

**PENNINGTON BOROUGH
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
MARCH 13, 2013**

Vice Chairman Reilly called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act was announced.

Board Members Present: Mark Blackwell, Keelan Evanini, Josh Levy, Thomas Ogren (took part in Pennington School presentation), William B. Meytrott (stepped out for a minute), James Reilly, Vice Chairman, Nadine Stern, Alternate. Absent: Eileen Heinzl, Katherine O'Neill, Winn Thompson, Chairman, Deborah L. Gnat, Alternate.

Also Present: Cindy Coppola, Coppola & Coppola Associates, Borough Planner; Edwin W. Schmierer, Mason, Griffin & Pierson, Board Attorney; Mary W. Mistretta, Planning Board Secretary. Absent: Carmela Roberts, Roberts Engineering Group, LLC, Borough Engineer; John Flemming, Zoning Officer.

OPEN TIME FOR PUBLIC ADDRESS – Mr. Reilly asked if there was anyone in the public who had comments or questions regarding items not on the agenda, there being none the open time for public address was closed.

APPLICATIONS

Kinsale Properties, LLC, Matthew Henderson, Managing Member, 134 South Main Street, Block 505, Lot 19 (old Block 13, Lot 24), R-80 Zone.

Present: Robert N. Ridolfi, LLC, Attorney; Elizabeth C. McKenzie, P.P., P.A., Planner, E. Harvey Myers, Architect, Matthew Henderson, Applicant.

Mr. Reilly stated that the applicant was applying for a use variance. The applicant is requesting to use the unit on the first floor as a residential apartment instead of the previous use of office space. Apartments are not a permitted use in the R-80 zone and a use variance is required. Mr. Schmierer indicated that proof of notice and proof of publication were in order and the Board could take jurisdiction. Mr. Reilly stated that waivers were requested for the checklist and the Board granted the waivers by voice vote.

Mr. Ridolfi stated that the applicant also requested an interpretation of a resolution for a previously approved application that permitted the applicant to use the first floor as a residential apartment. In the alternative the applicant has applied for a use variance that would permit that use. A chronological use of the premises from 1980 on was included in the Board's packages. The first floor has been vacant for the last couple of years, but has been used for office space since 1980. Previous to 1994, the first floor was used for both commercial/office space and apartment space. A variance was granted in 1994 to allow the office use to expand into the apartment area. Mr. Ridolfi stated that they had reviewed Ms. Coppola's memorandum of March 11, 2013 and they were prepared to address all the issues she raised. Mr. Ridolfi stated that Matthew Henderson was a managing member of the applicant Kinsale Properties, LLC. and will give an overview and description of the property. E. Harvey Myers will describe the architectural details and floor plans. Elizabeth C. McKenzie will provide the background and the special reasons on which the Board will be able to approve the application for a use variance.

Matthew Henderson was sworn in and stated that he was authorized to speak on behalf of the applicant and was familiar with the office proceedings. Mr. Ridolfi questioned Mr.

Henderson regarding the property and the activities of the real estate office when it was open. Mr. Henderson described the lot and stated that it was long and narrow with an irregular shape and there is a barn/shed in the rear. There is a driveway going to the parking area that is shared with the neighbor. The real estate office using the first floor space closed in 2010 and the space is currently vacant. Mr. Henderson described how the office was used and stated that the office was open on weekends. Mr. Henderson stated that no exterior modifications would be made if the application was approved. Mr. Henderson stated that he was a managing member of Callaway Henderson Sotheby International Realty and was also a sales agent. Mr. Henderson testified that he felt the proposed use was appropriate for the property. He stated that it would be hard to tell that there were two apartments from the exterior and the house. Ms. Stern had questions regarding the adjacent house and the second floor of the applicant's house. Mr. Henderson stated that the adjacent house was a single family house and there was only one apartment on the second floor of the applicant's house. Mr. Henderson noted that there would be parking for approximately 6-8 cars in the rear. Mr. Evanini had questions regarding the two front doors on the right side of the house. Mr. Henderson stated that the door on the right goes to a stairway up to the second floor apartment and the other door goes into the first floor apartment. Mr. Evanini stated that the two doors would make it appear that there were two separate units.

Harvey Myers, architect for the applicant, was sworn in and gave his qualifications which were accepted by the Board. Mr. Myers stated that he prepared the floor plans and visited the site many times. Mr. Ridolfi asked Mr. Myers to clarify a discrepancy between the floor plans that were originally submitted and the revised floor plans regarding a stair case. Exhibits entered were: A-1 Floor Plan originally submitted and A-2 Revised Floor plans. Mr. Myers explained that the original plans were for the office and did not address the unit upstairs. The revised plans added the following: extended to include the area up to the property line which included the stairway going upstairs, changed the large window to show the existing two windows in the front and a patio. Mr. Myers described the space that had previously been a real estate office. Along with the three office spaces there was a conference room and a kitchen. Mr. Myers stated that the proposed apartment would be converted with one large bedroom, living/dining room space, kitchen and small bedroom and den to the rear. Mr. Myers stated that there would not have to be any exterior changes done to convert the space. The utilities for the kitchen already exist as the new kitchen will be in the same area as the existing one. Ms. Coppola asked for clarification on the stairway by the side door. Mr. Myers stated that it was another set of stairs that went up to the second floor and it is used to move large furniture up to the second floor apartment. The entrances to the stairway are kept locked and are only accessible when permission is granted to use it.

Ms. Elizabeth C. McKenzie, architect's planner, was sworn in and gave her qualifications which the Board accepted. Entered into evidence, A-3 Elizabeth C. McKenzie, Curriculum Vitae. Ms. McKenzie stated that she had been to the property a number of times. She stated that she was retained for the purposes of determining whether the applicant's request for either an Interpretation or Variance to replace the real estate office with an apartment on the first floor could be justified based on the criteria in the Municipal Land Use Law. Entered into evidence was Exhibit A-4 Aerial maps from three different views. Ms. McKenzie stated that the area is a single family residential area in character, but up closer to Academy Avenue there are three two-family dwellings or half single family dwellings that are evident. Ms. McKenzie stated that lots in the R-80 are required to have a minimum of 12,000 sq. ft. and a minimum of 80 ft. of frontage. The property is 11,986 sq. ft. with a very irregular lot shape. Ms. McKenzie stated that they believe the building was constructed as a two-family dwelling with an apartment above and below because of the double doors. Previously there

was a barber shop on the first floor and an apartment. The commercial use was changed to a real estate office and in 1994 there was variance approval to convert the entire first floor to a real estate office. The second floor has always been rented as a residential apartment. Peyton Realty received the variance in 1994 and there was concern expressed by the neighbors about intensifying the commercial activity in the residential area. The Board approved the application, but included in the resolution the statement that if the owner ever wanted to come back and convert the first floor space back into a residential use conforming to the R-80 Zone, it can do so as of right. This is what the applicant is proposing, but since the resolution the zoning has changed and the R-80 Zone no longer allows two-family dwellings. Ms. McKenzie presented special reasons to justify the granting of the D variance and that there would be no substantial detriments to the public good or the zone plan. There is adequate parking for two residential units without making any changes to the existing parking lot and there is room to expand the parking area if it was ever needed. The parking lot of the Masonic Temple backs up to the rear of the property and if changes were ever needed in the applicant's parking area it would only affect the adjacent parking area of the Temple. Ms. McKenzie noted that the Borough's ordinance calls for residential uses rather than commercial uses to be located in the R-80 Zone and by obtaining the zoning variance they would be relinquishing all rights to any commercial use on the premises in the future and would be promoting the zone plan. Ms. McKenzie stated that the area is not strictly single family residences and she feels that having two residential apartments would support the Historic District and would not be destructive of the historic character of the area. Ms. McKenzie outlined different purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law that she felt would be promoted by granting the variance.

Ms. McKenzie addressed comments in Ms. Coppola's memorandum of March 11, 2013 regarding the negative criteria. Neighbors had concerns about adequate parking at the hearing for the last variance, but Ms. McKenzie pointed out that there was adequate parking in the rear for two apartments and there will not be the same traffic activity as there would be with a real estate office when it is busy. Ms. McKenzie felt that overall the application promoted the zone plan and moved it in the right direction. There would be no substantial detriment to the public good and no substantial impairment of the zone plan and ordinance.

Mr. Evanini asked the applicant why they wouldn't just convert the house into a single family unit. Ms. McKenzie stated that the building lends itself to the use of two apartments and a lot of renovations would be required to turn it into a single family home. Ms. McKenzie stated that they feel that are doing what the Board had intended in 1994 by reverting the first floor space back to residential. Ms. Coppola asked if one of the front doors would be removed if the house was converted to single family and Ms. McKenzie stated that it would and, therefore, there would be an exterior change. Ms. Coppola asked if there was an existing full kitchen and Mr. Myers stated that there was. Ms. Coppola stated that this would make it unique in that the kitchen was not being changed and it is particularly suited to an apartment. Ms. Coppola asked if the applicant would be interested in making one of the apartments an affordable apartment and Ms. McKenzie stated that it is not proposed at this time. Ms. Coppola stated that Ms. McKenzie outlined the special reasons and from a suitability perspective the property is relatively unique and had previously been part office and part apartment on the first floor for many years. Mr. Evanini asked for further clarification regarding the previous uses. Ms. McKenzie stated that a commercial use and apartment existed on the first floor before zoning and were grandfathered. Ms. Coppola felt that it was important to point out that if the D variance is granted it will automatically relinquish the commercial use. Mr. Reilly clarified that the applicant was requesting an interpretation of the 1994 resolution of approval that the applicant has a right to create an apartment on the first

floor and would just require a majority of the Board agreeing. If the Board did not agree with the interpretation the approval would be for a D variance. Ms. Coppola was sworn in and stated that at one time the ordinance allowed dwelling conversions in the R-80 zone as a conditional use. This was in existence back in 1994 when the Board approved the expansion of the commercial space, however, it was repealed in 2000 and dwelling conversions in the R-80 were no longer conditional uses. Mr. Reilly stated that it would appear that Borough Council did not want that procedure to remain and it would dispose of the matter of rights and the applicant would need a use variance.

Mr. Reilly asked if there was anyone in the public that had questions or comments regarding the application.

Ms. Gail Stratton, 138 S. Main Street, was sworn in. Ms. Stratton stated she lived next door to the south of 134 S. Main. Ms. Stratton stated that they have an easement to share the driveway with the applicant. She stated that she has been in the building many times and the kitchen on the first floor is not what normally would be described as a kitchen. It was her understanding that when the real estate office moved out in 2010 it stopped the commercial use of the property. Mr. Schmierer stated that there would have to be an intention to abandon the use and if the owners still have the notion that they wanted to rent it out as a commercial property the use would not go away. There would have to be an affirmative abandonment. Ms. Stratton stated that the house across the street previously had a commercial use and has been turned into a single family house and she feels that it is time that 134 be turned into a single family house. Mr. Reilly clarified that if the variance is denied the house would not necessarily become a single family house, the owner could rent the space as a real estate office. Ms. Stratton stated that when the real estate office was there they used the Masonic Temple lot and often parked in the street. Ms. Stratton showed the Board pictures of the parking area which is not maintained and she does not feel that 6-8 cars could park in the rear. If there were that many cars they would have to turn on her property as there is not that much space. Ms. Stratton has lived there for 25 years and stated that parking has always been a problem and pointed out that if there were four tenants in the two apartments each of them could have a car. Ms. Stratton stated that they have issues living next to a semi abandoned property that is not maintained. Parts of the metal roof blew off, branches from the trees fall into the driveway and no one comes to maintain the property and she does not feel that there would be any improvement if there was an apartment on the first floor. She stated that there is an absentee landlord and it is a detriment to the neighborhood. Ms. Stratton also pointed out that there was a big sink hole appearing by the side door that is covered by bricks that is encroaching into the driveway. She stated that the owners are nonresponsive to phone calls regarding these maintenance issues and it is another reason why she feels it should go back to a single owner. Ms. Stratton pointed out that she uses the driveway, but parks on her own property. Mr. Evanini asked about the proposed kitchen and the applicant stated that the kitchen would be enlarged. Mr. Schmierer entered Ms. Stratton presented photographs to the Board and they were entered into evidence as Exhibit O-1. Ms. Stern asked about the use of the driveway and Ms. Stratton stated that the easement would remain if either one of the properties were sold.

Brent Stratton, 138 S. Main Street, was sworn in. Mr. Stratton stated that he would like to clarify a few points that came up. Mr. Stratton stated that the easement was recorded in their deed and it would be perpetual and conveyed to future owners. Mr. Stratton pointed out that the parking area for the applicant's property looks larger than it really is as only half the area belongs to 134 S. Main Street. He felt it would be a stretch to get four cars in the area

and six to eight would be impossible. He also stated that people did not want to park in that area as the sap and berries fell off the trees. Mr. Stratton did not feel that a variance should be granted for an apartment in the R-80 district and stated that the space has been vacant for a couple of years and this would be a good time to get it back to a single family house. Mr. Schmierer clarified that the application is not for a single family home, but to reintroduce a rental property on the first floor. If it is denied a commercial use can continue, but the Board does not have the ability to direct the applicant that this become a single family home.

Ms. Rachel Ullman, 132 S. Main Street, was sworn in. Ms. Ullman stated that she lived in the attached house to the north of the applicant's. Ms. Ullman pointed out that the two-family houses that Ms. McKenzie referred to were in the Town Center Zone and not the R-80 Zone. Ms. Ullman stated that her property also has two front doors. Ms. Ullman stated that she has copies of deeds for her home that go back to 1865. She stated that it had been a tavern and inn and in 1870 the home next door (134) was constructed as an addition to house the carriages for people who stayed at the inn and was not constructed as two apartments. Ms. Ullman gave the Board a little history of the property since they moved there in 2010. Ms. Ullman stated that after the real estate office moved out their calls about maintenance problems were never resolved. A complaint was made regarding a hole in the foundation where animals were getting in and they called and complained and it was never fixed. Ms. Ullman also felt that her property value would go down attached to a multifamily unit. She feels that it would maintain its value with a commercial property on the first floor with an apartment on the second floor since that is the way it was when they bought their property. Mr. Levy asked why she preferred the real estate office as to having an apartment and Ms. Ullman responded that they knew the office people would be there monitoring the office and the building and they would only be using it for office work during office hours and she does not know who would be renting the apartment. Ms. Stern asked what the applicant would have to do to use the space for other than a real estate office and Mr. Schmierer agreed that they would have to come back for a use variance.

Mr. Jeffrey Ullman, stated that he lived in Somerset and would like to speak on his daughter-in-law's behalf. He stated that the only reasons the Board has been given to grant the application are reasons that arise out of the existing nonconformity. He asked how would making it into a two family dwelling conform with the zoning plan since the R-80 is a single family zone. He felt that since the applicant is trying to change the use they know that a real estate office is not a profitable use there and they are not authorized to have any other commercial use there because of the prior approval which limited the nonconforming use. He feels that his daughter-in-law and the neighbors are saying to keep it as commercial rather than multifamily because the commercial use is temporary and sooner or later it will have to be given up, whereas the multifamily use would be forever. Mr. Ullman did not feel that any special reasons have been given to grant the use variance.

There being no further comments, Mr. Reilly closed the public comment period of the hearing. Ms. McKenzie asked to address a comment that was made regarding the location of the two family dwelling units. She stated that they are in the R-80 Zone as the Town Center Zone starts north of Academy Street and the houses she pointed out are all south of Academy. Mr. Ridolfi stated that the applicant has taken out a permit for the roof and he stated that he could count 6 or 7 available parking spaces. He stated that he had a discussion with the applicant regarding the house needing to be maintained and he felt that with residents in the apartment it will be properly maintained.

Mr. Meytrott felt that most of the objections were based more on property maintenance issues than zoning issues and he does not believe that the Board was there to address that issue. He feels it is a hard decision and wonders if it is in the best zoning interest to leave the commercial use and go back to a residential. He also stated that there was testimony and a difference of opinion whether there was enough parking. He stated that they would be allowing an apartment which is not allowed in the R-80 Zone. Mr. Meytrott stated that he would like to hear the opinions of the other Board Members. Ms. Stern stated that she thought this application would be simple and it is clearly not simple. She felt that if the owners of the property maintained it appropriately and been good neighbors they may not be having this problem. If the property had been maintained properly there might not be as much concern as to who the property will be rented to. She stated that it was not in her realm of authority, but her advice to the applicant would be to show that they can maintain the property and it would not bring down the value of the neighbor's property if it was rented out and would not be a detriment and, therefore, Ms. Stern would not approve it. Mr. Evanini agreed with Mr. Meytrott that the issue was more zoning and even though the maintenance problems are somewhat damaging to the current property owners they don't bear on the question that much. He agrees with Ms. McKenzie's statement that the residential use will bring it closer with the intention of the R-80 Zone, but the question is whether the Board wants to grant a variance to something that is closer to the intended use or do they want to try to reinstate the intended use. He would be more inclined to approve the variance if there were other two family units in the area and he felt that it would be easier to convert the house to two residential units, but he is not sure if that should be given consideration. Mr. Blackwell also felt that the application would be simple and he feels bad for the neighbors, but he does not feel that it should be a consideration. The question was if the Board wanted to approve the application and get closer to the zone intention. Although he feels bad for the neighbors, he understands why the applicant needs to generate some kind of income and he doesn't see a problem with the application. He has seen the property for 50 years and the different uses that have been there and the two doors have always been in the front of the house. Mr. Blackwell feels that moving the commercial use out for a residential use is a good thing and it is not a bad thing for the town to have apartments. Mr. Blackwell stated that in his experience tenants make good neighbors and he is leaning towards approving the application. Mr. Levy stated that after Ms. McKenzie's testimony he was strongly inclined to approve the application as she made some great points. Although provided with good testimony on the negative criteria, he felt that the public was here stating that there are substantial detriments. Their testimony is strong since they are the ones that will have to live with it and he is still weighing that point. Mr. Reilly stated that he is not really convinced that the special needs criteria standard is really met. There may be no other multi family houses and it may be a good thing to have apartments, but the Borough Council has seen fit to establish an ordinance that does not allow them in the R-80 Zone. While it seems good to eliminate a commercial use in a residential area, he is not sure what the ultimate fate of the property would be and it may expire on its own and become a single family property which would be conforming to the zone. He is not convinced that the special needs standards have been met and it would be a tremendous benefit to the zone plan to create a two family house. Mr. Reilly stated that on balance he did not feel from a zoning perspective that the standard has been met. Mr. Meytrott stated that in reading the Land Use Law he was not convinced that the negative criteria had been met and he does not feel that he can support the application. Mr. Blackwell made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Ridolfi stated that it was clear the Board was in angst regarding the application and asked if it could be carried to the next meeting to enable another member to listen to the tapes and be qualified to vote. Mr. Schmierer stated that the consensus of the Board was clear and he did not feel that carrying the meeting to the next month for one vote would make a difference. Mr. Reilly

asked if anyone wanted to move to carry the application to the next meeting. There being no motions the Board denied the request to carry the application. Mr. Reilly asked if there was a second to Mr. Blackwell's motion to approve the application, there being none the motion failed. Ms. Stern made a motion to deny the application and Mr. Meytrott seconded the motion. Mr. Blackwell reminded the Board that if the application is denied what alternative would the applicant have and the unit may stay empty in its present state. Voting yes: Evanini, Levy, Meytrott, Stern, Reilly. Voting no: Blackwell. Absent: Heinzl, Ogren, O'Neill, Thompson, Gnatt. The hearing ended at 9:53 p.m.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION

Paul & Melissa Mantuano, Block 702, Lot 17, 206 Burd Street, R-80 Zone.

Mr. Blackwell made a motion, seconded by Mr. Meytrott to adopt the resolution of approval. Voting yes: Blackwell, Evanini, Meytrott, Reilly. Not voting: Levy, Stern. Absent: Heinzl, Ogren, O'Neill, Thompson, Gnatt.

Mr. Schmierer was excused from The Pennington School presentation.

WORK SESSION, CORRESPONDENCE

The Pennington School, Conceptual Presentation.

Present: Graeme McWhirter, Herbert Seeburger, Van Cleef Associates, Robert Douglass and John Clover, Voith & Mactavish Architects LLP

Mr. McWhirter stated that they wanted to update the Board regarding future plans that are being discussed. Mr. McWhirter stated that a few years ago the school received approvals from the Board that included new roads, additional parking and an area that was marked off showing a location for a new gymnasium extension and a new academic building. They have had Voith & Mactavish Architects LLP do an analysis of the school's needs and they have concluded that there is a need for a new building with twenty classrooms, offices and a learning center, approximately 25,000 sq. ft. Mr. McWhirter introduced Robert Douglass and John Clover from Voith & Mactavish Architects LLP. Mr. Clover explained that the campus is very tight on space and the only feasible area to place the building is in the area of the existing Lodge and Lowelldon buildings. Mr. Douglass stated that they have been meeting with a sub committee of the Historic Commission to discuss different options and have distributed four different renderings to the Board for discussion. Mr. Douglass explained that the Historic Commission did not like the option that proposed moving Lowelldon to Green Street as it would take it out of the Historic District and out of context with the campus. Mr. McWhirter stated that that Lowelldon was at one time the head master's house and is currently being used as the admissions office. Option A moves Lowelldon east, but interferes with the view of Old Main and the war memorial, but still stays in the Historic District and makes a gate to the campus. It also screens the library which the Historic Commission preferred. Mr. McWhirter was asked why they could not move the building to Main Street. He responded that they looked into moving the building to one of their lots on Main Street or next to the head of school's house on Laning Avenue and the cost to either site would be substantially higher than moving it to Green. Option B moved Lowelldon to the corner of Green Street and Delaware Avenue next to the tennis courts. It would be set back with the historic structures on W. Delaware. There was discussion as to what the building would be used for if it was placed on the corner. Mr. McWhirter was not sure since he did not feel that it would be a good spot for the admission's office and would not be in a good

place for a residence. Option C relocating Lowelldon to Green Street with the residential houses was the original proposal and would best meet the school's needs. Option E keeps Lowelldon in place with the proposed academic building located next to it. The proximity of structures would negatively impact the effect of the historic structure in terms of scale and views. It would also create a poor location for a residence and a complex circulation problem. This proposal would also likely eliminate at least two specimen trees. Mr. Douglass stated that there was discussion with the Historic Commission regarding the right process they should go through. Mr. Reilly stated that the process is also new to the Board. Mr. Ogren stated that the options have been discussed with the subcommittee of the Historic Commission, but the whole Commission has not voted on any of them and there is no official recommendation to the Planning Board. Mr. Holtermann, Chairman of the Historic Commission, referred to the ordinance and stated that development applications should get recommendations by the Historic Commission to the Planning Board and they shall be considered advisory only. Approval by the Planning Board shall not relieve the applicant of the requirement of obtaining a certificate of appropriateness from the Historic Commission for those aspects of the project not covered by the development application. Mr. Ogren stated that he worked on developing the Historic Ordinance and the intent was that if a demolition was part of a site plan application the Board would review it. Mr. Holtermann stated that if they agreed on the demolition a certificate of appropriateness would be issued, but if they disagreed and did not issue one then the applicant could appeal the Historic Commission's decision along with their application to the Planning Board. Mr. Reilly summarized that the applicant should first go to the Historic Commission to apply for a certificate of appropriateness and if the Commission refuses to issue one the applicant can appeal to the Planning Board. Ms. Coppola noted that the Historic Commission can only issue certificates of appropriateness at open public meetings, but they could do it jointly at a Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Douglass asked the Board if they had any comments or suggestions regarding the proposals. Ms. Coppola asked if they had looked at site triangles regarding the location on Option B. Her concern would be the lack of visibility of people crossing back and forth at that corner at busy traffic times. The Board agreed that this was a good point and Option B was eliminated. Mr. Evanini asked if there was any consideration to removing some of the athletic facilities to make space. Mr. McWhirter stated that they are already short for sports facilities and could not consider eliminating them. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that the residents would probably be upset too since they also use the facilities. Ms. Coppola questioned the impact the building would have on the memorial on Option A and there was discussion regarding this. If they used Option A the Lowelldon building would most likely stay as the admissions office. Mr. Reilly asked if there was any consideration to replacing O'Hanlon Hall with the new building. Mr. McWhirter stated that when O'Hanlon was built there was a lot of green space, but the campus has changed since then and the only green space left in the center of campus is that area and they felt that the campus would lose a lot of character if they built in that area. Ms. Coppola asked if the relocated building on Option A could be moved a little further north and east. Mr. Douglass stated that if they move it further east it would interfere with the view of Old Main. Mr. Holtermann stated that Historic had suggested that the building be moved further north and west for both buildings. Mr. Douglass stated that this would help establish a street line and would also help define the campus space a little better. There was discussion about moving Lowelldon to Green Street and Board members felt that it belonged on campus. Ms. Stern stated that she felt that the building looked much more monolithic in Option E than in Option A and she would be concerned about the trees that would have to be removed. Mr. Evanini stated that he really liked Option E, where Lowelldon stayed in place. Mr. Reilly agreed with Mr. Evanini and

stated that it solved a number of problems. Mr. Holtermann stated that the Historic Commission were very appreciative that The Pennington School met with them in the preliminary stages of their planning. He feels that the historic value of the campus is important and that moving Lowelldon far away would seriously detract from that. He stated that if there was a way to keep it on campus it would be an asset to the school and the town. Mr. Ogren stated that he felt one of the major assets in the town was the open space in front of Old Main and he was concerned about moving Lowelldon too close to Delaware that it might take away from the view scape and open space. Mr. Holtermann asked if the Lodge was being demolished would the school be willing to offer it to someone who would move it or salvage it for historic elements. Mr. McWhirter stated that he could not think of any downsides to doing that.

MINUTES – December 12, 2012 – Mr. Meytrott made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evanini to approve the December minutes and the Board agreed by voice vote.
January 9, 2013 – Mr. Evanini made a motion, seconded by Mr. Meytrott to approve the January minutes with a correction to Mr. Meytrott's term of office.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary W. Mistretta
Planning Board Secretary