The majority of the condominium homes would have individual septic systems with some shared due to the topography and layout of the site. It was confirmed that the exact specifics of the septic systems still need to be vetted in the field. A water line is proposed to connect to where it currently ends on Forbes Road, with the plan to bring it across the tracks and through the site to service the homes. If that becomes unfeasible, there is room for a community well to service the units. It was noted that the hatched area on the plan is reserved as a recreation area for more yard area as the homes are being kept as tight as possible. There is a previous trail on the property, and vegetation is proposed to be added in that area for increased buffering. The entrance is also planned to be moved as far south as possible before the wetlands widen to help provide buffering of vehicle lights from the abutter across the street. It was confirmed that there will need to be a wetland impact to some degree in order to enter the site. The town owns most of the land to the north and south of the property. Gove Environmental has been working on the wetland and soil delineations. The hope is to submit for a site plan review as soon as possible, but looking for feedback at this point to guide that final design.

The Chair asked if a variance was received for the use; **Mr. Coronati** confirmed that it has already been received.

Mr. Coronati explained that the project is not being proposed as an open space/cluster subdivision, and is proposed as a condominium ownership, therefore anticipating it to be a site plan review. The Chair commented that condominiums must be subdivided per the ordinance; **Bart** added that he will check to make sure.

The Chair questioned what the setbacks are from septic systems to wetlands. **Mr. Coronati** confirmed the calculations will need to be double checked and confirmed for the final design. The requirement is 75' from the very poorly drained soils, but the majority of the site are poorly drained soils, which are required to be 50', as is displayed on the plan.

Mr. Coronati confirmed the wetland delineation was completed in January 2025.

Zach asked if tie-in to town sewer is expected. **Mr. Coronati** confirmed they are not anticipating that as the sewer line is not close to the lot, but it is not being ruled out in case anything comes up when test pits are done.

Mr. Coronati noted how the units were originally going to extend further on the land with additional wetland impact, but they decided to focus on just the area of the lot closest to the road per discussion with staff and abutters.

Bill asked regarding lot minimums; **Mr. Coronati** explained that lot loading calculations are

completed and are currently 0.5 acres. The very poorly drained soils are not included in that calculation. It was confirmed that the layout would remain the same if they were planning to connect to town sewer. It was further explained that they need some space between units while also trying to keep the road as short as possible. **Bill** clarified that he would hope to see it shifted as far from wetlands as possible.

It was confirmed that the septic systems would be standard leach fields, with about a 2200 SF footprint. Test pits will be completed in every area that is highlighted for a proposed septic on the plan. They are hoping to keep further away from the neighbors to the north. It was also added that there is some topography that limits the layout, with about a 35'+ of elevation change. The units proposed to have a shared system will likely need to have the homes built into the grade, illustrating the need to share a system due to the limited space in that area of the lot.

Bill expressed nervousness about nitrogen loading so close to Great Bay, referring to a study that estimated how septic systems load about 20 pounds per year each. It was asked if some advanced treatment could be possible, and also to have the systems moved as far away from the wetland as possible.

The Chair summarized that at this level of discussion there is not a need to go into too much detail, but that the septic systems are a concern.

Bill asked about the areas marked as storm water areas on plan. **Mr. Coronati** explained that they are being proposed to be put in low spots that are already topographically there on the lot. The plans will need to go to the state for AoT, storm water review, and septic review and lot loading. It was added that the cul-de-sac area is too small to be a treatment area, but that the plan is to pipe storm water from that area.

Bill also brought up lawn care and concern for fertilizer pollution and nitrogen footprint; it was confirmed that that could be part of condominium documents.

Zach asked for confirmation that construction would not be through the wetlands outside of the proposed entrance and crossing; **Mr. Coronati** confirmed that the proposed road would be the only egress. The only temporary impact would be for the water line connection. It was discussed that the ownership of the waterline is to be determined, and is expected to be part of the TRC review discussions.

Bart asked regarding the water line and if they have an easement in place to cross under the railroad. **Mr. Graham** confirmed that they are currently engaged in active discussions at the moment.

Mr. Graham also confirmed that the road is proposed to be kept as a private road. **Bart** added that in the future if it were to be asked to become a town road, it would be denied if it does not meet town standards, and wants to make sure that is understood. It was noted how the homes are being proposed at 25-30' off edge of pavement. The Chair explained that the road going from private to a town road has come up with another development, so they want it to be clear at this stage of the project.

Bart asked regarding the 80% age restriction mentioned earlier. **Mr. Coronati** explained that 55+ developments allow that 20% do not have to be age restricted, raising the example of people passing and leaving home to children or a younger spouse. **Atty. Baum** added that it

was a variance request for age-restricted development and the intent is to keep it age-restricted and to follow all town, state and federal requirements, with it not discriminatory by having to be 80% age-restricted. The intent is to comply with requirements.

Bart asked if the footprint of the homes will vary or if they will all be the same. **Mr. Coronati** explained that there will be some variation but that they cannot each have different individual styles; there will be some variation with different bump outs, garages, etc.

The Chair asked for clarification of the condominium ownership. **Atty. Baum** clarified that the ownership will be the building and some lawn around it with limited common area.

It was also confirmed that the units will be two stories. **Bart** suggested a universal living approach, therefore being able to age in place. **Mr. Graham** confirmed that they do provide diversity with second-floor suites upstairs in order to have a child or caretaker able to live upstairs while aging residents can stay downstairs. Some of the units could be designed as single story as well, also noting that some owners may choose to have a fully finished basement. **Bart** clarified that the idea is to ensure people can stay and age in place without having to move later in age.

Bart also suggested some reconfiguration of the road with some ideas for a central play area, with a tradeoff of more wetland impact for increased quality of the neighborhood.

It was confirmed that they have not hired traffic engineer yet, and there was only a study completed at this point for preliminary discussions and assessment.

Mr. Coronati explained that they do not have questions yet for storm water as it is still being designed, and asked if a further traffic study would be needed. **Bart** confirmed that a traffic study would be needed per town regulations.

The Chair confirmed that they will need to check if the project goes under site plan or subdivision for the application. It was confirmed that it will be clarified and checked.

It was summarized that the major concerns include wetland impacts, the configuration of the development, traffic, water source, the septic systems, and storm water.

Mr. Coronati explained they tried to break up the storm water treatment with multiple ponds. It was also added that they are hoping to not request any waivers.

The public comment was opened at 8:00 PM.

Mark Vatcher, 184 New Road, asked regarding fire suppression and if there will be fire hydrants.

The Chair confirmed that the TRC incorporates department heads into the discussion and review, including the Fire Chief, and that it will be addressed.

Mr. Vatcher continued regarding concerns about utilities, with septic tanks that use a pump up have concern with loss of power, also noting that they have a pump in the cellar at their house due to the issue with water in area.

Sara Tambling, 204 New Road, asked if the existing trees in the wetland areas are planned to be left as-is or if the area is going to be manicured at all.

The Chair explained that there are specific regulations for the wetland overlay district that speaks to the regulations on what is allowed.

Claudia Vatcher, 184 New Road, explained that she is a direct abutter to the north, and asked regarding the road entrance and how far it is being moved.

Mr. Coronati explained it is moving from when it was presented to ZBA by roughly 40', and will be about 150' from their property line at the closest location. They will also be adding a buffer line as well. They will not be cutting trees in the existing wetland buffer or clearing, highlighting that they will be planting some additional.

The Chair added there will be more dedicated details to the plantings and trees in the next stage of the design too.

Mrs. Vatcher added emphasis of how wet the land is in the area, and commended the owner/applicant for their communication through the process, concluding with concern for the proximity to their lot in relation to the end of proposed street and development.

Mr. Coronati pointed to property line on plan, displaying that the far end of the development is past the **Vatcher's** property line and will therefore not be right next to them.

Matt Larkin, 189 New Road, noted that he is the abutter across the road from the proposed entrance, and highlighted concern of added traffic with deliveries. Noted that the hope is that the plantings will add to the buffer. Also, highlighted concern of nitrogen loading and with the soil survey, noting discrepancies with the soil types and the areas of very poorly drained soils as there is more standing water in the large area. The surface water has a direct line out to Great Bay as well.

The Chair confirmed that the plans undergo town review, and they have the right for a separate wetland scientist to confirm and check anything that may be a discrepancy.

Mr. Larkin continued that the abutters' wells are close to the property, with concern for the construction and development affecting the wells. Further concerns highlighted were that the old road has not been revegetated as stated; that at the ZBA meeting they were told 3500-4000 SF houses, not 2500 SF; concerns that the storm water basins could hit groundwater; and concern with the water line being an unknown at this point with ability to connect.

Gary Levy, 81 New Road, commented on the construction timeline and thresholds for vesting. Highlighted concern with construction vehicles on the road, and that the road may need to be bonded during construction. The road is showing a fair amount of cracking, which could be exacerbated by heavy vehicles.

Atty. Baum confirmed that five years is the typical vesting and it is set by the Planning Board; it is 3 years for transfer control for a typical condominium, and best to be completed by that time. It is planned to be built out as quickly as the market demands, and while the demand is there currently, there is always potential for that to change.

Mr. Levy highlighted that the road was fixed in 2017/18, therefore the residents do not want it to return to the previous state of road before it was fixed, and concluded by stating that the applicant/owner has been very helpful and communicative through the process as well.

Mr. Coronati provided some clarification: the old road is included in the plan to be revegetated; believes that the total size of the homes was being confused with the footprint of the home; and added that the floor plans will be provided. **Atty. Baum** clarified that those floor plans will be recorded at the registry of deeds.

Bart asked what the timeline is roughly. **Mr. Graham** explained they are likely about 60 days away from formal submission.

The Chair reiterated that TRC is the next step in process, which can include up to three members from the board.

251
252 **5. New/Old Business**

253 a. Discussion relative to the Planning Board's rules of procedure.

254 The Chair introduced that the rules of procedure document was last amended in 2018 with only
255 a minor change, and otherwise last edited in 2009.

256
257 Suggested changes included to have plans not be required to be signed by the chair, and
258 instead authorize the town planner to physically sign the plans. It has created issues with
259 recording plans at the registry of deeds in a timely manner in the past. It was explained how
260 since the town planner is the one to check that all conditions are met, it would make sense that
261 they are the one to sign it as well.

262 **Bart** confirmed that this rule is in the site regulations and not this document, but that can be
263 presented as an edit to be made.

264
265 The Chair commented on the physical papers and copies that applicant provides to the board. It
266 was suggested to have online review of the documents and to only have important documents
267 physically printed for the meeting. **Bart** confirmed that if someone wants a document physically
268 printed, that can be communicated ahead of time. It was clarified that plan sets should still be
269 required, though, to include 11 x 17 versions for members. It was reiterated that if a specific
270 document is requested to be printed by a member, that can easily be done, but the goal is to
271 reduce time and paper waste.

272
273 **Bart** recommended that the TRC should meet prior to Planning Board meeting to save time.
274 Therefore, there will be a more complete application at the time they are presenting to the
275 Planning Board with more issues resolved at the TRC level.

276 The Chair also recommended having standing members on the committee instead of how it is
277 currently with rotating members application by application.

278
279 **Bill** asked regarding when applications require state review separate of town, and how that
280 impacts the timeline; it was explained that if the state requests modifications that are significant
281 enough to the plans, then the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Board again if
282 they had already approved it prior to feedback from the state level.

283
284 The Chair also commented on minimizing information received last minute from applicants so
285 that the board has sufficient review time before the meeting.

286
287 **Bart** confirmed that he will draft language, including for the site plan and subdivision regulations
288 to codify the changes discussed, and bring to the next regular meeting

289
290 b. Committee Reports/Planner's Report

291 Conservation Commission: **None**

292 Town Council: **None**

293 Planner's Report: **Bart** commented that there might be application for Hersey Lane for building
294 a residence on a Class VI road. He noted that he will not be present at the August meeting, but
295 that the board will just have to provide comment and that he will provide the statute language.
296 Also, the Mark West presentation for the wetland mapping update is anticipated for September.
297 At the September meeting, it is also planned to show a map with district boundary ideas and
298 discuss delineations and transitions from neighborhoods.

299 The workshop prior to the August meeting will be at 6 PM again for the Transportation chapter,
300 with Colin Lentz from SRPC to speak to it.

301 The zoning amendments for the VC district and sub districts also passed Town Council and is

now in effect. The zoning map has been updated and uploaded to the applicable website pages. They are planning to do online survey to replicate the focus groups and hear more from residents and their thoughts on their neighborhoods. It will probably run for two months, and will be posted to the website.

6. Adjourn

Action

Motion: **Jane Ford** moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 PM.

Second: **Jamie Bruton**

Discussion: None

Vote: **Approved 5-0-0**

Respectfully submitted,
Bridgette Grotheer
Land Use Administrator

DCAT:

https://videoplayer.telvue.com/player/XSekdEeRsk0JHqVHAvKJVka7_5VixKP/videos