



TOWN OF
NEWMARKET
NEW HAMPSHIRE

PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, July 14, 2026 at 7:00 PM

Town Hall, Council Chambers

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Present: Val Shelton (Chair), Zachary Shollar (Vice Chair), Jane Ford, Bill Arcieri, Jeff Goldknopf, Justin Glazebrook (Town Council – Ex officio), Bart McDonough (Director of Planning & Community Development)

Absent: Jamie Bruton, Eric Botterman (Alternate)

The Chair called the regular meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

The voting members will be: **Val Shelton, Zach Shollar, Jane Ford, Bill Arcieri, Jeff Goldknopf, Justin Glazebrook.**

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Public Comments

The public comment was opened at 7:04 PM. There were no public comments for items not on the agenda. The public comment was closed at 7:05 PM.

3. Review & Approval of Minutes

a. June 9, 2026

Action

Motion: Jeff Goldknopf moved to approve the minutes of June 9, 2026.

Second: Jane Ford

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 6-0-0

4. Regular Business

a. Pursuant to RSA 674:2-4 and Section 4.16 Town Master Plan of the Municipal Code of the Town of Newmarket, notice is hereby given that the Planning Board will hold a public hearing to review and adopt a new master plan comprising of the following chapters enumerated hereinbelow, or take any other action relative thereto.

- 1. Vision, 2. Existing and Future Land Use, 3. Arts, Culture and Historic Resources, 4. Community Facilities and Utilities, 5. Downtown Riverfront, 6. Economic Development, 7. Energy, 8. Housing, 9. Land and Water Conversation, 10. Recreation, 11. Transportation.

The proposed master plan chapter amendments can be viewed by visiting the following link below, or by visiting the Department of Planning and Community Development located in Town Hall. (<https://www.newmarketnh.gov/522/Draft-Master-Plan-2026-PDFs>)

The Chair read the above into the record, and gave an overview of the process thus far developing the Master Plan.

Kerrie Diers and **Rachel Dewey** with Strafford Regional Planning Commission introduced the Master Plan and the new draft public-facing website for the chapters and themes. With the

website interface, it was shown how each topic has a tile to navigate to specific chapters. The Arts, Culture and Historic Resources Chapter was presented as an example of a chapter landing page. The Implementation Plan page was also shown, having an interactive map that can organize information by chapter or theme, with it explained that the map can be updated as often as the Town wishes.

The Chair asked regarding if there is a link to a spreadsheet showing the implementation goals. It was confirmed that the spreadsheet can be added to the website.

Zach praised the heat map shown on the Implementation Plan page as a way for the public to be able to see where items are focused.

Bill asked regarding updating the map; **Rachel** explained that it can be easily updated, and it is tied to data through a spreadsheet on the back-end. Therefore, if an updated spreadsheet is provided, it can be uploaded for updating the map through coordination with SRPC and **Bart**.

Zach also noted that the Long-Range Planning Subcommittee could also assist with those updates.

It was recommended that prioritization should be added as a field for the map to be able to sort and filter by (short-term, long-range, etc.).

Public comment was opened at 7:10 PM.

Bob Daigle asked when public comment is going to be received; the Chair explained that they have been receiving comments throughout the process but that this is the first public hearing.

Mr. Daigle asked if there will be further public hearings.

Bill added that the Master Plan is a living document and can therefore be fluid and updated after the initial official adoption still as well.

The Chair reviewed how this is the first comprehensive update in about 20 years, and explained individual chapters have been updated since then and therefore they can continue to do amendments in a similar way moving forward. It was also explained that the Zoning Board of Adjustment and Capital Improvement Plan also are informed by the Master Plan.

Jeff agreed that it may be beneficial to have more time for the public to review the full draft. It was confirmed that the draft website interface will be made be accessible to the public and shared.

Bart confirmed that the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting is August 11.

Kimberly Harris, 6 Lincoln Avenue, asked when the last rewrite was. It was confirmed to be in 2004, but reiterated there has been further updates and amendments to individual chapters. It was also confirmed that the previous Master Plan is on the website if people wished to compare.

Ms. Harris continued to ask what the larger things being changed in the Master Plan are when comparing the information.

The Chair further spoke to the past two years of work on the update, how each chapter had its own separate subcommittee, and items that no longer applied or were no longer relevant were removed. The draft for adoption includes editing for consistencies between chapters and creating cohesiveness throughout the document.

Bill commented that it depends on when an individual member of the public is interested in for what they overall may take away from the Master Plan.

Bart commented that links will be added to the department and Planning Board pages for people to be able to review the draft website, and that the PDF versions have been posted for review already. It was further explained that there are broad differences in chapters and contents between the previous comprehensive update and this one.

Zach confirmed that there could be a list formulated of old versus new chapter names and the different themes.

The Chair also noted that the Planning Board members and other board members will need to be updated, while also noting previous members, and the different chapter subcommittee members as well.

George Willant, 42 Schanda Drive, asked what the overall goal was for adopting the updated Master Plan; the Chair noted that the original goal was Spring 2026.

Bart recommended that it would be advisable to continue the hearing to August for comments, with the hope to adopt it at the next meeting.

Bill added that he would suggest the action items should be a prioritization for anyone in the public that is reviewing the Master Plan.

Zach added that the overall vision should be reviewed by the public as well, and that the board is otherwise comfortable with the document pending any public comments.

There was consensus that the August 11 continued hearing will guide when the final adoption would be.

Justin added that he does not foresee any major adjustments as well, therefore hoping for approval in August pending any minor changes.

Action

Motion: **Zach Shollar** motioned to continue the public comments for the Master Plan adoption to the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting on August 11, 2026.

Second: **Bill Arcieri**

Discussion: None

Vote: **Approved 6-0-0**

- b. Pursuant to RSA 676:4 and Section 2.02 Design Review of 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 applicants Altus Engineering and Portsmouth Architects, representing Cheney East Company, will be reviewed by Planning Board to discuss and provide input on a development concept for a property located at 14 Elm Street, Tax Map U2, Lot 245 in the Village Corridor-Center District. The first concept proposes an apartment building with an 11,720 sf. footprint, comprising 20 dwelling units with 25 parking spaces with associated utilities and infrastructure. The application is on file in the Department of Planning and Community Development office located in the Newmarket Town Hall with an address of 186 Main Street.

The Chair read the above into the record, and explained that this is a design review with non-binding discussions. It will not be voted on, and is strictly a review meeting.

Jeff Goldknopf *recused himself from the discussion.*

Richard Desjardins, Portsmouth Architects, introduced himself with **Mark Gianniny**, Portsmouth Architects, and **Patrick Journeay**, Altus Engineering. The plan being presented can be found at: <https://newmarketnh.portal.civicclerk.com/event/2436/files/attachment/7909>.

Mr. Desjardins began by explaining that they were before the Board for a first design review in February for the redevelopment, and this plan is an addendum to that submittal. All dimensional reductions between the previous proposal and this proposal are provided in the documents submitted, including the reduction of about 2000 SF to the building footprint. The history of the site and neighborhood was reviewed with a previous two-story mill building extensively covering the site and surrounding land, drawing architectural and design inspiration from that. The design

includes a brick stair/elevator tower, and the building transitions to a mansard roof structure in the rear of the site toward Washington Street to break up the façade and have the building appear as separate multiple buildings. The revised design also preserves the largest and healthiest tree along Elm Street. It was explained that the lot is about 17000 SF, substantially larger than the minimum for the zone which is 3000 SF, which drives some of the relief requests. It was added that the lot size can accommodate and warrants a larger building for urban infill, with Nichols Avenue and Washington Street serving as the boundary to the R3 zoning district, which has also been identified in the proposed master plan as an area for zoning reevaluation to encourage a variety of housing affordability and diversity.

Mr. Desjardins continued to review key changes to the design, as follows: the Washington Street buildout request is eliminated; the parking garage is fully enclosed to conceal parking within the structure along with bikes, trash, tenant storage and mechanical space systems; 10' in building width has been removed to reduce the structure size; the pushing and pulling in the building has been increased so that no flat portions exceed the maximum 50' in length on Elm Street and 100' on Nichols Avenue; parking spaces have been reduced and provides one parking space per unit; setbacks have been increased to provide more landscaping; there will be a multi-functional bench to replace the current existing bus stop area; the project including diverse unit sizes ranging from 488 SF studio to a 1450 SF two-bedroom unit; community-based elements including a 1000 SF community rooftop deck for the building residents accessible by elevator, a sharable office space on the second floor, and a lounge area on the third floor; proposing a partial green roof to aid in stormwater retention and aid in the heat island effect; both the flat roof and mansard roof portions on the project being below the max building height of the neighboring zoning district to transition from the VC to R3 district; an overview that the site is a two minute walk to Main Street and four minute walk to central downtown areas, encouraging pedestrian activity of residents instead of vehicle traffic

Mr. Journeay further continued that since February, more survey information has been collected in regards to drainage and sidewalks. They also met with **Bart** and **Lyndsay** to discuss traffic, safety, and drainage elements. The current intent is to have vehicles enter the site on Elm Street and exit on Washington Street. The current design will also suggest relocation for crosswalks and rebuilding of ADA crosswalks, with landscaping proposed in between the building and sidewalk/crosswalk areas. Stormwater discharge would be redirected to the larger drainage pipe on Elm Street, and away from the current undersized pipe on Nichols Avenue and Washington Street. It was reiterated that the proposed green roof would also aid in slowing water flow. The utilities that will be proposed to connect in the site were also referenced.

Public comment opened at 8:05 PM.

Andrew Hart, 6 Lincoln Avenue, spoke to the property frontage on three streets; narrow streets with sidewalks only on Nichols Avenue; current challenges with Lincoln Avenue being a dead-end street as dump trucks have to back into the streets, and similar issue with plow trucks as well. Commented that the neighborhood is mainly a cluster of single family homes, duplexes, and colonial-type homes that have been converted into apartment units. Also commented on parking issues, as most homes have two cars. Continued that the neighborhood is of pedestrian streets with lots of activity. Regarding drainage, commented that Washington Avenue frequently floods, including in the winter when it floods and freezes. Disagrees with the proposed exit on Washington Street. Further described neighborhood; spoke to Master Plan, Transportation chapter calling for multi-modal streets which this development would go against, Disagrees that this would add affordable housing. In terms of the Resiliency chapter, it is a flood-prone area where this development would not help. Housing chapter highlights building in rural residential district, and disagreed that the VCC district definition and goals aligns with this proposal.

Jennifer Whitten, 16 Nichols Avenue, described that she lived in the neighborhood when she was in college and recently moved back. Spoke to the population density with about 40 dwelling units currently on Nichols Avenue, where this would add another 20 units. Overwhelmed by parking due to recreation activities, and especially when parking is full on Main Street. Trouble for emergency vehicles to pass as well. Concerned with visibility for sight distance. Appreciate historical information and details, but noted that there were not as many cars for cause of concern previously. Spoke to community in the neighborhood, lots of children, economic diversity, retirees, great range of different people. Concerned by the impact this will have on that community, addition of cars, pollution with stormwater and air pollution. Questions regarding impact to public safety, asked if four-plexes would be possible without impeding on sight-lines as much. Echoed concern regarding plows. Disagreed that it is consistent with neighborhood. Wondered what other proposal could support existing neighborhood instead of focusing on future tenants.

Bill Mitchell, 2 Lincoln Avenue, introduced how he has lived in the neighborhood for six years. Spoke to issues with trucks and maneuvering on the streets. Worried about only having one parking space per unit and how additional cars would be supported, causing issues for pedestrians and the police. Wants advancement and improvement, but believes this needs to be looked at more carefully.

Richie Reeves, 8 Lincoln Avenue, reviewed that he has lived in neighborhood since 2019. Spoke anecdotally regarding the neighborhood and the feeling of the town, worried about it becoming like Portsmouth and not bringing together community, changing Newmarket negatively.

Mike Mangan, owner of 10-12 Nichols Avenue, asked regarding the relief that would be needed for this proposal, and also regarding parking in the area and where/if it is allowed on the streets in the neighborhood.

Andrea McCurry, 13 ½ Nichols Avenue, spoke that she believes there is a more sensible way to approach the property and the development, and agreed with issues with parking and narrow roads, stating that the proposal does not fit in with the neighborhood and the area.

Alyssa Chase, 10 Nichols Avenue, agreed with the previous comments, spoke to previously living in Portsmouth and staying in Newmarket for the community and welcoming feeling. Does not like the design of the building, believes it would have a negative impact. Used to live on Spring Street where there was one parking space per unit which was very hard to manage.

John Carmichael, 44 Elm Street, asked regarding the bus station and the bench. It was confirmed that the bench would be covered. Spoke to how children wait at the bench for the school bus. Added that Nichols Avenue has been on the historic district for unique housing; commented that it would be a shame for the historicalness on the street to be overshadowed by this new building.

Donald Pelletier, 42 Elm Street, asked if the Master Plan would inform the new development, or if the development would have changes. It was clarified that the Master Plan is separate from the Zoning Ordinance; Master Plan is general visioning whereas developments are under the development regulations and zoning ordinance.

Brad Ritchie, 8 Washington Street, added the importance to carefully consider changes and how it impacts the greater neighborhood and town. Spoke to previous proposals that had previously been discussed.

Bob Daigle, 43 Elm Street, praised the plan but commented that if it could be reduced to therefore better fit the neighborhood.

Brian Michaelis, 41 Elm Street, introduced himself as a resident since 1984, commented on an environmental impact study for any proposal. Spoke to Rivermoor Landing history as well, sewage system and infrastructure, existing system is dilapidated and does not believe it could support this development. Commented on traffic in neighborhood as well and how this would add to it. Traffic study also urged.

Andrea McCurry, asked regarding the existing white house and how it was previously being renovated and why it is not being demolished.

Jennifer Whitten reiterated the question of what relief is being requested

Public comment closed at 8:45 PM.

Bart reviewed the relief being requested relative to the current zoning and design proposal. There will be Special Use Permits needed from the Planning Board, but no variances are needed from the Zoning Board of Adjustment based on the current design proposal. Explained that the building width maximum is 50' on Elm Street and 100' on Nichols Avenue, which the proposal exceeds and would require relief under the Special Use Permit. They are also proposing more than the maximum number of units per site, which is 16, therefore needing relief for that as well. The total units per building is also being exceeded. Building types are also listed in the zoning ordinance where this would be a different type than allowed, so relief can then also be requested through the Planning Board for that.

Bart continued to review the process. The proposal would next would go to the Technical Review Committee (TRC), which is open to the public but does not require notice and is not interactive with public comment. TRC will then submit a response letter to applicant after meeting, which is addressed in the formal submittal to Planning Board. The design is also reviewed by Town's consulting engineers at that stage.

The Chair also reiterated that maximum units per building is 8 units for this zone. Therefore it must meet the criteria of the Special Use Permit, which includes the building type. The Special Use Permit is an administrative decision of the Planning Board, which gives the Board authority to approve and modify.

Eric Weinrieb, Altus Engineering, commented regarding the design and the parking. State RSA only requires one space per dwelling unit, and more than the state minimum cannot be requested.

The Chair added that the zone also required no parking in the VCC zone, and therefore parking cannot be mandated.

Mr. Mangan asked on which streets parking is allowed. The Board referred to the Town parking ordinance for clarification.

Bart continued to review the staff report, which can be reviewed at: <https://newmarketnh.portal.civicclerk.com/event/2436/files/attachment/7933>. With the current proposal, the building length on Elm Street and Nichols Avenue would require relief. Relief would also be needed for

exceeding the 16-unit maximum units for a lot in the zone. The criteria for granting relief was reviewed under section 32-45 (f)(2).

Regarding section 32-45(f)(2), the Chair confirmed with the applicant that it is not a townhouse development.

Mr. Desjardins noted that a fiscal impact study and market analysis would be completed after this stage.

Discussion continued to the Special Use Permit requiring a community space as the focal point;

Mr. Desjardins pointed to the community rooftop deck, landscaping areas around street fronts, shared office spaces, and the development being direct walking distance to downtown.

Zach asked for clarification that it is focused on residents of development; this was confirmed.

Bart reviewed intent of district as written in ordinance. **Zach** commented how it is on boundary of the districts and also gateway to neighborhood, and that it could better meet the transition of the neighborhoods with that in mind.

Mr. Desjardins commented on the breaking up of the façade in order to try to meet that goal, that if the building were to be separated then it would meet the proposed lengths, and also that they are trying to meet the different abutting zoning areas with respect to the height.

Discussion ensued regarding if the lot could hypothetically be subdividable in order to meet the regulations, which would also require firewalls. The parking opening would not be allowed, therefore requiring more curb cuts and likely requiring a reduction in parking spaces for maneuverability. Overall, the same building would not be able to be achieved if it was subdivided, hypothetically.

Mr. Weinrieb added how additional stairs and elevators would also be needed in the hypothetical scenario, causing increased infrastructure costs.

Discussion continued to the previous proposal with three buildings; **Bill** confirmed that less relief would be needed for that proposal, as relief would not be needed for length of building.

Mr. Desjardins spoke to February meeting and the board not agreeing with the height of the buildings in that proposal, as well as that proposal having more impervious surfaces.

Zach spoke further to design and the amount of units, pointing to the courtyard style developments that the district envisioned. **Mr. Desjardins** also spoke to the minimum lot size and the property exceeding that, explaining that the lot lends to a building of the proposed size.

Bart referred back to special use permit for exceeding 16 units and the requirement for a focal point as a common/social space. Further discussion ensued regarding different scenarios and design context.

Zach commented further on location of lot and meeting the purpose of district, and mitigation of impacts that have been commented on tonight.

Jane also added concerns regarding the design, noting that the design does not fit the environment, being familiar with the neighborhood and having traffic concerns observationally.

Bill added concerns with density, and parking needs. The Chair reiterated that it could be built with no parking based on regulations. **Bill** continued to express issues with the proposed density and seeing an adverse impact, noting that he could agree if it was reduced to 16 units and did not exceed that maximum.

Justin noted that there is a market for people that rent without readily provided parking spaces. Noted concerns with flooding and driving in the neighborhood with the roads, and appreciates effort with incorporating parking.

Zach further commented on the sidewalk; advised extending sidewalk, and to have a drop off location and trash receptacles relocation. **Mr. Desjardins** agreed that it could be explored to relocate the trash. Commented on traffic, trying to keep traffic off of narrower streets. Items would help alleviate the relief request.

Mr. Desjardins concluded that the proposal is still a residential use in residential neighborhood. **Mr. Weinrieb** explained that formalizing crosswalks and sidewalks better through the proposal will increase safety and correct drainage, and that it is ADA accessible. They will be redirecting drainage to Elm Street to reduce public safety issue of flooding and icing in the winter as has been expressed. They will change the turning radius as well. Commented that they could explore adding a sidewalk along Nichols Avenue if it is preferred to add that for public safety benefit, but that this would take away some landscaping.

Bill asked for confirmation regarding stormwater; **Mr. Weinrieb** explained that they are only adding 2000 SF of additional impervious surface than what is currently on the site.

Discussion returned to the building type and if it is consistent with the zone. It was noted that the proposed type is more in line with a large Main Street building typology.

Zach agreed that it meets the VCC zone, and sees that they are trying to blend it in with neighborhood and typologies, but on a bigger scale. **Bill** agreed as well.

Discussion continued to review the setback and structure height consistency further. Sheet A9 was reviewed with it noted that the proposal is consistent as the building structure gets closer to the adjacent lots. It was noted that it is taller than adjacent lots by about 4-5' from peak to peak. It was also noted that providing the specific number will help clarify that further.

For the building length exceeding on Nichols Avenue and Elm Street, it was further explained that exceeding the length is due to trying to fit the parking.

Zach spoke to the impact of the size and building length relative to other impacts of the development.

The Board thanked the applicants and the public in conclusion of the discussion.

5. New/Old Business

a. Committee Reports

Consensus that there was nothing critical from committee reports at this time.

b. Planner's Report

Bart reported that the Town received a grant for Schanda Park planning. **Ivy Vann** will likely coming for presentation regarding HOP grant updates in September. A joint board and committee is trying to be planned to gather feedback and input for the wayfinding project, noting that members should keep an eye out for further communication. The CIP committee will start meeting in August. The Rosa-Folletts Brook project is on track for closing in October. The 200 New Road project is working through state process. A proposal for 37 Exeter Road will likely come before the Board soon, as well as one for 41 Exeter Road. A proposal at 3 North Main Street is pending. There will be a stormwater review for 5 Chapel Street likely in September.

Motion to extend the meeting close time past 10:00 PM made by Zach Shollar.

Motion seconded by Bill Arcieri.

Motion passed 6-0-0.

Bart continued that relief is going to be sought from the ZBA for 11 Creighton St, and then there will be a BLA request before the Planning Board. There will be a goal setting agenda for the Board planned soon as well.

c. Other Business

The Chair commented that members need to be careful posting anything on social media as active board members regarding any proposals before the Board.

6. Adjourn

Action

Motion: Jane Ford moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:02 PM.

Second: Justin Glazebrook

Discussion: None

Vote: Approved 6-0-0

Respectfully submitted,
Bridgette Grotheer
Land Use Administrator

DCAT:

https://videoplayer.telvue.com/player/XSekdEeRsk0JHQVHAVKJVka7_5VjxKP/videos