

**Town of Newington  
Planning Board Meeting  
February 13, 2006**

1. **Call to Order:** Acting Vice-Chairman Denis Hebert called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.  
**Present:** Acting Vice Chairman Denis Heber, Jack Pare, John Frink, Peggy Lamson, Vincent Frank, Cos Iocovozzi, Chris Cross, Tom Morgan – Town Planner.  
**Not Present:** Chair Sandy Hislop, Gail Klanchesser
  
2. **Minutes:** *January 9, 2006:* First page under Minutes: spelling – “re-cussed” should be “re-cused”. P. 2 of 4 – under Smokey Bones paragraph – 4<sup>th</sup> line, beginning “Denis reminded . . .”: change the word “entrance” to “curb-cut.” Next sentence, “Chris stated . . .” needs clarification: should be the existing “western” entrance on Piscataqua. P. 1 of 4 under Minutes – correct spelling of name, “Wisechuck” to “Waszczuk”.  
**Motion by Jack to accept the minutes of January 9, 2006 as presented, seconded by Peggy. Discussion. Vote to accept the minutes of January 9, 2006 as corrected, none opposed, motion passed.**

3. **Correspondence:**  
Tom referenced the Public Hearing notice for Flood Plain and e-mail relative to parking on Gosling road (also forwarded to Newington Police Department). Peggy noted that in a letter regarding 100 Arboretum from the Conservation Commission, it stated incorrectly that they would come back on February 15<sup>th</sup>: they will be back in March, not in February. Denis had a question about a letter received from Amy Clark regarding 100 Arboretum. Peggy complimented the Planning Board for getting approval for RSA 482-15 (Application for Prime Wetlands): good work, this was a 2 year endeavor. All should have a copy of the Master Plan.

Peggy introduced Executive Director of the Pease Development Authority (PDA), Mr. George Bald.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
A) **100 Arboretum Drive:**

Note: Peggy Lamson re-cused herself as being in conflict with this discussion.

Mr. Gregg M. Mikolaities, P.E., president of Appledore Engineering, Inc., introduced associates Michael Mates, P.E., and also Maria Stowell and George Bald of PDA and Sam Altruda, a partner of Farley White, owner of the property on 100 Arboretum. Gregg noted that after a preliminary meeting on January 9<sup>th</sup>, the workshop scheduled for January 23<sup>rd</sup> had been cancelled due to lack of quorum. No new plans have been submitted due to questions that arose regarding the January 9<sup>th</sup> presentation.

Gregg reviewed the changes to the site plan. He pointed out existing structures, the light blue area representing the new 10 acre lot, and the light gray showing areas remaining as-is. The dark gray area represents the 170,000 sq ft expansion: they will be adding 526 parking spaces to make 671 spaces total (3 spaces for every 4 employees), and wish to combine the two areas, currently partitioned as two separate 10-acre lots, into a single 20 acre lot. Gregg clarified that the proposed expansion and the combining of the two separate lots are two separate applications: right now he is addressing the proposed expansion.

Temporary access for trucks has been removed, the main entrance retained, they are maintaining the current landscaping and building style and will be adding sidewalks in certain areas. 25 ft and 100 ft buffers are being maintained and detention basins are being constructed, and they will be continuing with the 6 ft to 10 ft high berms. On January 30<sup>th</sup>, the variance on the loading [offsets??] was approved. Site lighting will match current lighting: low-level lighting, directed downward. They were not required to apply for a dredge permit per a letter from the Fire Chief which was included in Tom’s correspondence. At this point, no additional signage is planned. Further along, either signs will conform to the current style or Gregg will return to the Board to request new signage. Gregg passed out a letter from Steve Pernaw, Traffic Consultant, addressing last meeting’s comments regarding traffic generation. In brief: traffic generation computation is based on trips.

**Questions from Board Members:**

Jack asked if wetlands would be disturbed by the new construction, and Gregg responded that he didn't think so: the area in question is ordinary wetlands, not prime. The Board needed some clarification on the location of wetlands, since there is a conflict between the site plan being presented tonight and the wetlands noted on the site plan on record. Gregg noted that he, too, reviewed all the available plans, (the Newington tax map and aerial as well) separately and together, and that those shown tonight reflect the wetlands survey delineated in person by Mark West in January of 2005, and are therefore the most accurate. Mr. West is now a Town consultant and asked the Board's permission to do the work on this site plan, since he had done the original survey.

Denis was concerned about liability: where does liability stand on the issues of fire, traffic, public bathrooms, etc? It sounds as if the project is using Town government to enforce State laws. PDA Executive Director George Bald addressed this issue: despite the fact that the PDA coordinates with the City of Portsmouth for the care of the roadways at Pease (a very unusual arrangement which is working quite well), the road network on the Pease Tradeport is the responsibility of the Pease Tradeport Authority, and they assume the liability. Also, in several months the Capital Improvement Master Plan, which clarifies this and other issues, will be available.

Denis was still concerned that the Planning Board might be held accountable for not having made a recommendation regarding the safety of the roadways. Board member Chris Cross noted that usually the Planning Board asks for a consultation regarding traffic issues. However, in this case, the PDA has an on-staff consultant who has already addressed the traffic issues, including sequential development. Denis requested that the PDA provide something in writing absolving the Planning Board for not making a recommendation in this case.

Other concerns raised by the Board included: sidewalks, clarification about the detention basins and how snow removal will be handled, basic fire safety, and when traffic issues will be addressed.

Tom applauded the fact that seven years ago a sidewalk was installed in front of the 100 Arboretum building, but expressed concern that seven years later, there is still no promised sidewalk in front of the now-empty Celestica building. According to George Bald, a survey was conducted and revealed that people like being able to walk all over the Pease Tradeport. The PDA understands the importance of sidewalks and will stay on top of that issue.

Mike Mates, P.E., described how water is drained into the detention basins: it is piped down to the basins, with outlets at or below the recommended rates of drainage. The catch basins and manholes all pipe to the detention basins using the same outlet. The detention basins use a natural filtering process to clean the runoff. Snow removal will be accomplished by pushing the snow to the extreme end of the newly proposed parking lot and allowing it to melt into the culverts which pipe into the basins. He noted that these are not natural but constructed wetlands and don't accumulate as much trash as natural wetlands will.

Gregg stated that Portsmouth both reviews and enforces fire laws, and that fire hydrants are included in the Master Plan. Only Police coverage is provided by the Town of Newington. The Fire Department has the current building plans in hand for review at this time. John Frink noted that the project will contribute \$1,275/trip to the PDA.

Maria Stowell said that the traffic study had been done anticipating a certain level of development, and that when that level of development is reached, the PDA will look at the intersections needing improvement at that time. George Bald noted once again that the Master Plan is being approved for July, and that once it reaches the Planning Board, they can recommend that attention be paid to particular intersections. Some intersections are already being monitored, since they are subject to cut-through traffic. George said he appreciates the tolerance and understanding of the Board regarding some of the unusual circumstances surrounding management of the Pease Tradeport .

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** George Bald commented that he is very excited about this project. It's a good company. The PDA is looking for high-quality companies, and this company is focused on that. They are being cautious. He is in favor of this project.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON 100 ARBORETUM DRIVE CLOSED AT 7:30 P.M.**

**Discussion, Part 1: 100 Arboretum Drive, Building Expansion:**

Chris asked if the driveways will be okay for trucks as well as cars. Gregg responded that the driveways will be designed to handle trucks. They are planning to get geo-tech borings to check the stress levels on the pavement. The plan also includes some very subtle planning, such as wider isles and curves designed using turning templates for trucks. John noted that the variance in the loading area has already been granted. Note: The Public Notice references, first, the proposed expansion of the lot at 100 Arboretum (which affects lot lines) and, second, the 170,000 expansion of the office building at 100 Arboretum. The current discussion references the office building expansion.

Board members discussed whether or not to wait until the Conservation Commission has had a chance to review their issues. If the Board holds off to wait for the Conservation Commission, it will be two more months before approvals can be made and the project can continue. Tom proposed that if the Planning Board is ready to approve the site plan as presented tonight, that the motion to approve be made contingent upon the Conservation Commissions later review and approval.

**It was moved by Cos and seconded by Chris that the Planning Board approve the building plan for 100 Arboretum as presented on the condition that the following issues are addressed:**

- 1) 8 questions by the Conservation Commission, referenced in a document dated February 6<sup>th</sup>, 2006;
- 2) Additions concerns:
  - Sidewalks
  - \*\*\*Receiving a letter from Mark West regarding the accuracy of the wetland surveys
  - The bus stop pad
  - Handicap access
  - Placing a snow removal plan on file

**Discussion. Voting on motion: all approved, motion passed.**

**100 ARBORETUM PRESENTATION, Part 2: Subdivision:**

Tom noted that combining the two ten acre lots into a single lot will require moving the lease lines. Usually, there are many issues which arise when lot lines are moved. However, in this case, there are no tax issues for Newington, since the tax liability lies with the PDA. Chris added that since this lot line adjustment doesn't create a new, buildable lot, there is no need for a special meeting to discuss it.

Gregg, referencing the site plan drawing, reiterated that the light gray area represents the existing construction on 10 acres and the dark gray area is the proposed construction, also a 10 acre area. The project would like to have these two 10-acre lots officially combined to denote a single 20-acre lot. Tom reminded the Board that the intent of the Public Notice is to let abutters and others know what is going on. Denis asked if the Board was being asked to sign a mylar – a legal document. Maria Stowell indicated that this was true, and that the PDA had already signed it.

**Motion was made by Chris and seconded by Vincent to approve the lot line adjustment for the two lots at 100 Arboretum Drive. Discussion. Vote: all approved, motion passed.**

**100 ARBORETUM: GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Tom stated that the new PDA Board Chair would like to meet with the Planning Board and other interested town officials to discuss the legalities involved with this project and others that might arise. John noted that it is a courtesy on the part of the PDA to involve the Newington Planning Board in its projects, and he and other Board members expressed their thanks.

**B) SMOKEY BONES ACCESS**

According to Tom, Dave Latulippe of Smokey Bones had a scheduling conflict and was unable to attend tonight's meeting. Discussion continued: the Board would like to schedule his return for the next Public Hearing. Public safety is at risk in this instance, and time is continuing to pass without any correction at that intersection. If Mr. Latulippe misses another meeting, the Board will have to take action, which might include sending a letter asking that that intersection be closed down until the issue is resolved. It was noted that a sign -- insufficient to address the confusion -- has been placed at the intersection (without a sign permit) and that the owners have failed to tape over the Smokey Bones sign. The Board stressed that this issue must be addressed as soon as possible.

The Board scheduled a continuance of the Smokey Bones hearing for March 13<sup>th</sup>.

Notes: There will be a Work Session on February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2006. Peggy Lamson returned at 7:55 p.m.

### **C) FLOODPLAIN AMENDMENTS TO SUBDIVISION & SITE PLAN REGULATIONS**

The Board would like to see the Town join the National Flood Insurance Program. This is necessary because many homeowners are being forced to pay higher insurance rates because the Town map is not correct. In order to change the Town Map, it is necessary to belong to the National Flood Insurance Program. Prerequisites for that include: a vote at the Town meeting to approve the Zone Amendment endorsed by the Planning Board; and a vote by the Board of Selectmen to join the program. The Planning Board is currently considering the amendments to the subdivision and site plan regulations, which will incorporate the FEMA restrictions. Most towns are already a part of this program.

There was some confusion over what the Planning Board needs to do, so Tom clarified: amendments to three different sets of regulations are required -- zoning, subdivision and site plan. Only Town meeting can adopt the zoning proposal: that is scheduled for the March meeting. The subdivision and site plan amendments only require a vote by the Planning Board after a Public Hearing such as tonight's meeting. (This proposal was noted for Public Hearing.) Once voted in, these amendments are immediately binding.

John is very concerned that if the Planning Board approves this before the Town gives their approval, it may create issues for applicants, who will be subject to the new rules whether or not the Town votes to join the National Flood Insurance Program. These new regulations may cause insurance increases for some of the townspeople. However, he understands that there is a risk that FEMA won't accept the new Town maps if Newington doesn't belong to this program. These amendments may also affect what types of necessary permits are required for applicants, and their cost. Tom reminded the Board that if the Town doesn't approve membership, or even after the map has been changed and approved, the Board can unapprove their membership.

**Motion was made by Vincent and seconded by Peggy to approve the Flood Plain Amendments to the Site Plan regulations as proposed. Discussion. Vote: 6 approved, 1 abstention (John Frink); motion Passed.**

### **5. NEW BUSINESS: Proposal for a Wingate Inn behind the Exxon**

**Summary:** Mike Haverski, representing Mr. Butler and Applevale Construction for Wingate Inn, is seeking the Board's endorsement for his hotel before progressing to the stage of spending money to create the more detailed site plan drawings. However, the Board is reluctant to give approval to the project without seeing those detailed drawings. Also, the Board has made recommendations which support an initiative which will come before the State for final approval in May ("Option 13"), and Mike does not want to create plans based on a regulation which has not yet been approved.

**Detailed Discussion:** Mike Haverski, representing Mr. Butler and Applevale Construction, presented a redesigned plan which they feel addresses all the changes that have been asked for. He is looking for an endorsement from the Planning Board. A Civil Engineer has been hired for doing the soil testing, and the building is being designed at this point.

Chris clarified the reasons for the suggested changes by giving background on "Option 13". The State of New Hampshire has been engaged in a long process to define a roadway corridor into Spaulding Turnpike. This process began in 2003 and is nearly over, now. As part of the process, the State sought input from the Towns being affected, including Newington. The Planning Board felt that all of the proposals presented did not allow for the proper development of Newington because the previous 12 proposals closed the off and on ramp at Exit 4. Newington businesses depend upon the Exit 4 ramps.

So in July of 2005, the Planning Board offered an alternative, Option 13, which would allow Exit 4 to remain open by changing Spaulding Turnpike from an open access highway to a limited access highway. This means that the Exit 4 off-ramp can have no turn-offs up to the Shattuck Way intersection, and the on-ramp must have no off-ramps or joiners until it leaves that intersection. The proposal went to Public Hearing in October of 2005 and was seen by the State, and the Advisory Taskforce and the State determined that their primary alternative would become Option 13. The final hearing to confirm Option 13 will be held in May.

Chris told Mike that Option 13 requires the purchase of a right-of-way to provide access to several businesses affected by the changes. It is a 60 ft access corridor and runs very close to the Wingate property. The Town and the Planning Board are committed to supporting Option 13 as being the only option which still allows access to several Newington businesses. If the Board approves your preliminary plan as proposed, Chris said, the right-of-way will only be possible with considerable harm to your buildings and a great deal of re-work on your part. If that is not possible, then the State will be forced to revert to one of the previous 12 options, all of which close Exit 4 and adversely affect Newington businesses, including your hotel.

Therefore, as the first applicant to come before the Board who will be affected by the Option 13 proposal, if it passes, the Board would like to see you create a development which protects that right-of-way corridor. This can be done by creating a design which moves the actual building down and places only easily movable construction – such as parking lots and landscaping – in the path of the proposed ROW corridor. The Board feels that your hotel is a reasonable use of that land and a good match with the gas station, and could go forward in support of the plan if the suggested changes were made. But the Board is reluctant to support the project without protecting the proposed access corridor.

*Mike* reiterated that he want the Board's endorsement for this conceptual plan. He has been attempting to work with the State, as well.

Board members are displeased with the response of State Department of Transportation (DOT) representative Chris Waszczuk to repeated requests to meet with them. Vincent noted that the Board does not appreciate the attitude of the DOT: they are being ignored by the State DOT Representative. Peggy concurred, saying that the Conservation Commission is also frustrated that the State is ignoring the community. If the DOT would come talk, the Board and Conservation Commission will be better able to do their business'. Chris reminded the Board that the DOT considers this to be a local land use issue and will not make any commitments until the decision is made in 90 days as to how the land will be utilized. Cos suggested that perhaps an approval could be made for this applicant pending State approval.

Mike is very frustrated as well. He has spoken to Chris Waszczuk (the State DOT representative) and nobody at DOT knows what's going on until the hearing in 90 days. But Mike can't continue with his plans without a driveway permit – which he can't acquire until the State settles the Spaulding issue. He noted that the Nimble Hill entrance is gone: there is only one exit and one entrance. They've allowed 15 ft to the lot line so that the State could take part of his land, if necessary, and still have their ROW. Then the access would be directly onto the public way. Mike presented some proposals made by the State, but the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) did not approve the State's proposal. Wingate asked for a zero lot line, but the State would only allow a 15 ft variance. This leaves the Wingate project some latitude to get rid of a few parking spaces.

Mike and the Board discussed entrance and roadway options. The Board suggested moving the hotel down to free up more space at one end. Mike is not inclined to do that until he receives an endorsement from the Board and it becomes a requirement of the State. Basically, Mike said, he would like to know that if he can make it work within current Town and State guidelines, the Board will approve the project. He emphasized the fact that the current plan meets all current State and Town guidelines except for the arbitrary argument that that the State *might* want to have a road there. Mike asked the State and was told that the State doesn't want any property to make a roadway right now.

Denis noted that the State is in a very precarious position right now because it cannot make any commitments until the Public Hearing has been held. In the meantime, he wondered why Mike would choose to put forth a project that would support the closing of Exit 4, which would likely put Wingate out of business.

John feels that usually, in a situation like this, the best option is to let the applicant work with the State. However, in this case, the applicant is unable to do anything with his property while waiting for the Public Hearing to take place. John thinks that making the applicant wait is unfair. If the Planning Board has any difficulty with the concept of a hotel in this general area, we should let him know. If not, we should let him have what he wants and state that we think it's a fine idea to put a hotel there as long as he is able to meet State as well as local guidelines. If the Board makes no recommendations, John is very concerned that depriving a landowner of reasonable use of his land could make the Planning Board liable for a lawsuit. He would rather leave it in the State's hands: either they'll offer to buy land for the ROW or they won't. He, too, supports the proposal *in concept*. Even if this sends mixed messages to the State (i.e.

supporting a concept that *doesn't* support Option 13), it seems the only fair thing to do for the applicant. Cos agreed.

Chris proposed that Mike only do one set of plans – plans that will work whether or not Option 13 is approved. That way, he won't have to change his plans and can begin moving forward with his project. Obviously, any plan presented will need some adjustments on setbacks and other things. Because of this, it seems unlikely that the plan will come before the Board for final approval prior to the hearing in 90 days. Chris stated that he wants to insure that Option 13 is well supported – and to begin doing that with the Wingate project. In order to go forward, Mike should choose the worst case (most restrictive) scenario – that Option 13 passes – and proceed from there. Cos questioned why he should go with the most restrictive option now, and Chris stated he believes the building as drawn is located too close to existing growth. But with a slight adjustment it can conform.

Point of order: Denis – sensing a lot of tension — requested that each person address the Chair and be recognized by him first before speaking. He will recognize Mike after each person speaks to see if he would like to respond.

Mike was very frustrated with the Board. He reiterated that his current plan meets current regulations for setbacks and land use. He is hesitant to change anything else. Chris Cross forwarded him a plan, and he had the conceptual plans redrawn according to Chris's plan—and the ZBA wouldn't approve them. He wants conceptual approval. Peggy asked for clarification of what he means by "conceptual approval." Mike stated that he wants to hear that if the plans meet current regulations for land use and setbacks as they stand today, that the Board will approve the idea. Mike's dealings with the State should not be affecting this decision. When Peggy responded that the Board has a responsibility to the abutting property owners, Mike answered that the abutters are in favor of the project as designed.

Denis emphasized that the Board must look after the welfare of the whole Town. If Mike's plan cuts off an exit to the town, it will be difficult for them to approve it. Mike said that if the Board has any real concerns with the plan before it, take a vote and deny it. Mike has been to the State with Chris's proposed plan, and they denied it. He has also been to many Planning Board meetings.

The Board discussed its options and responsibilities. Vincent thinks that if Mike is willing to comply with State regulations, the Board should approve the plan. If Option 13 later develops into reality, it will be the applicant's problem. Jack noted that there are some mundane issues that need to be addressed, such as the 30 ft. setback. Mike's plan was at 0 ft and 30 ft at the ZBA meeting Jack attended, and the ZBA asked Mike to go 15 ft & 15 ft. ZBA seemed inclined to give 15 ft on a side. Tom stated that the ZBA had not been asked to rule on that and that if it's an issue, the applicant should be told right away. Also, the applicant has done what the Board requested. John wondered if the Board could give the applicant a simple vote of confidence.

Denis stated that there must be a Public Hearing before the Board can make any kind of approval. He also reminded the Board that they do not have to act tonight – they have ninety days from the time of the Public Hearing to approve any plan. However, since no actual plan has been presented – only a conceptual drawing – there is nothing to bring to a Public Hearing at present.

Peggy was very disturbed by Mike's request. He is the first person she has ever encountered who has asked for an "endorsement" without a detailed engineering plan and prior to a Public Hearing. What's up with that? It seems suspicious, as if there might be something more going on here than just a request to build on a site.

Denis stated unequivocally that the Board will not promise to approve any plan they have not seen the detailed drawings for. He has in the past sought council regarding just this issue. "We have a lot of time to work with you," he told Mike, "so come back with a plan to show us."

John wondered if they could just do an informal poll of each member of the Board regarding a hotel on that site: yay or nay. A poll is not a commitment. Denis disagreed. He feels that an informal poll in support of the project could lead an applicant to believe that approval is secure. Chris asked John if he thought that he could ever give a pre-disposition on a project and stand by that in a court of law.

Denis summarized the Board's position: you have a conforming use. There are issues. Those have not been addressed. There are no details for the Board to look at. You've been asked to address these issues. You need to work with us. It's up to you to decide whether or not you have a piece of property that can be developed. Cos agreed: the Planning Board requires a full site plan, on a blueprint and, yes, this is a legal use of the site.

Mike felt that they were led to believe that a conceptual plan was acceptable. Yet the Board has refused to endorse it. He doesn't want to spend more money on this project only to be told down the road that the Board would rather see a convenience store at that location. Cos reiterated that the usage for that site is correct, and that what the Board needs now is the blueprint. The Board must have specifics. Mike said he would produce a full set of plans for the Board to look at. Peggy further noted that Planning Board is a subdivision of the State and takes an oath to follow the Town Planning procedures. The Board must adhere to those procedures; they are obligated to look out for the interests of all the Town landowners.

Mike still feels that the Board has arbitrary rules. He's been here before the Board many times, has made six different changes to the plan, and doesn't want to be held up for another six months. Denis corrected him: Mike has been before the Board three times, including tonight. If he has made six changes to the plans, then some of those were the result of discussions outside of this Board's purview and are his own concern.

Cos wondered if there actually is a "paper road" – i.e. a drawing for the ROW access road that can be acquired and incorporated into an applicant's plan. Board members variously concurred that there is no problem with a hotel on that site. The Board began to discuss variances, but became stymied by the lack of a detailed engineering drawing to refer back to.

Denis again summarized: the issues that need to be addressed are – the setbacks, the curb-back, the alignment of the driveway, the 60 ft ROW wanted by the town, and the Option 13 proposal. This is a difficult lot, and its issues do need to be addressed. Denis requested that Mike return with a plan – the next public meeting is March 13th. Mike stated that he can't believe the Board can do what it is doing. He requested that Board members not send any more plans and expressed frustration that the State is in such a state of flux right now.

Cos and Tom left for a short break at 9:30 pm

**6. MASTER PLAN: Town Services and Facilities** – postponed to work session on Feb 27<sup>th</sup>.

**7. PLANNING BOARD TRAINING:**

Jack and his wife would like to be reimbursed \$50 for a 1-day UNH extension course regarding the GIS to learn how to hyperlink ordinary photographs into the GIS aerial photographs. One use of this will be to create an historical inventory for the Historical Business District.. It might also be useful with regard to site reviews.

**Motion was made by Peggy and seconded by Cos to reimburse \$50 to Jack Pare for GIS hyperlink training at UNH. Discussion opened. Vote taken: all in favor, no opposed, motion passed.**

Also, regarding GIS: Jack noted that with Jason Weiss (sp??), the Portsmouth GIS specialist, they have written Newington as an option into the RFP for aerial flood plain mapping that will be done by plane this spring. So the Town of Newington will pay for the plane to fly an additional 2-3 miles in order to map the Newington flood plains.

**8. PENDING BUSINESS:** Postponed until Feb. 27<sup>th</sup> work session.

**9. Concluding Comments:**

- Denis noted that an applicant whose presence had been requested showed up for a scheduled Board meeting only to find no quorum present. This is embarrassing! If you can't come to a meeting, please let him know in advance.
- Peggy requested that Tom please not schedule any more applicants for the work session on February 27<sup>th</sup>: the Board needs a work night to clear away some business.
- Tom asked Board members to read the Master Plan changes carefully – there are many of them.
- Jack requested that if anyone has observations about the Master Plan and you want to send them by e-mail, please copy them to Tom for backup and to create a paper trail.
- Regarding wetland mitigation: there seems to be some miscommunication occurring. Chris stated that at a recent meeting that he attended with the State as the sole representative from Newington, the State doesn't want Peggy to contact them. They have no new information for the Conservation Commission and are confused about the Town's position regarding the Railway Brook and Preserve the Drive-In Theatre. The last they knew, the Town wanted to restore the Railway Brook and Preserve the Drive-In Theatre. Chris told them he thought that, in fact, the CC does not want the Drive-In Theatre as a conservation property, but rather, to have it restored to the tax [roll?], not absorbed by the State.

They need a letter stating the Town's current position on this. Tom stated that that letter is already on his desk waiting for signature.

- Denis had several issues:
  - 1) He would also like the Conservation Committee to contact the State with a letter stating that they want the wetlands mitigation to be done in Newington, not in some other town.
  - 2) Re: the Regional Septic Sewer System -- Newington has some prime lands that could easily be developed by other towns in ways that would be detrimental to Newington, and we need to stay cognizant of this. Does anybody have any ideas how we can do that? Cos noted that Dave Sweeny(sp??) is our representative on that committee. He should be contacted to come talk to the Board, CC and Selectmen about this. Denis reiterated this is a "biggy" for the CC: it will affect the entire estuary. Denis asked Tom to get the meeting information.

**Motion was made by Cos and Seconded by Peggy to adjourn. No discussion. Vote taken: all approved. Motion passed.**

**The meeting adjourned at 9:55 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Suzanne E George  
Recorder