Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Call to Order: Chair Denis Hebert called the October 11, 2016 meeting

at 6:30 p.m.

**Present:** Chair Denis Hebert; Vice-Chair Christopher Cross; Board

Members: Bernie Christopher; Jack Pare; Mark Phillips; Alternate Members: Ken Latchaw and Peter Welch; Board of Selectmen's Representative, Cosmas Iocovozzi; Interim Planner, Gerald

Coogan and Jane Kendall, Recorder

**Absent:** Jim Weiner

**Public Guests:** James Caughran and Jose Valdez with Georgia-Pacific Gypsum;

Phil Corbet with CMA; Board of Selectman, Mike Marconi; Ann Beebe; Deb Daley; Tim Galliano; Norm LeClerc; Paul Reardon; Mark Phillips; Colin Dinsmore, P.E. with Ambit Engineering Joe

Mitchell; Doreen Stern

#### 1) Preliminary Consultation:

A) Proposal by Georgia-Pacific Gypsum for a trucking and warehouse facility at 34-36 Patterson Lane, Tax Map 19, Lot 6, Tax map 13, Lot 11

GP Gypsum Plant Manager, James Caughran appeared before the Board with Jose Valdez, also with GP Gypsum and Phil Corbet with CMA Engineering.

Mr. Caughran said Mr. Corbet would present their proposal for a truck terminal as due diligence before the final phase of purchasing the property. Mr. Corbet stated that they had also engaged abutters.

Mr. Corbet stated that they were proposing to load and unload trailers with their gypsum product to facilitate their Avery Lane site. He said they were also proposing a guard shack to manage activities in and out of site.

Mr. Corbet went through the layout of their plans, stating that the impervious footprint would be similar to what was previously proposed for an industrial parking area. He also explained that the grading of 3-4 foot slopes would be different than the previously application proposal because they discovered there was more ledge.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Mr. Corbet stated that the storm water management would also be similar to what was proposed and they were hoping to piggyback on the previously approved permits. He added that the wetlands would be mitigated with the wet pools wetlands plantings as well as a clean catch basin.

Alternate Board member, Ken Latchaw asked for a comparison of the previous plan to the current proposal to show where the proposed building envelope and parking were before. Mr. Corbet replied that they were almost the same with the parking up against the residential zoning boundary, assuming the lot merger was recorded with similar setbacks.

Chair Hebert responded that the merged lots were approved, signed and to be recorded at Rockingham County Registry of Deeds a year before. Jim Caughran, Plant Manager said it appeared that they had not been recorded. Mr. Corbet added that GP Gypsum would agree to a condition of approval to have the merger recorded, but they would want the same configuration. Chair Hebert agreed that merging the lots was the only way to meet setbacks for the proposed expansion on the non-conforming lots.

Board member, Bernie Christopher said he also recalled that the approval included a berm or tree line for a sound and visual buffer for the abutters. Mr. Corbet replied that they would use the excess material from the creation of the parking lot, but they would want to discuss the subject further with abutters.

Mr. Latchaw noted that hours of operation had been discussed during review of the previous application and asked what hours of operation GP Gypsum was intending and how much truck traffic there would be. Mr. Caughran replied that they would transfer their overflow of full truck loads from their plant to the Patterson Lane lot for pickup during their regular hours of operation which was five to six days per week, 24 hours per day.

Chair Hebert asked for clarification on the load transfers and storage. Mr. Caughran replied that the Avery Lane operation was not able to get the volume of loads all done in a normal day so from 3 p.m. to later in the evening and early morning, they would prepare loads for pickup. He said some loads came in live and were never disconnect, but others dropped an empty trailer for loading. He said Patterson Lane was intended as a transit facility.

Vice-Chair Cross asked if the guard shack would have a gate and be manned. Mr. Caughran replied it would be gated to protect materials on site and manned 24/7. Vice-Chair Cross asked if there would be an overnight bunk house and Mr. Caughran replied that they would have shift replacements and there would be no bunkhouse.

Vice-Chair Cross asked for clarification on the number of trucks per day. Mr. Caughran said they were currently running 30-35 trucks per day. Vice-Chair Cross asked how many they expected within five years and Mr. Caughran replied that there could be 45 trucks per day in five years.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Vice-Chair Cross asked what the maximum weight on the trucks was and Mr. Caughran said they were licensed to transport over the road, but he was not sure of the weight limit.

Vice-Chair Cross asked if the parking lot would be built to New Hampshire State standards and Mr. Caughran said he was not sure because highway standards were very deep. Mr. Corbet added that the parking lot would be built stronger than residential, most likely with 24" of pre-drain fresh gravel and drain areas and they would use concrete for loading areas.

Vice-Chair Cross commented that traffic for this proposal would be more than was approved for the previous application and suggested that the berm should be higher with a 4-1 slope. Mr. Corbet and Mr. Caughran agreed.

Interim Planner, Gerald Coogan reminded the Board that this was a preliminary consult for the applicant to take board member thoughts and the discussions were non-binding.

Chair Hebert added that this was not a public hearing, but he was going to open the meeting for limited public comments.

Norm Leclerc of Patterson Lane asked if any improvements to re-enforce the entrance and the gas pumping station on the corner of Patterson Lane considering 50 foot trailers had difficulty making the turn.

Ann Beebe of Patterson Lane and immediate abutter to the proposed site commented that no one had spoken with her.

Ms. Beebe commented that it was a residential street and 30 trucks going in and out 24 hours per day, seven days a week was too much. She added that leaking diesel, gas, and oil could be a problem for wells and asked how they would prevent ground contamination.

Ms. Beebe said there were already two berms at the back of the waterfront industrial area and they didn't keep sound out as much as they imagined. She added that the previous building on the residential side had a non-conforming setback and nothing was supposed to be built there. Chair Hebert agreed, but said he thought the previous proposal included the planting of trees, and any buffer would be better than none.

Paul Reardon of Patterson Lane said he met with GP Gypsum representatives. Mr. Reardon agreed that there were safety and environmental concerns, adding that it was impossible to turn a 50-foot truck coming in from Shattuck Way with no margin for error.

Mr. Reardon said 15 families lived on Patterson Lane who looked to the Board for consideration and asked if Board members would approve the proposal if they lived there.

Todd Galliano of Patterson Lane added that there were two lots for sale on Shattuck Way and wondered why GP Gypsum didn't purchase those lots.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Mr. Galliano said he had a young son and there were other children that rode their bikes on the lane, but he wasn't even comfortable having his son wait for the bus on the corner of Shattuck Way.

Mr. Galliano asked if there had been similar concerns with other proposals on Patterson Lane. Board member, Jack Pare agreed that those concerns had also been raised during other proposals.

Deb Daley of Patterson Lane stated that she worked from home and had to go in and out of Patterson Lane periodically. She commented that there was no pull off to accommodate commuters or trucks taking wide turns going in and out of Patterson Lane.

Paul Reardon of Patterson Lane added that there were numerous people from the surrounding industries, including groups of 15-20 people walking for fitness that walked in that area during their lunch breaks and there was nowhere for them to get off road for a truck taking a turn.

Mr. Reardon added that the natural gas pumping station never should have been put on the corner and he had to get the Town of Newington to put a guardrail around it because nothing had been there to protect it from vehicles coming down the Shattuck Way and taking the sharp corner onto Patterson Lane.

Mr. Pare commented that a gravel walking path along one side of the road would be needed for pedestrian safety.

Chair Hebert agreed that Patterson Lane was not built for heavy traffic and the proposal would require offsite improvement to deal with the intersection.

Chair Hebert stated warehouses and storage facilities were allowed, but he thought this proposal was for a closed building and he spoke with Town counsel, Attorney John Ratigan earlier in the afternoon and he didn't think truck terminals to off load and load materials outside would be an allowed use, referring to permitted uses on page Z13 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chair Hebert commented that sheet rock was a dusty business with trucks going in and out that would affect the residential neighborhood. He stated that Town council had suggested it might not be an allowed use and read through the conditions that had to be met, which included that industries shall not create traffic congestion, noise, hazardous dust, smoke or waste that would be detrimental to the surrounding area and environment.

Board of Selectmen's representative Cosmas locovazzi commented that Chair Hebert should obtain a written statement from Town counsel on any legal clarifications.

Chair Hebert commented that the Master Plan talked about uses that would create good jobs, but parking lots did not do that.

Mr. Caughran commented that a terminal was where product was moved around, loaded and unloaded from storage. He added that the expansion would allow them to move to a fourth shift, which would create another 15-20 jobs by the end of the next year.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Chair Hebert announced that comments were closed to the public and opened discussion to the Board.

Mr. Christopher commented that he understood that the applicant was talking about a truck terminal and didn't see that the Ordinance stated that storage had to be in a building, but questions regarding noises, environmental and safety hazards also had to be addressed.

Vice-Chair Cross agreed and added that they also needed to be sensitive toward the residents that used the common roadway.

Alternate Board member, Peter Welch agreed that they needed to be concerned with the suitability of the volume of truck traffic.

Mr. Pare commented that another attorney could argue that it was a terminal, but he agreed there was still a conflict with safety where industry and residents overlapped at the entrance. He said structure and geometry could be repaired with money, but it would require a lot of engineering to make the offsite entrance safe for the residents. Mr. Pare agreed that there were other lots available on Shattuck Way that might work better.

Mr. Latchaw commented that the previous application presented a traffic study to show that trucks could navigate the entrance, but they were only talking about one or two trucks a week and thirty or more trucks going in and out all day would take entire road and restrict residents from going in and out.

Mr. Pare commented that the previous application stated that they would need road guards once or twice a month, which might have been acceptable, but agreed that thirty or more trucks in and out would be too much.

Chair Hebert suggested that the turn radius going in and out and Patterson Lane would need to be beefed up.

Mr. Latchaw asked if they had given any thought to reversing their process by keep their trucks on their Avery Road site and putting their workers' parking on Patterson Lane. Mr. Caughran replied that it was a good question and might be possible, but they hadn't looked at that closely.

Chair Hebert asked how GP Gypsum was handling their overflow now and if they were still parking at Pease. Mr. Caughran replied that they were renting space from Sprague and no longer parking at Pease.

Chair Hebert asked if Avery Lane was getting more congested and Mr. Caughran replied that it was heavily trafficked. Chair Hebert said he thought Avery Lane was a private lane open to the public. Mr. Corbet said Avery Lane was owned by Westinghouse and GP Gypsum had an easement.

Chair Hebert stated that Westinghouse had recently informed the Board that they were maxed out. Mr. Corbet replied that there would be fewer trucks on Avery with the proposed Patterson Lane truck terminal. Chair Hebert replied that there would still be trucks coming in and out of Avery Lane to go to the plant and Westinghouse had stated that they couldn't handle the increased traffic of another 80 trucks in the coming year,

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

which would also kill another previously approved project. He said he didn't know what the Town could do if the owner said they couldn't take any more trucks.

Mr. Caughran stated that GP Gypsum used to do 110 trucks and their agreement was that they were granted an unlimited easement in 1975 and that was between Westinghouse and them.

Vice-Chair Cross commented that the Board should not see the proposal again until the lot was recorded as a merged lot and they could respond to the concerns raised. Mr. Pare added that it might be a good idea for the applicant to pursue other alternatives.

Mr. Latchaw suggested the applicant be given a summary of what they needed to respond to so there would be no misunderstanding. Chair Hebert agreed they needed clear direction, but didn't think board was sure what they would approve and had already told them that they had to meet criteria.

Mr. Coogan announced that the applicant was scheduled to go before the Technical Review Committee on October 20, 2016 and were also on the October 26, 2016 Planning Board agenda. Chair Hebert replied that he didn't think the Board was ready to consider the application unless the applicant considered other alternatives.

Mr. Pare said the TRC would be the second step, but the Board needed to determine if it was a permitted use first. Chair Hebert said the TRC would determine if the engineering and wetland requirements would be met during their review.

B) Preliminary presentation of proposal by KWA, LLC and Mark Phillips for an extended stay hotel and indoor multi-storage facility on Shattuck Way, Tax Map 7, Lot 2A

Board member, Mark Phillips recused himself and introduced Colin Dinsmore, P.E. with Ambit Engineering.

Mr. Phillips presented his proposal to develop the property on the high knoll between Shattuck Way and the Spaulding Turnpike Exit 4, that was previously known as Flagstones restaurant.

Mr. Phillips said the Lanier aircraft parts business owned the abutting piece and the Department of Transportation owned another piece.

Mr. Phillips said the property had been up for sale for 20 years, and the owner KWA, LLC was asking \$1,000,000 but he would only lease because he didn't want to sell to a national realtor.

Mr. Phillips said he was proposing to put four buildings on the property, a hotel and a storage facility. He stated that he would have to go before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) because Newington didn't allow two buildings on a lot. Mr. Phillips commented that it was unusual not to allow two buildings on a lot, especially since the Town Hall and the Police Department was on one lot and the Fire Department and the

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Newington Public School as on the same lot and Haugh Storage also had two buildings on one lot.

Mr. Phillips stated that the hotel he was proposing was a national brand called Value Place, that was founded under the name Extended Stay in 1975, and sold to Marriott in 1987. He said there were 230 of these hotels in the U.S. and currently the closest in Allentown, PA, but a new one had been approved in Merrimack, NH.

Mr. Phillips stated that Value Place was one of the most profitable chains in the U.S. with single rooms, the minimum stay being a week and the average stay being 21 days. He added that the rooms were prepaid at \$65 a night, ala carte with no coffee pots, no restaurant, bar, pool, pool tables, nothing for kids, strictly for extended stay business patrons working at Pease or the University of New Hampshire.

Mr. Phillips stated that the self-storage facility he was proposing would be a three-story climate controlled building. He stated that he needed the storage facility to generate additional income to cover the cost of the land, adding that the facility wouldn't increase jobs, but the development would increase the town's tax revenue for the \$5,000,000 hotel and storage facility.

Mr. Phillips said there would be less parking area than had been previously approved for two office buildings.

Mr. Phillips stated that hotels and storage facilities would have lower traffic than other uses and the traffic engineer for the Merrimack hotel said they predicted 140 trips per day for 124 rooms and the storage facility usually saw five trips per day for 100 units, which would add up to 12-20 per day for this proposal.

Mr. Phillips stated that the buildings would be serviced with Town sewer, City of Portsmouth water, natural gas, and three phase power.

Colin Dinsmore, Civil Engineer with Ambit commented that the previous application for the lot was approved for two buildings because the property owner had deeded a large parcel of land to Newington. Chair Hebert agreed that two buildings on the single lot had been approved because the sewer and water lines needed to be shared and that Todd Adelman with KWL, LLC had donated a conservation lot across the street behind Eastern Ball Bearing.

Mr. Pare commented that some developers had used creative leases for separate buildings as was the case with Fox Run Mall.

Chair Hebert commented that just like the merged lots at 34-36 Patterson Lane that were supposed to be recorded, but were not, the Town recently discovered that Longhorn, McDonald's, ToysRUs were supposed to be separate lots, but were never recorded so now a Town employee would go to Rockingham County Registry of Deeds to be sure plans were registered.

Vice-Chair Cross said this lot was grandfathered to have two principal buildings. Chair Hebert replied that he wanted to see the conditions of approval.

Mr. Coogan commented that the plan had been approved, but he thought Mr. Phillips would still have to go before the ZBA and the Planning Board for site approvals.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Chair Hebert said he thought the approval had already been done. Mr. Coogan said a new applicant would need to go through site approval if the site plans changed. Chair Hebert agreed that he was not sure if the proposal made by the owner would stand up with a different builder.

Mr. Coogan added that the applicant had two years to exercise the variance. Mr. Pare replied that he thought Mr. Adelman had requested an extension. Chair Hebert commented that it would be terrible to require a new variance application after Mr. Adelman had already deeded conservation land to the Town.

Mr. Phillips commented that he was not aware of any other town that didn't allow two buildings on a lot. Chair Hebert replied that the Town had gone to court with Tyco and the Town's ordinance stood up in court, but he did recall that a variance was granted for this lot because of the need to share sewer and water.

Vice-Chair Cross commented that the Town had always limited one principal building and an accessory building to a lot, for a single owner, but this lot was approved with two principal buildings.

Vice-Chair Cross said the rendering of the proposal looked good, but he was not sure that DOT would allow them to grade the lot to level the ground. Mr. Phillips replied that he didn't think the change of elevation was that great and discussion continued regarding the grading.

Chair Hebert recalled that the original application approval was for two office buildings and the primary building was going to be encased with a mirrored glass. He said he was not sure about glare on the highway, however. Chair Hebert asked recording secretary, Jane Kendall if she recalled the conditions from the minutes and she said she did not. Mr. Pare said minutes were on the website. Ms. Kendall replied that some of the older minutes had been removed from the website, however. Chair Hebert asked Mr. Coogan to look up the file to see conditions.

Vice-Chair Cross pointed out that the conditions also required that the curb cut be set off by 400 feet from the curb cut across the street. Mr. Phillips replied that there would be a common entrance, but utilities would be separate.

Vice-Chair Cross suggested that sidewalks or bike paths to the nearby convenience store or bridge would be helpful. Chair Hebert commented that people could cross the street to get to the bridge and convenience store. Vice-Chair Cross replied that there was no on site crosswalk on that side of the street to safely cross.

Vice-Chair Cross commented that Shattuck Way was the gateway to Newington and the Board had previously approved some classy looking office buildings and he didn't think storage units would be a good use. Mr. Coogan added that they would need good landscaping and lighting as well.

Vice-Chair Cross also expressed concern that a hotel could draw an influx of welfare people that would become a burden to the Town as happened at another motel in town before. Mr. Phillips replied that he was insulted at the suggestion that he would propose such a project. He said the hotel would use a proprietary software system that

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

would do a criminal background check on lodgers before they would be permitted to stay. He added that the cost of \$459 per week, or \$2,000 a month would be a deterrent to any welfare recipients.

Chair Hebert commented that Vice-Chair Cross had brought up a good point and asked if the hotel would support the costs if anyone from the hotel came to the Town for welfare assistance. Mr. Phillips responded that was an unfair expectation to cover the weakness of Town management. Chair Hebert replied that it was the law and not a weakness of Town managements. Mr. Phillips replied that some towns were tolerant of welfare requests, but he would guarantee his own personal wealth so long as he had faith that whomever was running welfare in Town was competent.

Board of Selectmen Mike Marconi suggested that Mr. Phillips consider how other states handled the issue and inform the Board.

Chair Hebert commented that the Board had approved a proposal for 34-36 Patterson Lane and then the owner put the property up for sale to the highest bidder. He asked how the Board could be certain that a good hotel would continue or what would happen when it was sold to another operation. Mr. Phillips replied that he had built more storage facilities than anyone else in the state, but he needed to generate partners and this hotel company was looking for franchisees. He said he had no expertise with hospitality, and he wouldn't have anything to do with a restaurant, but he thought Great American Hotels would do a good job managing the hotel.

Discussion ensued regarding the self-storage facility design, dimensions and capacity.

Mr. Latchaw asked if there would be lifts at the entrance and Mr. Phillips replied that they would need a loading door so there wouldn't be a truck in front of glass in front.

Discussion ensued regarding the pavement and setbacks. Vice-Chair Cross pointed out that the proposal had extensive use of the entire rear setback for pavement other than the access driveways, which were considered a structure in the Ordinance and weren't allowed in the setback. Vice-Chair Cross added that the site was handicapped because of wetlands and setbacks and that the proposal would be an over development of the site.

Doreen Stern of Shattuck Way thanked Mr. Phillips for informing her and her husband of the proposal. She said she and her husband understood the site would be developed one day, but this proposal went against everything that had previously been discussed and approved. She commented that upscale people could be transient and creepy too and expressed concern as someone that lived across the street that a hotel without a lot of employees to supervise lodgers could open a can of worms for the police and fire departments and the residents would have to be on guard. She said a similar hotel worked fine at Pease because there were no residents nearby.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Mr. Phillips replied that both the hotel and storage facility were permitted uses by right and he thought they were the only thing that would support the lot at a cost of a million dollars.

Mr. Latchaw asked if it was within the privy of the Board to require a round the clock security guard. Chair Hebert replied that a security guard wouldn't be required, but a clerk would call police if there was a problem. Mr. Phillips added that there would also be cameras on the building.

Ms. Stern commented that there were also concerns with 24/7 hours of operation, lighting and signage for a hotel. Chair Hebert replied they would have to meet lighting and signage requirements, but a hotel and a storage facility were permitted uses for the zone.

Chair Hebert commented that there would be a concern that a ladder truck might have difficulty reaching four stories so they should check with the fire chief.

Vice-Chair Cross pointed out that they would also need guard rails because of the gas lines and to protect open space.

Mr. Phillips asked if the driveway structure could get a waiver for the setback. Chair Hebert informed Mr. Phillips that he would need to show a hardship in order to get a variance from the setback, but it appeared it was self-imposed by maximizing the lot. He said a single building or two smaller buildings would work on the lot.

Mr. Coogan asked if pavement was considered a structure and Chair Hebert said it was according to the Town's definitions.

Chair Hebert announced that they could continue the consult further after they had checked on the previous conditions of approval and talked with Town counsel.

#### 3) Work Session: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)

Mr. Coogan proposed that the Board make a recommendation for public hearing for adoption of the amendment to the Ordinance on accessory dwelling units (ADU's).

Chris Cross made a motion to schedule a public hearing for adoption of the amendment to the Ordinance on accessory dwelling units. Mark Phillips seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding clarification on the amendment to change the maximum of ADU's to 1,000 square feet.

Mr. Coogan commented that the law required that ADU's be a minimum of 750 square feet, someone could do an ADU that was 500 square feet. Mr. Pare asked if that would break the State law and Chair Hebert clarified that the Town was only required to allow the minimum.

Mr. Pare recalled there had been discussion about requesting relief if someone wanted to split another level of their home that was larger than the maximum. Vice-

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Chair Cross said they could request a variance if the dimensions were larger. Chair Hebert replied it would be up to the ZBA to determine if there was a hardship or if separate utilities were required for a duplex.

Vice-Chair Cross asked exterior entrances were required and Chair Hebert replied that the State only required a separate door to the ADU, and they required that a connecting door in a common wall locked from both sides for privacy for the unit to qualify as a separate dwelling. Vice-Chair Cross added that the exterior door of the main house should not be on same side. Chair Hebert suggested they say the ADU should match the architecture of the main dwelling. Vice-Chair Cross added that the interior had to share a common wall.

Chris Cross amended the motion to add that the ADU must share a common wall and match the architecture of the main dwelling. Jack Pare seconded the motion and all were in favor.

#### 4) Correspondence and Status Report by Town Planner

Mr. Coogan informed the Board that Jones and Beach Engineering were delayed in coming up with a cul-de-sac design that would create sufficient frontage for Michael Berounsky's subdivision proposal on Swan Island Lane to meet the Board's concerns.

Vice-Chair Cross stated that he withdrew his design suggestion because Chair Hebert had said the peanut shaped design had problems so he suggested they go back to an alternate. Mr. Coogan suggested the Board should let the engineer work on the design himself.

Mr. Coogan also announced that Shogun's advocate for late night entertainment, general manager, Mr. Kim had left the restaurant and he had not heard anything more from them. Vice-Chair Cross asked if they had responded to their sign regulation violations and Mr. Coogan said the building inspector was working with them on that subject.

Mr. Coogan informed the Board that Mr. DiLorenzo was working with DOT regarding their curb cut on Woodbury Avenue. Chair Hebert said the issue was that the Town would be taking over Woodbury Avenue soon.

Mr. Coogan announced that Rockingham Planning would visit the Board on November 14, 2016 to talk about proposed changes to the Town Master Plan.

#### 5) Other Business and Discussions:

Chair Hebert informed the Board that he attended a Municipal Law Foundation lecture that covered agritourism and sign compliance, noting that municipalities couldn't control content, but they could control dimensions and setbacks for safety and setbacks, except in different zones.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Mr. Pare commented that there were regulations on flashing signs, but they were not being enforced for the Regal Cinema and Shogun.

#### 6) Budget:

Chair Hebert passed the Planning Board's budget, which he said had to be presented to the Board of Selectmen the following week.

The Board went through the line items and discussed their recommendations, including whether to continue to hold the line for COAST. It was decided that they would keep the previous year's budget, draining the Air Mitigation Fund and using the tax rate for the balance.

Discussion ensued regarding continuing their contribution to the COAST bus service. Chair Hebert stated that Greenland and Stratham were no longer receiving service or contributing.

Mr. Pare said they should stop at the malls. Chair Hebert said they wouldn't because they had other malls. Mr. Pare asked if the malls contributed and Vice-Chair Cross said the malls stopped contributing ten years ago because they saw no benefit from COAST's management. Mr. Pare suggested they drain the air mitigation and then bow out.

Chair Hebert said they should let the Town will decide. He said the surrounding larger cities provided many services that Newington residents utilized, including elderly housing and eldercare and this was one of only things Newington could do for the region.

Mr. Phillips commented that the Federal government took half the land from Newington, not Portsmouth for Pease Air Force Base and Newington wasn't getting anything from the Pease Development Authority. Chair Hebert replied that was through the State and the PDA reimbursed Newington for police force because it was required by law. He added that COAST also buses to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and the Navy didn't contribute either.

Vice-Chair Cross commented that it would be nice to make a contribution to the surrounding community, but it seemed like an endless pit. Chair Hebert agreed, but added that the Town didn't actively contribute much else to the larger community.

Ken Latchaw moved to recommend the proposed 2017 budget in the amount of \$175,700 to the Board of Selectmen with the clarification that the remaining air mitigation funds would be used toward the COAST payment. Chris Cross seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Minutes: Chris Cross moved to approve the Minutes for the September 26, 2016 meeting with corrections. Jack Pare seconded, and all were in favor.

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

Adjournment: Peter Welch moved to adjourn the meeting. Mark Phillips seconded

the motion and the meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, October 24, 2016

Respectfully

**Submitted by:** Jane K. Kendall, Recording Secretary

Meeting Minutes, Tuesday, October 11, 2016

These Minutes were approved and adopted at the October 24, 2016 Planning Board meeting.