

# Summary of Public Hearing Responses

## How to read this report

The responses to each of the options presented in the handout were tallied individually, and reported based on how the respondent answered the question “Does this option suit our community’s needs?” If the respondent answered ‘yes’, then any further responses were counted in the ‘Yes’ column. If they responded ‘no’ then any further responses were counted in the ‘No’ column. For example:

*The feedback from this handout...*

35/45 MAIN STREET

Does this option suit our community’s needs? yes How so?

☒ Location    ☒ Capacity    ☒ Convenience

☐ Visual Impact    ☐ Cost    ☐ Ease/Speed of Construction

☐ Eco Impact    ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

*...was reported as an additional ‘yes’ and in the boxes in the ‘yes’ column corresponding to ‘location,’ ‘capacity’ and ‘convenience’*

Does this option suit our community’s needs?	Yes – 6	No – 13	Maybe – 3
Location	5	6	2
Capacity	5	2	2
Convenience	3	3	2
Visual Impact	4	2	
Cost		5	
Ease/Speed of Construction	1		
Eco Impact		2	1

## NEWBUILD—potential parking structures

### 35/45 MAIN STREET

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 6	No – 13	Maybe – 3
Location	5	6	2
Capacity	5	2	2
Convenience	3	3	2
Visual Impact	4	2	
Cost		5	
Ease/Speed of Construction	1		
Eco Impact		2	1

- Maybe – public/private construction if hotel
- No – too expensive
- Yes – bank – sure
- Maybe – does it offset people who already park there?
- Yes – long term only; least offensive option – depends on price

### GUERNSEY GREEN SPACE

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 6	No – 17	Maybe – 2
Location	5		2
Capacity	4		2
Convenience	3		1
Visual Impact	4	5	2
Cost	3	5	1
Ease/Speed of Construction	3		1
Eco Impact	3	5	1

- No – keep green space
- No – too much concrete – ruin area aesthetic value – Town House Historical Society Guernsey
- No – loss of green space
- No – can't use up green space – too expensive
- No – leave the green space
- No – leave the green space alone
- Yes – Choice #2
- Maybe – not a fan of paving over green but it is close to town
- No – way too much capacity too expensive! Unforgivable it is like destroying the town green!

### VINE STREET / CATHOLIC CHURCH PARKING LOT

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 1	No – 19	Maybe – 1
Location		6	1
Capacity		1	1
Convenience		6	1
Visual Impact		2	1
Cost	1	4	1
Ease/Speed of Construction		2	1
Eco Impact			1

- Maybe - Question of passage to town in foul weather
- Yes – but need access = funicular or covered stairway but = more cost
- No – too remote
- No – three level – crazy
- No – too far too expensive
- No – on hill – not ease walk problem get back up hill with purchases
- No – too remote – ppl won't use it
- No – too steep of a hill & too far away
- No – too far and up hill
- No – too far not convenient
- No – Are you kidding?!
- No – out of the question! Out of the way - ghastly

### MUNICIPAL LOT, DEPOT STREET

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 7	No – 14	Maybe – 1
Location	6		1
Capacity	5		
Convenience	3		1
Visual Impact	4	6	
Cost	3	5	
Ease/Speed of Construction	1		
Eco Impact	1	1	

- No – too difficult not cost effective
- No – if hotel could use all those spaces for just hotel
- No – pricy +++
- No – too expensive
- No – too expensive & ugly for a garage
- Maybe – perhaps, down the road not necessary now
- Yes - 2<sup>nd</sup> option after GAR-Riverwalk

### DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER THOUGHTS ON ANY OF THESE OPTIONS?

- Combine Vine Street with 35/45 Main by building 35/45 Main high enough to be easily drivable into out of Vine Street lot – enter Vine, exit Main St. or enter Main, exit Vine
- Prefer 35/45 Main – but not 212 spaces – perhaps just behind Peoples bank with top level at same height as upper lot
- Too expensive – parking garage
- The key is to have thoughtful & considerate employees park in the municipal lots. This would alleviate much (not all) of the parking problem
- Too expensive – any parking garage option is too expensive and too ugly.
- Business owners listen to customers complain constantly.
- I do not support any of these options. Instead we should invest money on signs that direct people to the parking that is already available, and there is plenty of it. For those in need a shuttle bus could also be made available. People could park in Peterboro & Monadnock Plaza – a place with highly under used spaces to park – and then driven into downtown enjoying their morning paper. In Tokyo where I used to live, people enjoyed doing this daily & were more healthy too. Personally I intend on buying property here, but with property taxes already being high I will think twice about owning property here, if my taxes are paying for a God-awful parking garage. If the town builds that I would rather live somewhere else, and I say that with a saddened soul. I love Peterborough. I often came here to see my grandparents and Cambodian cousins, before I moved here in '97. To me this place is a sanctuary and a great example of how a community can live peacefully and cooperatively together in the world. If we destroy that by building something that wastes taxes, ruins natural beauty & disregards creative environmental thinking and living...we are throwing what Peterborough stands for into the trash. That is very disheartening considering that my grandfather Jonathan Strong and my grandmother Anne Strong worked so hard for decades ago to make Peterborough the beautiful place it is. If you need ideas call me [phone number redacted – NMS]. Jessica Kaiser
- Why should taxpayers pay huge sums to subsidize development possibilities for businesses. Most of us have no problems finding park spaces and would object vehemently to the destruction of the atmosphere of our town (an economic good!) that ugly parking structures would bring

## NEWPARK—potential new parking lots

### GAR HALL / RIVERWALK PROJECT

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 22	No – 5	Maybe – 1
Location	19		
Capacity	14		
Convenience	19		
Visual Impact	14	1	
Cost	11	1	
Ease/Speed of Construction	9		
Eco Impact	7	2	

- Yes – Keep it small
- Yes - #1 choice – cover w/ TIF district + do variation 3 \$1M or \$1.5 is nothing, amortized
- Yes – fits downtown image
- No – not needed – better utilization of existing spaces is the first step
- No – flood zone, private facility events could use all or most spaces for their events spaces be for GAR & not all for public availability
- No – I like the Riverwalk idea – parking too large for GAR Hall use
- Yes – variation 1 – small lot well landscaped no more than 20 + park benches
- Yes – LOVE the idea of a riverwalk! At 40 or 60, 20 is too few
- Yes – LID installations a MUST was this property under water in the 2007 flood?
- Protect our natural resources
- Yes – Choice #1
- Maybe – perhaps, but ignores obligations of original gift (to be used forever as a memorial & park – not what they meant!) & destroys most park potential to supply places for customers of priv. enterprise or some Depot workers. Flood plain, steep slope for drive, wetlands buffer! Town gets \$172,000 & pays \$600-\$900,000 doesn't make sense

### FIRE DEPARTMENT (WITH RELOCATION OF FIRE DEPARTMENT)

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 7	No – 11	Maybe –
Location	6	2	
Capacity	4		
Convenience	4	2	
Visual Impact	4	1	
Cost	3	3	
Ease/Speed of Construction	2		
Eco Impact	2		

- Yes – not until possible use as temporary library
- No – not going to happen
- Existing public spaces need to be better identified to town folks
- No – inconvenient to town
- No – Fire Department needs to be centrally located
- Yes – longer term
- Yes – municipal employees
- Yes – LID installations a MUST
- Yes – only as ancillary to move not causing it
- No – too much to relocate
- No – too expensive to move fire department & doesn't seem necessary to move it
- No – cost to move fire too prohibitive
- No – not well lighted if you are leaving work at night
- The location of the FD is not ideal & will have to move eventually cost of demolition is reasonable – just not Aquarius museum please! Recycle or sell bricks as mementos. Move FD to PW & Comm. Ctr area for synergy “big machines day” etc.
- No – not being used presently what are the chances it would be used if expanded

#### DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER THOUGHTS ON ANY OF THESE OPTIONS?

- GAR Riverwalk is right where the problem exists. Guernsey Green also, right where the issue is and helps with all concerns or both for long term
- This is something that needs to be resolved. My Picks: Riverwalk & Guernsey Green (both lots) why can't we have both??
- I believe there are adequate weekend spaces but the signage to identify the central lot as public parking is non-existent. I believe that there is a need to differentiate weekend & holiday parking needs from weekend needs. Perhaps town folk will feel fine about short term parking in the central lot on weekends if more weekend parking is the concern. We should first utilize this most convenient lot which is currently very available most weekends.
- How seldom do we have a chance to improve the attractiveness of downtown & create needed new parking – Riverwalk
- Thanks for putting this together. I'm sure this took a lot of work. Please no parallel parking on Main Street
- Has the river side adjacent to Granite Street been considered as the riverwalk extension. A strategically placed pedestrian bridge could open new parking options.
- Like PFD moving idea & using that space ultimately for more parking
- From a business owner's standpoint, the GAR/Riverwalk is the best option. The Guernsey Green Space is a close second. But do something – or there won't be any businesses in downtown that survive
- The municipal lot is Full during the week. If we use the riverwalk for Depot & office workers it would free up a large amount of spots for customers/all day parking. No additional structures or eyesores would be necessary right away.
- As a business owner parking needs to be near Business – take out 2hr parking also No tickets customers getting tickets is not an option!!

## NOWPARK—utilizing Current parking in new ways

### USE / REUSE OF EXISTING PARKING

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 9	No – 5	Maybe – 3
Location	6		
Capacity	3		
Convenience	3		
Visual Impact	4		
Cost	5	1	
Ease/Speed of Construction	3		
Eco Impact	5		

- No – been tried
- Yes – designates sections for employee parking as well as parking for patrons
- Yes – reconfigure & assess existing parking
- Yes – shorten parking in front of stores. Use library
- Yes – reduce time limits of most desirable spaces
- Maybe – I would agree to shorten parking times on Grove & Main
- Yes! – convenience & cost are deciding factors
- Maybe – make 2hr – 3hr?
- Yes – health of community & enjoyment of walking through & seeing beautiful Peterborough.
- Yes – first priority – mandate employee parking to Fire Station or Library
- No – we do not want to discourage downtown visitors

### SHARED PRIVATE LOTS

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 8	No – 8	Maybe –
Location	5		
Capacity	4		
Convenience	4		
Visual Impact	4		
Cost	1		
Ease/Speed of Construction	2		
Eco Impact	4		

- NO – Hard to execute
- Use churches – any land behind Verizon on Concord St.?
- No – only option while buildings downtown under utilized
- Yes – maximize existing pavement

- No – cost to businesses & employees & it is not enough space
- Yes – weekends
- No – most merchants can't afford to 'lease' parking
- Yes – at least until business picks up & need the space. Avoids creating more impervious surfaces
- No – this would drive down rents because of no parking and could chase business away

#### SATELLITE PARKING / SHUTTLE

Does this option suit our community's needs?	Yes – 6	No – 13	Maybe – 1
Location	1	1	
Capacity	3		
Convenience	2	1	
Visual Impact	3		
Cost	2	1	
Ease/Speed of Construction	2	1	
Eco Impact	2		

- Yes – metered parking downtown to offset cost of shuttle
- No – would not be used
- Probably impractical at this time unlikely to actually be used
- No – people won't use
- No – only for all day special events inconvenience getting from parking to downtown. Scheduled to shuttle route times. Depend on maintaining shuttle vehicle, fuel used, salaries and benefits.
- Only for special events
- No – special events only
- Maybe – I wonder how many would use it
- No – bad idea
- Yes – use plaza
- No – too much to purchase, insure, & maintain a vehicle; and hire a driver. Just not a good idea.
- No – won't walk
- Yes – additional jobs for new drivers
- Yes – first option in the future. Befitting town efforts to truly become "Greenerborough"
- No – why would anyone drive from a remote location in town to another remote location in town then take a bus into town then back to a remote location to drive home when they could go directly to the downtown location

#### DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER THOUGHTS ON ANY OF THESE OPTIONS?

- #1 Riverwalk/GAR Hall – good location – use of river/scenic – attractive – makes sense to pursue – price makes sense
- Shuttle will not work. Summer is the problem. How to address that. Sign "Public Parking" in central lot
- Signage for the central lot (by the movie theatre). Increase turnover shorter permitted times the closer the spaces are to the center of town. No new surfacing. Consider Summer Street for parking. Use of



Library parking. Ask business owners where their employees park & publicize. "Short term parking" is 30 minutes!

- More immediate needs would be taken care of 2 single level lots accommodating 40-60 new spaces. 1. Riverwalk 2. Guernsey – HATE TO GIVE UP THE GREEN 3. Repave municipal lot
- Most people enjoy parking & walking around town. Who wants to rely on a schedule of a shuttle, especially if you're going to work?
- There is not sufficient parking data (over longer time space) and certainly not enough public participation to legitimize spending taxpayer \$ or engineering studies for most NewPark & NewBuild solutions. First more all-day parking to outlying lots. Turn slots along river into half-day option. Explore pay to park options (metering or park placards with graduated scale from handicapped ->senior citizens on down. Explore paying existing Contoocook Valley Transportation for shuttle service trial, rather than town investing in vehicles & staff for shuttle services