

**JOINT MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT AND
THE PLANNING BOARD
TOWN OF PETERBOROUGH, New Hampshire
Minutes of October 22, 2012**

Members Present: Planning Board: Chairman Rick Monahan, Alan Zeller, Alternate Jerry Galus, Tom Weeks, Ivy Vann, and Barbara Miller, *ex officio*. ZBA: Chairman Jim Stewart, Sharon Monahan, Loretta Laurenitis, Bob Lambert, Maude Salinger, Peter Leishman. David Sobe and Matt Waitkins recused.

Staff Present: Carol Ogilvie, Director and Laura Norton, Administrative Assistant, Office of Community Development; and Dario Carrara, Code Enforcement Officer.

Planning Board Chairman Monahan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He welcomed the audience to “the first ever in recent history joint meeting of the Peterborough Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment.” He briefly reviewed how the meeting was to proceed adding “as Chairman of the Planning Board I am authorized to call the meeting to order. I will introduce my Board and then I will pass the meeting over to the Chairman of the ZBA.” Chair Monahan noted that after all testimony was heard and questions and concerns answered, the Public Hearing would (eventually) be closed and the ZBA would enter deliberation. He noted “the Planning Board is here to participate and assist by answering questions and will be allowed to ask questions during ZBA deliberation.” He concluded by noting “this is new ground, please bear with us.” He introduced his Board Members and appointed Alternate Jerry Galus to sit.

Before turning the meeting over to the ZBA Chairman, Chair Monahan read the Public Notice as follows:

Please be advised that the Zoning Board of Adjustment and the Planning Board will hold a joint Public Hearing beginning at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, October 22, 2012 at the Town House on an application from the Scott-Farrar Home for a 63-unit retirement community consisting of independent living apartments, assisted living apartments and memory care units, with associated community areas, located at 11, 13 & 15 Elm Street, Parcel ID #'s U023-039-000, U023-040-000, U023-040-100, and U023-041-000 in the General Residence, Family, and Rural Districts. The proposal requires the following board actions: (1) ZBA approval of a variance per Article §245-12 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance to place fill within the Shoreland Conservation Zone; (2) ZBA approval of a special exception per Article §245-7 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance to locate a Supported Residential Care Facility in the General Residence District; and (3) site plan review approval from the Planning Board. Information regarding this application is available for review at the Office of Community Development at 1 Grove Street during regular business hours. Anyone needing assistance to attend this meeting should contact the Office of Community Development at 924-8000 x 104 one week prior to the scheduled meeting. A complete agenda of this meeting is posted at the Town House, the Library, and on-line at www.townofpeterborough.com.

Chair Monahan then turned the meeting over to ZBA Chairman Jim Stewart. Chair Stewart took the microphone, looked around and asked “any corrections to the Notice?” With no response Chair Stewart introduced himself and his Board. He appointed Alternate Bob Lambert to sit. He then read a brief statement about the Rules and Procedures of the meeting. Just as Chair Stewart began to

introduce the applicant to proceed with their presentation, Ms. Laurenitis asked about the Notice. She questioned whether or not the notice was correct as the Variance request only noted the General Residence District. Mr. Carrara interjected “the Variance is to place fill in the Shoreline Conservation Zone,” and Ms. Ogilvie added “it is irrelevant what District is involved, and it is not pertinent to the Notice.” Ms. Salinger corroborated Ms. Laurenitis by noting “the Special Exception is for the General Residence but the plan shows the Family District is involved.”

Ms. Ogilvie explained that the plan was in accordance with the zoning. She noted that where a District boundary line divides a lot of record, the regulations for either District of the lot may be extended up to fifty (50) feet into the other District provided the lot has frontage in the District it is extending into. Ms. Salinger asked for further explanation and a graphic was presented to assist. A yellow dotted line on the graphic outlined the extension of the General Residence District into the Family District an additional fifty feet “to be treated as General Residence.” Ms. Salinger asked “can you tell me what ordinance that is?” Ms. Ogilvie replied “no, I cannot but I am sure Tom (Weeks) can.” From the Planning Board table Mr. Weeks replied “245-19.”

Chair Stewart re-directed the meeting back to the Rules and Procedures and emphasized everyone would have an opportunity to speak. He reminded anyone wishing to speak please state their name and affiliation (abutter, council, concerned citizen) for the record and that all questions be directed to the Board.

Thomas Hanna introduced himself as a land use attorney from Keene. With reference to other cases he noted “I have been here many times” and added “and if nothing else we are prepared, we have taken this very seriously.” Mr. Hanna distributed a list of agents or primary presenters to speak about different aspects of the project “but I will be the primary presenter for the application.” Mr. Hanna then began with and introduced Ed Despres, Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Scott-Farrar Home.

Mr. Despres began by thanking both Boards. “This is a first” he said. He apologized for speaking with his back to the audience (the AV equipment dictated his position). He noted he would like to begin by recognizing the Board of Trustees of the Scott-Farrar Home. He asked them to raise their hands adding “this is one group of dedicated members. I have been on the Board for about 6 years and we have done numerous site visits through Vermont and New Hampshire looking at the architecture and the construction of similar facilities, talking to architects and builders. I owe them a lot and would like to publicly thank them tonight.” Mr. Despres continued with a brief history of the Scott-Farrar Home beginning in 1909. He told a very similar story to the one he told at the Conceptual Hearing in September with the first Home for the Aged located on Vine Street. When life-long resident Jenny Scott died in 1951 she bequeathed half of her estate to build a “fireproof home for the aged” which opened its doors in 1957 and is the present Scott-Farrar Home. “To give you a reference” he continued, “a postage stamp was 3 cents, a new car was about \$2,100.00, a new home was about \$12,000.00, Dwight Eisenhower was President and *I* was in the first grade!”

Mr. Despres noted that the Trustees had bought the small house to the south as well as what was referred to the Frost House, barn and field “about four years ago so we now have just under 7 acres.” He gave a brief update of the status of the present day Scott-Farrar facility. “It is an aged

facility using its endowment to support itself” adding “it is not on a feasible track going forward”. He described the small rooms that cannot accommodate couples living. He noted 18 assisted living rooms and common space “with 15 residents in occupancy.”

Mr. Despres told the audience “we just do not have a competitive facility. We feel we are different than RiverMead and Summerhill” and noted “expanding to 63 units in terms of this type of facility is really on the smaller side but large enough to be feasibly viable.” He noted the expansion would include 25 independent living apartments, 20 assisted living units and 18 memory care units. “Today it is only assisted living” he said. Mr. Despres noted “we are a non-profit charitable organization and we intend to stay that way in the future.” He added “we pay in lieu of taxes now based on the size of the facility and will have that conversation with the town when appropriate.” He concluded by noting “we have been in town for over a century, we have a great in-town, multi-use neighborhood with an easy walk to the Downtown. It is a unique site in town to increase density which is a part of the Master Plan.” He read their Mission Statement which included “providing a healthy, safe, home-like environment for the Monadnock Region’s older citizens at an affordable cost. The professional quality of care, diverse backgrounds of the residents and variety of activities contribute to a rich and stimulating atmosphere. A home dedicated to meeting the needs of each resident in a dignified and caring manner.” He noted “we end that with *where caring is a way of life*. We would like to continue our mission, thank you.”

Steve Humphreys introduced himself and began with a brief reviewed his credentials. He noted he was an architect with EGA, P.C. of Newburyport, Massachusetts adding “we have 46 years of experience and our specialty is senior housing and senior living of one type or another” citing 55+ communities, specialty care, skilled care, long term care and hospice. “Every job I have ever had has been in New Hampshire” he said. He went on to review the existing conditions of the proposed site. He pointed out the four structures (current facility, utility shed, small house and larger house with attached barn) noting “it is 6.6 acres with a natural buffer along the north with open field on the other sides.”

Mr. Humphreys pointed out the 30-foot building setback, the edge of the wetlands, the 50-foot wetland buffer and the 250-foot Shoreline Protection buffer. He went on to note the lot was unique in that it was located in three zoning districts (Family, General Residence and Rural). He reviewed the topography and the available building site noting “our design is contiguous for efficiency and life safety codes while leaving as much open space as possible.”

Mr. Humphreys noted the design allowed the existing facility to remain open during construction. He reviewed the conceptual site plan of the new facility by going over each level of the building (three in all) and describing the locations and amenities of the independent living, assisted living and memory care units. Ms. Monahan asked for clarification on the overflow parking. “Does that space exist now?” she asked. Mr. Humphreys replied it did but there was no plan to do anything with that area “except possibly use it for overflow parking on busy days, like Mother’s Day.” Ms. Monahan noted “so no improvements are proposed.” “No” replied Mr. Humphreys. Ms. Monahan asked “what about the sewer easement? That is existing right? And is the intent to have that remain as it is?” “Yes” replied Mr. Humphreys.

Mr. Humphreys went on to review the entrances off Evans Road (the memory care facility and service entrance with 11 parking spaces) and Elm Street (main entrance with 10 covered parking spaces and across from Nubanusit Lane entrance to 35 spaces for guests and staff). He also pointed out the 16 drive-in car ports on the conceptual rendering. He reviewed the zoning requirements for parking citing “1.5 spaces per unit so we have 72 spaces with the overflow of 15 spaces for special occasions.”

Mr. Leishman asked for clarification on the number of curb cuts on Elm Street. A brief discussion followed with Mr. Weeks concluding the current five curb cuts would be reduced to three curb cuts on the proposed plan. Ms. Salinger asked that the curb cuts be pointed out on the graphic for clarity and asked if the overflow parking was currently being used and if so, what its capacity was.

Eldon Munson introduced himself as a Scott Farrar Board member. He told the members the overflow lot was not currently used by the facility but has been used by neighbors on request and that the intent was to keep it for overflow parking for special events in the future.

Mr. Humphreys addressed the streetscape and said that the facility would be built in one phase, “non-stop construction” he said. He noted the demolition of the current facility would follow. He continued with an in-depth review of the floor plan of each level of the new facility. He also reviewed the lighting plan including the style (comparable to the light poles in the Downtown) and height of the light poles. In the back of the facility he pointed out the fire lane and again noted “the topography is good for the site.”

Ms. Salinger asked him to go back to the fire lane and asked “is it in the Shoreline Conservation Zone?” Mr. Humphreys replied “no” Ms. Salinger asked him to point out the boundary line for the Zone. He did and it was determined that a bit of the grading of the fire lane was in two areas of the Shoreline Conservation Zone.

Ms. Laurenitis noted her concern over the size of the independent living units. “They are pretty large” she said. Mr. Humphreys replied that the independent living units were designed to be like small apartments, with a mix of one-bedroom, one den and two-bedroom, two dens. Attorney Hanna added “the continued survival of the Scott-Farrar Home is dependent on not having the under-sized rooms they have now. They are too small and not able to survive even with a full complement of residents, so it was decided the independent units would be the size the public desires.” Ms. Laurenitis asked about market studies and research that may support that with Attorney Hanna replying “market studies are only polling” adding “to me this is what it means to make the facility feasible in the long term.”

Ms. Monahan asked that the graphics clearly reflect the 50-foot Wetlands setback and the Shoreline Conservation Zone in future plans.

Chair Stewart looked to Mr. Humphreys and said “go ahead Sir.” Mr. Humphreys replied the last few slides were a rendering of a “drive-by” to see what the facility would look like. The images began at the top of Elm and Main Streets and “drove past” the facility with Mr. Humphreys pointing out landmarks and intersecting streets. When he got to the front of the current facility he

pointed out the two large trees that stand there now. "We would like to save them" he said. When he got to the barn attached to the Frost House Ms. Salinger inquired about its status. Mr. Humphreys replied "we plan to take it and move it" adding "we feel we can use it for a maintenance building on the other side of the lot." He noted that if the barn was not reusable "we would build something new in the character of the existing barn." At the end of the "drive-by" a member asked if what they had seen was "a true rendition or an accurate picture of what we will see?" Mr. Humphreys replied "yes, this is what we are proposing." He noted "the firm creates the view and then sends it to an artist and they draw it."

Mr. Leishman asked about progress made with abutters with specific concerns about the project, "You asked at a great time" replied Mr. Humphreys. He proceeded to review an elevation looking at the proposed facility from Evans Road looking north. The graphic showed the addition of a stone wall along the Evans Road property line with landscaping to provide screening, soundproofing and traffic headlight glare (in particular) for the Wenblad property at 2 Evans Road. "The vegetation will not absorb the noise, you need something substantial" noted Mr. Humphreys adding the building was mostly obscured by the vegetation and landscaping. Chair Stewart asked about the width of the entry off Evans Road with Mr. Humphreys replying "24 feet, with the wall as close to the road as we can get."

Attorney Hanna noted there had been substantial discussion about the prospective resident car ports or garages and asked Mr. Humphreys to review that portion of the plan. Mr. Humphreys displayed a graphic that showed the garage area. He pointed out the two large trees "one Oak and one Maple" that currently stand and reiterated "we intend to save these trees." He then reviewed the design of the structure and how it was "benched into the grade" and would be landscaped with trellises and vines that would screen the vehicles. A member of the audience stood and asked if there might be an illustration for the back of the building. Chair Stewart immediately stood and addressed the audience. "Everyone will have an opportunity to speak, I promise you that. Right now I would like the presentation to be completed. Then we will get to the questions." He noted there was still much more information to be heard according to the list of presenters they had been given at the beginning of the meeting. He asked the presentation to continue but be aware of the hour and be timely in their reporting. Attorney Hanna agreed but noted "we are getting all the facts out."

Andy Peterson read a letter he composed as a result of being asked to provide a professional opinion of the effect of the proposed Scott-Farrar project on neighborhood property values (embedded at the end of the Minutes). In essence, Mr. Peterson reported that "based on my site visit, inspection of the proposed plan materials and building elevations and years of experience in the local real estate market, I am of the opinion that surrounding property values will not be adversely affected by the proposed expansion of the property's current use."

A member of the audience noted they had seen elevations for all sides but the back of the building. Chair Stewart reiterated that everyone would have an opportunity to speak once the applicant was done with their presentation.

A traffic Report (prepared and submitted by Robert Duval, PE and Mike O'Donnell of TF Moran) followed. The details of the study that were reviewed included an intersection study,

(Elm Street with Main Street, Nubanusit Lane, Winter Street, Evans Road and US Route 101), existing conditions, trip generations, level of service analysis, sight distances and conclusions. Essentially the traffic engineers reported that the development would generate one trip every 4-5 minutes during peak hours, which is imperceptible to most drivers, there were no significant level of service drops associated with the traffic generated by the development and associated changes in delay would be minimal, and in no instances does a queue length increase by more than one car length as a result of the traffic generated by the proposed development.

The engineers also briefly described traffic calming measures (often starting with the most benign and working their way up to traffic lights). Mr. Duval suggested painting a double solid yellow line on Elm Street “with or without the development.” He also noted a 20 mile-per-hour speed limit would be another measure to calm traffic “after that we go to speed tables, signs and beacons.”

Ms. Salinger noted that Elm Street was a direct route to the Catholic Church, Adams Playground and the Elementary School. Mr. Duval noted their traffic numbers “matched the Planning Commission numbers” and noted the study was conducted “the last week of September, so school was back in session.” Ms. Salinger asked about staff traffic with Mr. Monson replying “when all is said and done the staff will number about 55 total but that will be distributed over three shifts, they will not be in the building at the same time.” Ms. Salinger asked again about the peak traffic hours, specifically the AM peak hours and how they coincided with the elementary school hours. A brief discussion about the safest and best locations to cross the street was also discussed. Chair Monahan noted “the comments made suggest a real concern on the notion of traffic calming, it has been resonated over and over again.”

Chair Stewart looked at the list of agents and noted the time. Attorney Hanna replied “we have one more, he will be short.” Chair Stewart replied “alright, because I would like to open the hearing up to the public before they leave tonight” adding “then we will continue the hearing to a date and time certain to review the Variance and Special Exception criteria and the feedback from tonight’s meeting.” Attorney Hanna replied “I think that is a good idea.”

Attorney Hanna noted “and not to go into the criteria on the Variance, but I would like you to note a letter of support submitted by George Sterling and confirm for the record that you have that.” He went on to say “in addition we have two other reports for you, one from Powers, Smith & Associates (a Real Estate Appraiser & Consultant firm) that I would like to submit now.” Chair Stewart interjected “for the record, all of this material will be available for review at the Town House.” Attorney Hanna stated the report noted the mitigation for two homes on Evans Road (#2 and #4 Evans Road). “These efforts include a substantial stone wall that will run from the site driveway toward Elm Street past the 11-space parking area. It will be five feet high and will block the headlights and mitigate most sound effects at the location of the parking area. The wall and trees will also block the view of the proposed building” he said. Attorney Hanna went on to note the owner of #2 Evans Road (Teri Wenblad) was in the audience. “She had concerns, we met with her and her husband and several other people and we did this fairly substantial landscaping project at her request, which is a good request.” He concluded by noting “the family and their council agreed to our plan as well as a tree buffer or fence along their property line.

They have not spoken tonight, but Scott-Farrar Home and the Wenblad Family have reached an agreement to their satisfaction.”

Attorney Hanna then noted the submission of a site assessment by ecologist Jeffry Littleton of Moosewood Ecological, LLC. He noted the report stated that in Mr. Littleton’s professional opinion and on-site observations there would be no adverse effects on the wildlife. He also noted several recommendations that may help increase the benefits of the Shore land Conservation Zone, including enhancing the wildlife habitat and water quality.

The last agent to speak was Kevin Anderson of Meridian Land Services. “This should only take a couple of minutes” he said. Mr. Anderson reviewed a graphic of the Shoreline Conservation Zone. He pointed out that after an original estimate of 8200 square feet of encroachment for site grading and placement of fill material “we have been able to reduce that number to 2300 square feet. We met with the Fire Department to get the exact criteria to downsize the area by having the service lane 20 wide and 20 feet from the back of the building.” The members had several questions about the plan and the existing conditions. Ms. Laurenitis asked what kind of material would be used as fill with Mr. Anderson relying “gravel with loam on top of that then seeded with native grasses and landscaped to promote a healthy habitat in the conservation area.” Ms. Monahan asked for confirmation that “there would be no other disturbance or transfer of earth other than what has been presented” with Mr. Anderson replying “just what has been presented.” Ms. Monahan replied “thank you” adding “and it looks like there is no impact to the Wetland protection Zone.” Mr. Anderson replied “correct.”

Randy Knowles, Landscape Architect, spoke briefly about the landscaping plans for the site.

Attorney Hanna noted for the record he had created a Scott-Farrar Photo Index consisting of 44 photos of the immediate neighborhood with address and orientation provided.

With that Chair Stewart announced “I would like to table any more presentations” adding “this is one of the first of its kind and we have heard an enormous amount of information in reference to both zoning and site plan.” Chair Stewart went to note “I would like to open the hearing to the public for questions and general comments.”

First to the microphone was Laura Campbell of 19 Elm Street. “I am not an abutter but I live just two houses down” she said. She began with complimenting the landscape plan on Evans Road noting “it is a considerable improvement to the entrance.” With reference to the elevations that had been shown Ms. Campbell asked “is the plan accurate? How close are they to the final version?” Ms. Campbell pointed out what she believed to be architectural anomalies and transition issues from view to view of the elevations.

Posy Bass of 2 Elm Street introduced herself and noted “Scott-Farrar is a wonderful neighbor” adding “and I am essentially in favor of the project but have a number of concerns.” She asked about the parking, which is not driven by need but by the requirements of the underlying district. She asked about the Planning Board’s authority to waive those requirements. She also voiced concern over the overflow parking area and a nice line of trees along the Nubanusit that would be “important to the neighbors across the river.” She asked “will you need to cut them down?”

adding “I hope not.” Chair Monahan interjected “I don’t believe there will be any changes in that area” adding “and regarding the issue of parking, the Planning Board can review and waive parking requirements during site plan when deemed appropriate. It is my view and others that we certainly have no need to impose an excess of parking on the site when it is to no one’s advantage.” He concluded by assuring Ms. Bass, “we will review it in much closer detail when the time comes.”

Linda DuBreuil of 4 Evans Road introduced herself and asked about the lighting in the parking lot of the memory care portion of the facility. “Will they be dimmed at night?” she asked adding “otherwise they will be shining in our bedroom window.” She also voiced her concern about delivery trucks and asked if they would be restricted to daytime deliveries only. Chair Monahan replied “come to site plan review” with Chair Stewart adding “the impact to the abutters and the neighborhood is of utmost concern.”

A brief distinction between the two Boards followed with the explanation that the ZBA looks at hardship situations and impacts to a neighborhood (cautious to not overwhelm a neighborhood with a use) where the Planning Board looks to make sure a proposed structure does not overwhelm the site itself. Mr. Weeks interjected and as far as the lights go, they will be turned off or reduced at night or they (the applicant) will have to come back to this Board for a Special Exception.”

Monica Pellettieri of 15 Winter Street introduced herself. She briefly reiterated the traffic problem on Elm Street and noted a survey that had come from the Elementary School regarding Safe Routes to School (SRTS), a program that encourages children to walk or ride their bikes to school, “which will increase the pedestrian traffic.” “We will look at that issue and have a response for you” replied Attorney Hanna.

Ian Meiklejohn, owner of 22 Union Street, introduced himself. He noted the view from Union Street would be an important aspect to consider. “There are about 20 families that overlook the current structure” he said. Mr. Meiklejohn went on to note his concern over the size of the new facility and a series of tree trimmings that would further diminish the screen for the Union Street homes.

Ms. Vann interjected “excuse me, it was my understanding that there will be no disturbance to the trees on the Nubanusit bank.” After a brief discussion it was noted that there would indeed be cutting (about five feet into a 40-foot deep section of woodland) on the Nubanusit bank. Landscape Architect Randy Knowles displayed a graphic and pointed the area out.

Robert Wood of 16 Union Street introduced himself. He noted he would like to see elevations of the backside of the building adding “this will affect both sides of Union Street and High Street.” Mr. Wood went on to note “my overriding concern though is the sheer size of this development. I support the mission of Scott Farrar but I know and I hope I don’t have to remind the Board members that more than the adjacent neighborhood will be impacted.” He noted “the size drives other concerns” noting lighting as an example. “There will be proper outside lighting but there will also be lights from the 63 units coming out.” He concluded that part of the value of his

property was its location. "If I am looking at this my property value would have to be taken into consideration."

Matt Waitkins of 14 Union Street introduced himself. He began with "I agree with everything Woody said." He reiterated the concerns regarding the overflow parking and noted "if relief is granted there should be a condition that area is eliminated for parking forever." He noted the parking area was located "right on the river and is not necessary in any way." Mr. Waitkins went on to note his concerns about the size of the project. He likened one of the independent apartments (at 1400 square feet) as being larger in square feet than his house. "Please take that into consideration" he said adding "and lessen the envelope of the building."

Hope Driscoll of 10 Elm Street introduced herself. She noted "my siblings and I are not opposed to this project. Scott-Farrar has been a good neighbor." She went on to note the architects had taken the concerns they heard at the conceptual and responded to them with satisfaction. She added it (the building) seems big for the neighborhood "but I would rather see Scott-Farrar continue" (versus) having the site become something else.

John Patterson introduced himself as a member of the Peterborough Conservation Commission. He began by referring to what had been deemed the overflow parking area on the lot. "What a parking lot is doing in the Wetland Protection Zone is beyond me." Chair Stewart asked Mr. Patterson if he was speaking on behalf of the Conservation Commission with Mr. Patterson replying "no, we have had no formal request for input; I do hope that is forthcoming." A brief discussion about the status of the parking area followed. Mr. Weeks concluded "it is legally non-conforming and will remain that way as long as operations continue."

Ellie King of 1 River Street introduced herself. She noted the large amount of pedestrian traffic (including many children of all ages) on Elm Street. She described her view of the Scott-Farrar property out her west window. "I love the trees and the field in the back, I love the way it looks" she said adding "with this plan, all I will see out my west window is a parking lot. I did not come up here from New York City to look at a parking lot."

Ms. King went on to express her concerns about the size of the proposed building noting "it looks about eight times bigger than it is now. I do not understand why that is necessary" she said. She concluded by noting "I think you could scale it down" and gave the audience a few ideas of how to do just that. She concluded by noting "after all, it is the Scott-Farrar Home, not a ski resort in Utah."

Tracy Messer of West Peterborough introduced himself. He had a brief prepared statement in favor of the project and providing for an aging baby-boomer population. "I am in favor of this" He said adding "I know the personal challenges of aging parents."

Bob Silwa of 12 Elm Street introduced himself noting he had written a letter for the Conceptual meeting as he had not been able to attend it. He noted the developers of the project "have hit upon and corrected many of our concerns." He noted he lives directly across the street from the facility and his concerns about looking out to the carports was addressed to his satisfaction.

George Pellettieri, owner of 1 Winter Street introduced himself. He noted “this is the third meeting I have attended and I am generally in support of the project.” He went on to note that each time they’ve met the Trustees have addressed issues and come back with revisions. “In one way or another they have responded, maybe not to everyone’s satisfaction but they have responded.” He went on to say “the overriding issue is traffic” adding “traffic studies show traffic flows, not traffic realities. People drive really fast, we need to continue to address this.” Mr. Pellettieri said he felt the conceptual renderings did a good job of indicating the long term effects the landscaping would have over the years.

Chair Stewart thanked all attendance for their participation. He briefly summarized some of the key issues that had been identified (an elevation of the back of the building, a review of the lighting (inside and out), the status of the overflow parking area and its proximity to the Nubanusit, visual impacts and potential screening for Union and High Street residents, and formal input, concerns and recommendations from the Conservation Commission).

A continuation of this Public Hearing was set for Thursday, November 8, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the Upper Hall of the Town House.

The meeting adjourned at 10:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura Norton
Administrative Assistant

Approved January 7, 2013