

Matthew Heins

From: Kathy SAVAGE <rocksav@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 03, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Matthew Heins
Cc: reels3@comcast.net; rfdemarzo@aol.com
Subject: Planning Board Meeting June 8
Attachments: Conway Storage bld. Hanover pic 1.jpg; Conway Storage Bld. Hanover pic 2.jpg; Conway Storage Bldg. Pic 3 Hanover.jpg

Matthew:

Please submit this email and the attached pictures of Conway's Hanover building to the Planning Board prior to the scheduled June 8 meeting during which the proposal on 50 Mattakeesett Street construction by the Conway Realty Co. Also please respond back with the appropriate information needed so that we may be able to participate via ZOOM at the meeting scheduled for June 8, 2020.

We would like to voice our strong disapproval of the proposal by Conway to construct a 4000 s.f. storage building in the rear of their existing building at 50 Mattakeesett Street and abutting our home on Grove Street and which is within the Center Protection District. Some of our objections are listed below:

1. The Center Protection District should be respected and protected. This type of building is not suited for this District and should be constructed in a industrial complex of which there are many locally with available land.
2. Use of the proposed building is listed as for employees only. We question why they would take on this expense to provide storage for their employees? Also the employees would be able to "loan" their space to whoever - possibly their real estate clients or whoever they choose to give access to? Last year we listened to a lengthy presentation about new revenue streams for Conway due to the evolution of the real estate business and they are now taking on this expense as a employee benefit??? Obviously there will be some monetary gain for them which makes me believe that this space is rental space. Conway shows online that they have 700+ employees - how can they police this? We see no mention in the proposal for a Deed Restriction for Employee Use Only. Again this is not within the guidelines of the Center Protection District.
3. The submitted plans call for multiple waivers of traffic studies, landscaping requirements, buffer strips, development impact statements. We do not agree with any of these requests for waivers. Buffer strips to our residential properties are suggested to be 20" instead of 50" and this is completely unacceptable to us and it is obvious that this would greatly impact the value of our home in a negative way. Conway states that there will be no traffic changes due to this building - that will not be the case and not demanding a traffic study during the appropriate time of the day and day of the week (not at 1am in the morning on a Monday) should be a requirement. Development

impact would be severe - this would be literally be in the play area of a daycare center - what prospective parent would want strangers and additional traffic coming in and out observing their babies at play.. As residential abutters this would greatly diminish the value of our properties which we purchased with the express understanding that there would be no "industrial type" building here in the center of Town.

4. This is the second time that Conway has presented this proposal - last year they withdrew when there was apparent strong disapproval by the taxpayers of this Town. Now they have resubmitted with minor tweaks to this same plan - the major one being that "only employees" will use this. We believe that this is just semantics and this could not be enforced.

5. Please look at the pictures which we took of the storage unit building Conway has constructed behind their office in Hanover. This is NOT the type of building that should be built within the Center Protection District. This is basically the same type they are suggesting they building in our backyard. Let me ask this - how would the Planning Board Members like to have that building in THEIR backyards.

6. In addition we believe that the list of abutters that have been notified of this proposal is incorrect. Legally all abutters need to be notified. This proposal would result in violation of our rights as abutters to the Right of Quiet Enjoyment of our properties.

We also would like to respectfully ask if any member of the Planning Board have had or are currently in any kind of joint business arrangements with Conway as this would create a conflict of interest. We would expect that if that is the case that that individual(s) would recuse themselves from voting on this proposal.

We also feel that with the current environment, these meetings give a unfair advantage to the Conway Company since the public is not in attendance and we are not able to express our opinions or question their statements in real time.

We strongly recommend that The Planning Board vote this proposal down immediately.

Conway Storage bld. Hanover pic 1



Conway Storage Bld. Hanover pic 2



Conway Storage Bldg. Pic 3 Hanover

