



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Board of Appeals

149 Main Street

Watertown, MA 02472

Harry J. Vlachos, Chairman
Melissa M. Santucci, Clerk
Stuart J. Bailey, Member
Deborah Elliot, Member
David Ferris, Alternate
Suneeth P. John, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6428
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **June 30, 2010** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Harry J. Vlachos, Chairman; Melissa Santucci, Clerk; Stuart Bailey, Member; Deborah Elliott, Member; David Ferris, Alternate Member; Suneeth P. John, Alternate Member; Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development and Planning; Nancy Scott, Zoning Enforcement Officer; Louise Civetti, Clerk to BOA. Absent: Danielle Fillis Evans, Senior Planner.**

Chair Vlachos opened the meeting, introduced the board and staff, swore in the audience and noted a correction in the May 26, 2010 minutes: 117 Lovell Ave., at paragraph, "...historically, if there were minor increases..." Member Santucci motioned to accept the minutes of May 26, 2010 with the correction, as noted. Member Ferris seconded. Voted 5-0. Approved.

Chair Vlachos stated that **240 Waverly Avenue** will not be heard as it is continued at the Planning Board hearing and **49 Buick Street** has not submitted information on his new design and may not be heard, as well.

Ms. Santucci read the first legal notice:

James Hoyt, Esquire; Prince, Lobel, Glovsky & Tye LLP for Clear Wireless, LLC - Affiliate of Sprint/Nextel, 100 Cambridge Street, Suite 2200, Boston, MA 02114 herein requests the Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit** in accordance with §5.13, Wireless Telecommunications Facilities, Restricted Zoning District, Zoning Ordinance and a **Use Variance** in accordance with the Federal **Telecommunications Act (TCA)**, so as to install (3) panel antennas, 3'6" in height: (1) attached on existing elevator penthouse, (1) attached on existing chimney - not further extending above existing roof structures at 61'-3"; (1) attached on existing stair penthouse at 58'-1", further install (1) backhaul dish antenna on stair penthouse also at 58'-1" and associated equipment cabinet on roof at **462 Mt. Auburn Street**, located in the T (Two-family) Zoning District.

Chair Vlachos noted that all four full members are in attendance tonight and only one of the alternates may vote. Mr. John stated that he would most likely be recusing himself from the Perkins case (being heard later this evening) and would prefer to vote on this case. Mr. Ferris will be the alternate and Mr. John will be the voting member.

James Hoyt, Attorney for the applicant introduced Anoop Jai Kumar, Radio Frequency Engineer and Andrew Thompson, Site Acquisitions Administrator. He explained that that they are deploying a 4th generation wireless internet, providing high-speed wireless internet service. This service operates similarly to the 3G network where you can use an i-phone for internet service wherever coverage is available. This will allow you to bring your laptop wherever coverage is and have a high-speed internet service. They hope to roll this out next fall. The 4G antennas (which transmit an enormous amount of data) and a dish network providing direct-beam data transfers. The dish provides an inter-connect of their entire network obviating the need for many more phone lines. At this location, they are proposing three 3 panel antennas located on an existing stairwell penthouse; an exi

sting elevator penthouse and an existing chimney. On the stair penthouse they are also attaching the one two-foot dish antenna. They are proposing a roof curb, a slightly raised platform to place their radio equipment cabinet, run with coax cable run along the rooftop and all done in an unobtrusive fashion utilizing the existing structures.

Anoop Kumar, RF Engineer, 200 Fifth Ave., Waltham, said the map that is shown covers mostly Mt. Auburn and School Streets as they do not have any coverage now. The green on the map of Watertown shows the future coverage after the other three proposed sites. Ms. Elliott asked if this plan is the full coverage rollout. Mr. Kumar said this is the initial launch plan on the existing carrier sites.

Ms. Santucci asked if the maps in the application package – future sites listed with yellow dots are zoning approved.

Chair Vlachos noted that the affidavit from the RF Engineer should have the language, “Executed under the penalty of perjury.” Atty. Hoyt will fill that language in and have Anoop sign it.

Mr. Hoyt reiterated that they chose this site for the existing facility and the height, using existing structures to make it less obtrusive.

Chair Vlachos said it is not obtrusive. Mr. Hoyt said there are a lot of structures on this roof top that already exist that they can use. It will be inconspicuous.

Mr. Magoon showed the simulations on the monitor noting the only viewable antenna is the dish antenna on the north side. Mr. Ferris noted that is the back side view with the dish facing towards Mt. Auburn Street. Ms. Santucci noted that the dish antenna is more difficult to screen. Mr. Hoyt said the view from Mt. Auburn would be invisible. Ms. Elliott asked if there is a view of the equipment cabinet. Mr. Hoyt said you cannot see the cabinet unless you are on the roof. Maintenance is one – two times a month with just a view of the equipment to be sure it is operable and then they leave. Access is generally given by the building maintenance person.

Ms. Santucci asked if there is existing Sprint equipment. Mr. Hoyt said there is no other Sprint installation here.

Rachel Sachs Jones, 59 Adams Avenue, states that the antennas existing on 462 Mt. Auburn Street overhang the building and are in their view. She and her husband have both been active in the historical preservation of the town. She believes that if the committees and groups that Watertown has today were in place a number of years ago, the Victorian home that was at this location would not have been demolished and this non-descript building put in its place. She remembers that a manager at Oakley Country Club signed a contract with T-Mobile for a tower structure on their property and a protest on their driveway took place. The town did not allow the antenna tower and T-Mobile brought a suit against the town but dropped the suit when the town allowed them to provide access on the roof top of this building at 462 Mt. Auburn. Two additional cell phone companies have equipment on this roof top now. The roof of the building is a terrible site that they and their neighbors can see it from their back yards. The chimney is a false chimney. The bare, uncovered equipment is unsightly on the roof. She said you may not see it from Mt. Auburn Street but if you back up, you can see it. She would like the ZBA to limit the equipment on this roof. She said when the trees are not in full, they have a direct sight of the roof. They are in a single-family zoning district, although the Planning Board report, dated June 11, 2010, states that the direct abutters to this building are not. The report also states that the tenants were not notified of this hearing. The owner does not live in Watertown. She cites each of the criteria listed in the ordinance for wireless facilities: residences within 50 feet, which this site has; restricted in a two-family zone, which this site is; equipment is not fully concealed or camouflaged (there are antennas hanging off the sides – these are existing and she doesn’t want this compounded); also a curb, which she believes may be at the edge of the roof line (it is not); an appropriate location for t; she doesn’t believe the co-location is a good idea. The topography of the land is seen by their house and their next door neighbors. The use, as developed will adversely affect the neighborhood. The FCC states that no feasible alternative sight to this one and she does not agree. She submitted photos of the roof from her property and her neighbors’ property.

Jay Jones, 59 Adams Avenue said that Mr. Hoyt selected this site as it has an existing facility and the building is tall. The neighbors believe this is the worst reason. He asks if there is there a limit to the amount of cell phone companies that can go on this roof. He said we loose our civilization in little pieces like this.

Mr. Ferris asked where the photographs were taken from. Mrs. Jones said they were taken from their yard.

David Russo, 115 Irving Street stated that you do not see the prominence the building has to the street from the photos. The building is on an incline; is a 5 story building; and then the equipment is on top of that. He believes this building will look like the view of the apartment building next to Greg's Restaurant parking lot, which appears to be an amusement park roof with multiple antennas. He requests the board deny the request.

Mr. John asked if we had a map with all of the wireless coverage on it. Mr. Magoon said he could produce one but does not have one tonight. He added that the report from the Planning Board that states that it is preferable to co-locate on an existing wireless facility and he supports that. With the FCC stating we will have wireless facilities no matter what, we start to look at where we are going to have them. You have to have them where they are going to provide coverage. Should they be in multiple locations or have multiple carriers on one building. Aesthetics of an installation can be done more pleasing as opposed to adding to a different building and creating more issues of aesthetics. Other facilities are camouflaged behind faux chimney's; faux walls, steeples, etc. In this case, a panel or a brick screen around the top of the building or another faux structure could be erected.

Chair Vlachos said this particular petition is less obtrusive than what is existing.

Mr. John said they have heard comments from the neighbors and suggests that the applicant use a video as a tool to explain or show how the view changes – instead of just snap shots. He said a video would allow a perspective of the roofline from all angles.

Mr. Hoyt said the photograph shows the T-mobile antenna protruding a foot out from the right and he has never seen anything like that. He said there must be a reason – technologically or structurally that they installed it like that. Their (Clear Wireless) will have their antennas flush-mounted and will be painted to match. The cabinet is 4'6" and is in the center of the roof and would not be visible unless you were very far back and up the hill.

Ms. Santucci said that the photos that were submitted from 59 Adams Street show the view that is there now. Their view will change minimally as the equipment being installed will not be visible to them.

Ms. Jones asked if cell phone companies are obliged to remove equipment they are no longer using. Chair Vlachos explained that this is a condition of the approval. He added that the equipment on this roof is being used.

Mr. Ferris asked if there are options for the dish installation to make it less visible. Mr. Hoyt said you'd have to build an additional 10' high structure to hide it. He further explained that additional structures would increase the volume and the silhouette but the silhouette would be rectangular vs. a dish. He suggested a three-sided chimney, as an option, as well.

Mr. Bailey asked if the 3G would be defunct if the 4G were operational. Mr. Hoyt said the 3G is for handheld devices and the 4G is for laptops, etc. They are the first to roll-out the 4G network.

Mr. Vlachos suggested that when the other carriers came forth for their 4G networks, they would ask them to upgrade the installations to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Santucci asked if they have the alternate site analysis. Mr. Hoyt said they based their alternative site analysis on co-locating. Ms. Santucci suggested that they show the alternative sites showing that this site is the best location. Mr. Hoyt again stated that most municipalities demand co-location and he believes that a new location, if there were one, would not be what the town would look for.

Andrew Thompson, Clear Wire Site Acquisitions, said when choosing this location, they first look at existing structures to co-locate on. The primary goal is a tower then a building. The Planning Board and Staff encouraged co-location. They became more familiar with what happened with T-Mobile and found that it was Watertown's preference to have a co-location rather than another location. This site was preferable than the cell tower at the – the other location was a two-story structure that would not provide the height. The RF analysis looked at a school between Mt. Auburn and the Golf course that did not work out – the Hosmer School.

Ms. Santucci said she needs to see where they looked. There is nothing to compare the coverage of what they are showing. How are they demonstrating that they have to go on this building. Mr. Thompson said they have no coverage now and this is the best location for this service.

Chair Vlachos asked if the 3G and 4G run on different frequencies. Mr. Hoyt said the 3G and the 4G doesn't matter – what matters is the frequency and the strength of the propagation.

Chair Vlachos asked for further comments from the audience. Hearing none, declared a business mode. He read from the Staff Report dated June 4th recommending approval and stated that the Planning Board also recommended approval. He said this installation is not as obtrusive as the (board) normally sees. He noted Ms. Santucci stated there was not an alternative location analysis done and they were basing this on co-location. He is inclined to be in favor of this petition. He does not want to penalize them for other carriers whose equipment is obtrusive.

Ms. Elliott agrees with the comments from Mr. Vlachos and hopes T-mobile comes before them to upgrade and they can then correct or improve their installations.

Mr. Bailey agrees.

Ms. Santucci asked to see the coverage map. Mr. Hoyt said this was not included in their packages as this map shows the locations that the board now approves. Ms. Santucci said that this is a network built from scratch and has 3 locations and is not trying to infill a coverage gap. She said the FCC is clear that the (wireless facility) needs to prove that there is no other feasible alternative. She likes the site and the installation but they have not submitted any alternative locations or a list of addresses. She said they have not fulfilled their obligation. It is a crucial piece for her to vote on.

Mr. Hoyt offered a compromise and said they can generate that. They will identify 4-story or higher buildings only as opposed to tower locations as the analysis will be whatever property owner wanted to make the rent – they could go anywhere. He doesn't believe that is the desirable alternative that the board is looking for. They will put together the maps

Ms. Santucci asked if the analysis had been completed. Mr. Hoyt explained that the site analysis is for existing facilities. They will provide a list of sites that do not have existing facilities that provide similar coverage – which will show there are no existing rooftops that provide this coverage. He asks that this be a condition that they provide that.

Ms. Santucci asked if this coverage map (with the yellow dots showing future coverage) is the only area they are interested in having coverage. She said there isn't any coverage on Arsenal Street. Mr. Hoyt stated that the initial goal was to have enough coverage so the people in Watertown would purchase the 4G technology and not have coverage. In the future, as they begin to identify users that do not have coverage, they will be back for additional site coverage. That would be the "in-fill". This is only for good coverage, not great coverage to roll out a launch. The site coverage was done for the high buildings with existing facilities. They will provide "raw" land sites.

Mr. Magoon noted Ms. Santucci's concern regarding the applicants fulfillment of the FCC regulations requiring a list of viable sites; however, he explained that in this instance, it is a co-location, which is preferred. He further explained that if they petitioned for Bell Tower Place (across the street), we'd say, 'no, put it on the existing'. He stated that it would be better not to spread across community. He added that given the analysis of other sites in the area, the requirement would not be repeated with each application. "That suffices. A new location requires alternative analysis and employing a third party review to further verify. We

are providing the extra step of review and analysis on new sites but an existing site that has been determined to be appropriate, they are encouraging that – not withstanding the aesthetic point.”

Ms. Santucci said the other networks have different sites; different RF's and you cannot take one analysis and use it for all networks. She further explained that this is a new network and they have the opportunity to strategically place the antennas within the community to minimize the number of installations as opposed to when cell phones first came out, they were being placed on locations wherever they could get leases and then infill from there. This is an opportunity to plan a better network. She wants to know why this is the best location for their network.

Mr. Kumar stated that they could show a Google map with the locations. Ms. Santucci reiterated that she is interested in seeing the RF maps and alternative analysis. Mr. Kumar said he would do the maps when he can get a lease and know they can be installed there. He said there is a school they considered and they said, 'no'. If the landlord is not agreeing, there is no sense in doing a map as the location is not a possibility.

Mr. Magoon said the purpose of the RF map is to demonstrate coverage and there is no coverage. Mr. Kumar said if there is not a possibility, they would not create a map.

Chair Vlachos said the board would want to know who they contacted. Mr. Kumar said this building was their second choice. Ms. Santucci said that is the type of information they want to know.

Chair Vlachos said he doesn't think the information is going to make any difference but he wants to see all members satisfied.

Mr. Kumar said they started their baseline with what the town wanted – co-location.

Mr. Ferris added that anytime there is an element that creates a silhouette visible from the street, there should be something placed around it. In this case, the dish is the issue and his suggestion is to keep the dish where it is but provide a chimney around it (for camouflage) – that is the type of thing he'd be looking for in the future.

Mr. John agrees.

Mr. Hoyt stated that they would provide a site analysis despite his preference of this being a condition. He will go back to the engineers to see if there is an alternative design for the dish to reduce the silhouette.

Mr. Hoyt explained that they have a fall launch date and they have to have as many sites up and running as soon as they can and without an August meeting, he asks that the board provide an approval with conditions for the alternative site analysis and silhouette design with either Staff approval. He then clarified that he thought we would not be meeting until September. He agreed to continue to July. No vote was taken.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Board of Appeals

149 Main Street

Watertown, MA 02472

Harry J. Vlachos, Chairman
Melissa M. Santucci, Clerk
Stuart J. Bailey, Member
Deborah Elliot, Member
David Ferris, Alternate
Suneeth P. John, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6428
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **June 30, 2010** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Harry J. Vlachos**, *Chairman*; **Melissa Santucci**, *Clerk*; **Stuart Bailey**, *Member*; **Deborah Elliott**, *Member*; **David Ferris**, *Alternate Member*; **Suneeth P. John**, *Alternate Member*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development and Planning*; **Nancy Scott**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to BOA*. *Absent: Danielle Fillis Evans, Senior Planner.*

Chair Vlachos asked if **49 Buick Street** is presenting this evening. Ms. Civetti stated that the petitioner is not in attendance despite repeated notifications via mail and e-mail. Ms. Scott said that we should call it a day on this petition as he was going to present alternative plans but has not come forward. When he has plans, the process can begin again.

No vote was taken.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Board of Appeals

149 Main Street

Watertown, MA 02472

Harry J. Vlachos, Chairman
Melissa M. Santucci, Clerk
Stuart J. Bailey, Member
Deborah Elliot, Member
David Ferris, Alternate
Suneeth P. John, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6428
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, **June 30, 2010** at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: **Harry J. Vlachos**, *Chairman*; **Melissa Santucci**, *Clerk*; **Stuart Bailey**, *Member*; **Deborah Elliott**, *Member*; **David Ferris**, *Alternate Member*; **Suneeth P. John**, *Alternate Member*; **Steve Magoon**, *Director, Community Development and Planning*; **Nancy Scott**, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*; **Louise Civetti**, *Clerk to BOA*. *Absent: Danielle Fillis Evans, Senior Planner.*

Chair Vlachos stated that the next case, **175 North Beacon Street**, Perkins School, he will be recusing himself from as he did not file a notice that would have allowed him to hear the case. He said that Mr. John wanted to be clear that he had worked with one of the engineers on this case at another time and that would not effect his opinion of this case. There will be a 5 person board with both alternates voting and Ms. Santucci will chair in his absence. Ms. Elliott will act as clerk. Chair Vlachos swore in any remaining audience members and then declared a 5 minute break.

Ms. Santucci reconvened the meeting and Ms. Elliott read the legal notice:

Steven Rothstein, President, Perkins School for the Blind, 175 North Beacon Street, Watertown, MA herein requests the Board of Appeals to grant a **Special Permit-Site Plan Review** in accordance with Section 5.00(f), New Construction Exceeding 4,000 Square Feet, Zoning Ordinance, so as to permit construction of a 2-story building, 107.5'x 141.5', 16,502 sf inclusive of basement, for the Grousbeck Center for Students and Technology, providing 10 additional parking spaces, where 26 is required. Construct 30-vehicle parking area northerly of Hunt & Farrell Houses. Seeking a waiver for number of required parking spaces and to allow for 16 shadow parking spaces, where maximum 20% or 5 spaces is permitted. Further modify configuration of Beechwood Avenue parking lot to allow for separate entrance and exit street openings for the campus at **175 North Beacon Street**, located in the T (Two-Family) Zoning District.

Ken Hoffman, Holland & Knight, Attorney for Perkins School, spoke on the Dover Amendment regarding parking for the school.

Steven Rothstein, President, Perkins School for the Blind, thanked all staff and members for their time. He stated that in this tough fiscal time they are thrilled to be able to build this technology center. He said for that students that are blind, access to Braille and hearing output is their technology. Perkins wants to continue to be a leader in this field and with the generous gift (of the Grousbeck Center for Students and Technology) it will allow the students on the campus to get the training they need and allow Perkins to continue and expand their training of teachers. Most students that are blind are in public schools and they want to help teachers in public schools to know about the technology they need. In the building there will be a student center for students to learn as well as a training center for teachers and some offices. He then stated the building is 17,000 sf. There will be no new staff or students coming to the building. They are not hiring new staff so there will not be more cars. The teachers that come for training work during the week and they come for

training on the weekends. There is available parking on the weekends. There is more than enough parking on the campus. They had public meetings before meeting with the town and the request from the neighbors was not to cut down trees and to keep the green space – that is the reason for the shadow parking request. If there is a need for more cars, they will be able to accommodate them in the future. They are doing everything they can to preserve the green space. Perkins bought this property in 1910 and moved in 1912. They have planted 50 new trees - there are more trees than there were 8 years ago. They are planning more around the edges for the neighbors. Another project is to make the pond more beautiful. They are proposing an entrance and exit on Beechwood Avenue for safety to staff, students and neighbors with 6 less parking spaces.

Steven Garvin, Samiotis Engineering, Land Surveyors. They reconfigured the parking lot and reduced the impervious coverage and with the one-way in and one-way out, they have provided a safer flow and the ability for a fire truck to maneuver through. They have reduced drainage from the parking lot into the town's drainage – and the drainage from the building is infiltrated before emptying into the pond – they did a hydrology study and with the Conservation Commission and received an order of conditions showing that the pond would not be affected. They monitored it in March during the heavy rains to see how the pond reacted in relation to their model and it followed the model closely and they feel comfortable going forward. Other utilities are being fed through the campus – sewer, electrical, telecommunications. They are going outside the campus for another water/hydraulic connection on Beechwood Avenue. On the pond side of the new building, there are trees being preserved and along Beechwood, they are continuing the row of arborvitae to improve the existing buffer.

Ms. Santucci asked that he go over the adjusted parking areas, constructed and shadow parking spaces. Mr. Garvin indicated that their drawing showed green as the existing parking, yellow proposed, paved spaces and red the shadow spaces. The existing Beechwood Avenue lot has 131 spaces and will have 125. Along the track area, 11 new paved spaces with 6 shadow spaces – the shadow spaces are grass and if they are needed, they will be paved. Near the library, the lot has 19 spaces and will be reconfigured to create 5 additional spaces with 3 shadow spaces. Off North Beacon Street, between the Hilton Building and the lower school are 7 shadow spaces. A total of 10 new paved spaces and 16 shadow spaces, which are the 26 total requested.

Mr. Ferris stated that the landscaping will be blocked from the street by the new building and asked if the fence and arborvitae along Beechwood would be maintained and replenished and since the plant list shows only 4 new trees, would they add more landscaping to the plan. Mr. Rothstein said that the fence will be maintained and they have added or will add 50 new trees. The plan only shows this area, they look at the campus overall – they have invested a lot in the pond area. When they invest in new areas, they take away parking spaces. Mr. Ferris clarified that he was pointing out that the space between the new building and the street only shows grass and it would be nice to see more softscape there especially with the new entrance and exit. Christiine Rubinsky, Architect, spoke for the landscape architect, showing the low green hedge as a tactile planting for the blind students to keep them from the parking lot and the idea is to have good visibility and way finding coming into the building – they didn't want to block the building with trees along a very narrow strip. They will incorporate over time lower plantings and larger canopy trees – they are infilling the arborvitae hedge with existing arborvitae and they have relocated a forsythia hedge – green dots are trees to be relocated. Mr. Garvin added that there are numerous trees being preserved. Mr. Ferris asked if the tree in the lot will be protected with the two new spaces. Mr. John asked if the trees being removed are being replaced with the same caliper trees. Mr. Rothstein said they are moving 14 and adding 4 – they are replacing two older trees on the other side of the campus and they will have more trees on campus at the end of this project and today they have more trees than a decade ago.

Mr. John asked about composting 14 trees or are they adding 50 trees. Mr. Rothstein said the adding of 50 trees has been over several years. The two trees that are coming down will be composted and reused on campus. Ms. Rubinsky said 20 trees are lost, 14 are transplanted and 4 are new. Mr. John said there is a net deficit of 10 trees. He wants to be sure they are softening around the building. Mr. Garvin said they have staff that are overlooking this – they have added 50 trees over the last few years – a net gain on campus. The trees being taken down are not in great shape.

Mr. Bailey asked if the trees on the Beechwood Avenue are being composted. Mr. Garvin said they are street trees and they are working with the Tree Warden on composting those trees. Mr. Rothstein said they

have been asked by the town (as an ordinance) to add sidewalks and the trees have to be removed, which they are doing. Mr. Ferris added that he was disappointed to see the new driveway was going through two existing trees but when he saw the trees, they are not in good shape.

Mr. John asked if they are building with LEED or LEED Silver. Mr. Rothstein said they are LEED but hoping for LEED Silver.

Mr. John asked if they are working with impervious vs. pervious. Mr. Garvin said they are working with the existing parking lot with restriping and cutting it back. Mr. John then asked about bike racks. Ms. Rubinsky said they are putting bike racks at the east close and they will get the LEED points for having showers. Mr. Rothstein said they have added bike racks, they have a green-team, they have given out bikes, they pay people not to drive as well as other initiatives to reduce the carbon foot-print on the campus. They have a green newsletter on the lower school.

Mr. John asked about the lighting. Mr. Rothstein said they shield everything from the neighbors – there isn't any light pollution. Ms. Rubinsky said they are moving existing light fixtures to other locations and there will be adequate lighting for safety. Mr. Ferris added that the arborvitae are about 18' tall.

Ms. Elliott stated that this is the second or third building within the past couple of years and wondered if they have a master plan that they based the placement of these buildings on. Mr. Rothstein said they do have a master plan that they look at what their needs are – the lower school was a residential need and this building is fulfilling a need. They have plans for side building work – like air conditioning. They hope not to come back to the board as they have this building paid for but the lower school they have to complete their capitol debt before they think of any other projects.

Ms. Elliott stated that she has confidence in regards to the tree plantings as there is a master plan and the appropriate locations are decided upon for building.

Sybil Campbell, 70 Beechwood (corner of Edith) said that she has no comment on the shadow parking but the real problem is the parking on the side streets. She notes that Royal, Fifield and other streets are identified on the master parking plan but Edith is not. Edith is directly across from the new exit of the Beechwood parking lot. She asked how cars would enter/exit through a narrow crowded street. Non-resident employees of Perkins park on both sides of Beechwood narrowing the street to one lane – especially in the winter with the snow. She counted 24 cars today on the Perkins side of the street and one in front of her house. She had contacted Perkins in the past to tell them it was difficult getting in and out of her driveway due to the cars parked there and nothing was done. A school bus stop for small children exists near the proposed exit of Perkins, why can't Perkins maintain the same entrance/exit that exists now and widen it. Why hasn't the town done a traffic and fire safety study including Edith and Pequosette since it is likely that traffic will increase due to the proposed new exit.

Dawn MacDonald, 82-84 Beechwood Ave., said that she and her husband have lived here for 7 years and plan on continuing – she loves living across from Perkins and there is a beautiful view from her home of the campus. The traffic has increased greatly and there are cars parked up and down the street. Her boys, aged 2 & 4, risk getting hit if they were to run out as you cannot see over the parked cars. She can barely get out of her driveway. The traffic is 75% Perkins non-resident employees. She agrees, the entrance could be widened instead of a new exit. The grass along Perkins' side of Beechwood is muddy and destroyed from the parking. There used to be a curb on that side and the chunks of pavement (from the now non-existing curbing) was picked up and removed by her and her husband. There is a huge amount of foot traffic along the street, including two wheel chairs being pushed down the middle of the street tonight because of the cars parked on both sides of the street. On her side of the street, the sidewalk is narrow. She asked what Perkins was going to do about the parking as she feels this issue is more important than trees as she knows they will keep the campus beautiful.

Leo Falter, 28 Fifield Street, has lived here his entire life and stated that there are two concern: parking is a problem and cars blocking the driveways. They've tried to do things with Perkins and it is not working. There are 12 cars on Fifield Street now from Perkins; 15 cars on Riverside; 5 on Royal and 30 cars on North Beacon Street. He knows this as there are stickers on these cars. Perkins needs more parking spaces. This has been a serious and on-going problem for years. There used to be an orchard where there is a parking lot

now. Perkins has out-grown this campus. Their storage area on Fifield Street causes large trucks to back up the street to make their deliveries. Perkins growth mean more supplies – there are 3-4 tractor-trailer trucks daily - they should consider a different storage area. This street is too small.

Mr. Rothstein said they rent 60 spaces (plus an additional 10) from the Arsenal Mall now and they use a shuttle bus to and from the school. There were over 100 spaces lost due to construction.

The neighbors stated that there was an issue before the construction. They have called the police for the past 5-10 years and the police will not ticket the cars.

Evelyn Sullivan, 50 Beechwood Avenue, has lived there for 65 years and asked if moving the school bus stop across from Edith Avenue is going to be a problem for the kids. She stated that there wasn't any parking allowed on North Beacon Street until the construction began and wants to know if it is going to continue after the construction is complete.

Brenda Nichols, Perkins representative, said the North Beacon Street parking started back in September and has allowed them 30 more parking spaces.

Mr. Rothstein said that anyone is welcomed to call his office if there is a parking violation. They acquired additional parking before the construction began. The construction will be complete in December and 116 parking spaces will become available.

Ms. Scott suggested a meeting with the Traffic Department, Sgt. Deignan and the neighbors. Mr. Rothstein said he has had two meetings with the neighbors.

Ms. Santucci asked what the school is going to do to address the temporary parking issues.

Ms. Elliott suggested showing a proposed phased parking plan in color; plans for leasing more spaces or contractor parking spaces; and meeting with the neighbors.

Dennis Duff, 33 Spruce Street asked how many employees do they have and if they have a master plan for the parking.

Mr. Rothstein said they have 720 employees. 650 are on campus from 8 am – 4 pm, Monday – Friday. The master plan will show the parking. He will enforce internal procedures with employees and construction.

Ms. Elliott motioned to continue the case to July 28th. Mr. John seconded. Voted 5-0 to continue.

Ms. Elliott motioned to adjourn. Mr. Ferris seconded. Voted 5-0. The meeting ended at 10:30 p.m.

