

February 9, 2022

Dear Members of the Planning Board:

I write regarding the inclination of the Contract Planner, some members of the Planning Board, and the applicant to close the public hearing on CDA's proposal to redevelop the Mill Plaza.

The developer has yet to provide a true **pedestrian traffic study**, (one that considers movement, including pedestrian, skateboard, scooter, bike, Uber/Lyft, etc. activity) both on the site and on the adjoining neighborhood paths and streets --crucial information to weigh when evaluating the impact of student apartments in the Plaza on the adjacent neighborhood. Considering this proposal without having a proper analysis of pedestrian flow into, on, and out of the site would be, in a word, irresponsible.

You have not solicited **input from the Durham Police Department** regarding how the revised proposed plan is likely to affect the police department's ability to manage the environment so that we don't experience a rise in complaints, or worse, an increase in misdemeanor or criminal behaviors.

You have not required the developer to commission a **noise-impact study**, (see 1-6-22 letters from Scott Bogle and Andrew Kun), the need for which has been documented in numerous video clips presented during in your meetings and submitted to the legal record.

A more **comprehensive site walk** (See Joshua Meyrowitz 2-3-22) and **additional studies regarding the full impact of stormwater problems**, resulting from the proposed blasting away of the Plaza's urban forest and not restoring the full wetland buffer, would also be beneficial.

The public, whose input you are bound to consider, has requested repeatedly that you obtain the above information/studies without which you cannot accurately assess whether the applicant has met the terms of the Conditional Use criteria.

I believe you would be remiss to close the hearing before these studies can be completed. They will yield NEW information that ought to be considered as part of the Planning Board's review.

Despite the glaring omissions cited above, Contract Planner Rick Taintor stated in his review for this meeting that the Board, "as a whole," has not identified additional studies or input that it needs to make a decision. But at least two long-term board members have expressed support for maintaining Durham's tradition of leaving open the opportunity for both applicant and public input through your deliberative process, controlling the amount of it to the extent your work requires. I believe there are other members who would also support keeping the hearing open.

If you prefer to close off the public hearing before you begin your deliberations, please consider postponing doing so for another month or two or however long it takes to complete the aforementioned studies.

Sincerely,

Deborah Hirsch Mayer

19 Garden Lane
Durham, NH