

Meeting: April 7, 2026
Technical Advisory Committee
RE: 64 Bridge St (pages 307 to 338)
April 2, 2026

Dear Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,

64 Bridge St seems to show only one parking space at the rear of the building. Per the Downtown Overlay District (DOD) Other Non-residential uses need no parking. Residential Uses need the same as section 10.1112.3. Hotels and Motels require 0.75 per room, 1 per 100 sf of lounge or restaurant area and 1 per 25 sf of banquet facility.

This project is being called an Inn. However, they show a restaurant and bar as well as catering on the first floor (pg 318 of packet- Plan A1.1). On page 322 of the packet (Plan A1.5) a bar, a large sitting area usually called a lounge and two bathrooms are shown on the rooftop.

By definition this is not an Inn, it is a Hotel of less than 125 rooms. According to zoning regulations, parking for guest parking of 12.5 or more as well as a loading zone will be needed for this hotel.

Inn

A **building** offering lodging for transient boarders with up to 15 sleeping rooms. An **inn** may have a **caretaker residence** but does not have to be occupied by the owner, and shall not serve food to the public. (See also: **bed and breakfast, hotel, motel.**)

Hotel

A **building** in which the primary **use** is transient lodging accommodations offered to the public on a daily rate for compensation and where ingress and egress to the sleeping rooms is made primarily through an inside lobby or **office**, supervised by a **person** in charge at all hours. Such facilities may include, where allowed, such **accessory uses** as **restaurants, bars, taverns, nightclubs**, function rooms, places of public assembly or recreational facilities, but shall not include casino gambling, keno or other forms of gambling. (See also: **motel.**)

When looking at the page 323, Plan A3.1 its hard to say what buildings are being shown for Massing

This is 44 Bridge St to the left of 64 Bridge St..





These are the two houses across Hanover St to the right of 64 Bridge St

The question is: Does the building fit into all the zoning requirements? There doesn't seem to be a comparison of what is allowed vs what is being proposed.

This is a lot of activity 10' from a residential neighborhood with serious parking issues. A real Inn with first floor or underground parking might be a better fit for this location for which a variance would be needed to eliminate first floor commercial.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bratter
Property Owner
159 McDonough St

Dear Members of the Technical Advisory Committee,

I am writing as an abutter to the 304 Maplewood Avenue property to provide this supplementary letter in light of new information since my March letter.

For the record, I do not consent to any removal, alteration, or relocation of my fence.

To date, I have not received any direct communication from 304 Maplewood LLC regarding their site plan or surveyed boundary line. At the time of my previous letter, I was not aware that the proposed replacement of my fence was intended to satisfy the applicant's screening requirement. Screening and the maintenance of healthy landscaping are the responsibility of the applicant under Site Plan Regulations section 6.10.

I respectfully suggest that the applicant replace the dead evergreen trees along their side of the fence or install their own fence in place of those trees. Through restoration and continued maintenance the applicant can recreate screening where it previously existed. This will provide a safe buffer between residential and commercial properties while allowing the applicant to have the enhanced visual separation they are seeking.

Additionally, after the snow melted, I was able to inspect the sole boundary monument referenced for the eastern line. It appears to be a damaged plumbing-style pipe with brick fragments and other metal objects nearby. I have questions as to whether this is a legitimate boundary marker or remnant construction debris. This further reinforces my concerns noted in my previous letter regarding the difference in deed vs. surveyed measurements, the longstanding fence line and the boundary ambiguity referenced in the applicant's survey stating "title to lands beyond the fences is unclear".

Photos are included on the following page for reference.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Maria Abruzese
276 Maplewood Avenue



Google Maps 2019 screen capture shows evergreens on neighbor's side providing screening for residential abutters.



2024 photo shows evergreen trees on neighbor's side are no longer providing screening.



Photo shows of the 1" iron pipe is damaged and leaning. Labeled as 1" IP FOUND 0.2' Exposed on site plan survey. This is referenced as the sole marker for the eastern boundary.



Photo shows an alternative view of the degraded and damaged condition. No additional remarks regarding damage or leaning on shown site plan survey.