

Annual Financial Town Meeting	Total Eligible:	14,774
May 25, 2022 @ 7:00 P.M.	Attendance:	113 @ 6:58 PM
Barrington High School Auditorium		156 @ 7:09 PM
		220 @ 7:30 PM
		259 @ 8:05 PM
		292 @ 8:30 PM
		311 @ 9:00 PM

RESOLUTION TO AMEND RESTRICTIONS ON THE TOWN’S PURCHASE OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 25 WATSON AVENUE (ASSESSOR’S PLAT 7, LOT 4, F/K/A AS THE CARMELITE MONASTERY (THE “PROPERTY”)) IMPOSED BY THE 2021 FINANCIAL TOWN MEETING, TO ALLOW THE TOWN TO REQUEST AND ACCEPT PROPOSALS FOR REDEVELOPING THE PROPERTY, TO INCLUDE THE OPTION TO PHYSICALLY MODIFY, RENOVATE, EXPAND, OR PARTIALLY OR FULLY DEMOLISH, ANY OF THE BUILDINGS ON THE PROPERTY.

RESOLVED: That the restrictions on the Town’s purchase of property located at 25 Watson Avenue are hereby amended to allow the Town to request and accept proposals for redeveloping the property including the option to physically modify, renovate, expand, or partially or fully demolish, any of the buildings on the property.

President Carroll said at the last FTM we all approved (passed) the purchase of the Carmelite Monastery. It was understood that the property would be preserved but we have learned from the engineers that it is a difficult building to work with because structurally it is hard to cut into the floor, cannot place an elevator inside and must use existing hallways. This motion would allow but not require this Council or a future Town Council to take proposals that would include the demolition of the building. He said that one of the goals that we had is to recover as much as we could.

(President Carroll described the potential loss with reconstructing this building.)

Moderator Staples opened the floor for the voters to comment:

The following voters stated during public comment how they are opposed to demolishing the building (with such comments and concerns regarding: asbestos (with long-term effects), town invited us to speak but has not listened, no impact studies conducted (traffic etc.), cottage style is not in-keeping with neighborhood, “bait and switch”, hazardous to inhabitants and obtrusive to nature:

- Elizabeth Green, Watson Avenue
- Pamela Danforth, Ferry Lane
- Paige Barber, Clarke Road
- Tom Cregan, Tallwood Drive questioned why the price was re-negotiated.

President Carroll responded and explained that there was a contingency in the agreement and negotiated the price from \$3.5 million to \$3.2 million.

- Mary Grenier, Watson Avenue
- Vanessa Sheehan, Adelaide Avenue
- Susannah Holloway, Fales Avenue (Ms. Holloway commented that she was moved by President Carroll’s speech that his children were baptized at the monastery. Later he clarified that his children were not baptized at the monastery.)

- Steve Sheehan, Adelaide Avenue
- Mary Alice Gasbarro, Robbins Drive – she does not believe that the land is adaptable to hold the plan in which the town is suggesting for senior and affordable housing.

- Deb Nyser, Adelaide Avenue
- Alex Carracuzzo, Nayatt Road
- Alicia Field, Nayatt Road
- Ian Burgess, Adelaide Avenue
- Nora Aswald, Nayatt Road
- Peter Clifford, Starbrook Drive
- Elizabeth Grenier, Watson Avenue

President Carroll clarified that his children were not baptized at the Monastery. He said that the consensus of the Council is that they would like senior and affordable housing located on the Monastery property. With the market rate, units would pay for the affordable units. President Carroll

reiterated that the vote is to approve the option to demolish (see resolution above).

Sara O'Brien, Boyce Avenue requested a legal advisement regarding if this vote were to be delayed.

Solicitor Ursillo stated ultimately the property that is now owned by the Town can be sold at a FTM

11

via the voters. No matter what, this subject will be back at an FTM when there is a proposal from a developer. Whether or not the proposal contains saving the building or demolishing the building or partially refurbishing. This is to give the Town Council broader options on the Request For Proposal (RFP).

James Egan, Watson Avenue, asked for clarification with regard to the "proposals" as stated within the resolution (above).

Solicitor Ursillo commented that the Council wants to be very transparent when it goes out for proposals and the reason it is back at the FTM is to go out for a request for proposals that includes an option to not preserve the building. Knowing what is on record is that this body voted to buy the property with the restriction on it and it would not be in the best interest of the community, and it would not be a transparent transaction. He said his advice to the Council is that the RFP must be as transparent with the information regarding the building. Mr. Ursillo stated the resolution containing the following wording:

...TO INCLUDE THE OPTION TO PHYSICALLY MODIFY, RENOVATE, EXPAND, OR PARTIALLY OR FULLY DEMOLISH, ANY OF THE BUILDINGS ON THE PROPERTY.

and concluding that this resolution amends the resolution from the 2021 FTM.

TR Rimoshytus, Howard Avenue asked to reiterate the comment that we must return to an FTM for the sale of the property.

Solicitor Ursillo reiterated that when the property gets sold for development with a developer the voters must return and approve at a FTM to sell the property.

Councilman Kustell discussed the intent and motive in which we bought the property and to give us options with this open, transparent meeting(s).

Sam Chase, Nayatt Road asked once it goes to the developer, do we lose control.

President Carroll in this case we have restrictions (included in the RFP).

Solicitor Ursillo the sale will contain the deed restrictions.

Susannah Holloway stated to the audience to go slow and vote no.

Lisa Lowenstein asked for clarification.

President Carroll said it is not to demolish but to permit and remove a restriction.

Mary Grenier, Watson Avenue said she does not believe this is giving more options and have not been presented with options but setting up for a developer with an RFP to give them the option.

Pam Grove said what is to stop you from coming back next year with another option.

David Butera said as a builder the building does have potential and a good design team can come up with a new design.

Tim Twohig, Eleanor Drive said the option is for the developer to do studies. Where was the concern when the Barrington Middle School was being torn down with asbestos.

The following stated during public comment that they would be voting in favor to demolish the building (with such comments as: we need more flexibility and options, asbestos must be abated whether demolished or not, it is more costly to refurbish a building, the property is to serve the entire town, and, that we are all impacted how the town spends money:

- Richard Godfrey, Pine Avenue

- Kate Berard, Planning Board member – with voting yes, we see the options for the property.

- Carla DeStefano, Housing Board of Trustees member - with voting yes, we see the options for the property.

- Ed Hawrot, Watson Avenue

- Duenna Karner, Clarke Road

12

- Lisa Lowenstein, Hamilton Avenue

Motion failed (Voice vote: (2:13:04))