Dianne Boisvert

From: Micah Donahue <micahdonahue@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, January 2, 2022 5:32 PM

To: Katelyn E. Sullivan; Dianne Boisvert; Andrew Port

Subject: [Ext]22-24 Olive St. - submission from neighbor in response to developer's letter

Attachments: Cars added.pdf

external e-mail use caution opening

To the ZBA -

I note with interest Mr. Sarkis's letter of 12/30/2021.

PARKING

I'd first like to respond to a point re: parking. Mr. Sarkis states the following in his letter:

<<<

To clearly understand the design intent, when envisioning the improvements, please be mindful of:

• The open space that will remain, and where it is. The most important open space on the lot is grassy area near the corner of Russia and Olive. It will remain open.

>>>

Yes, some yard is being maintained at the corner of Olive & Russia. However, not mentioned here is the fact that the developer proposes to have parking and curb cuts (the latter discouraged by a recent city ordinance) for FOUR CARS side-by-side on Russia, where one single driveway currently exists. As you can see from the mockup attached, the impact is certainly detrimental to the streetscape. In the proposed plan this side of the property becomes a parking lot outside a massive 2-family development.

Although neighbors are not in favor of adding more cars to this tight street, I humbly suggest that any approved plan keep only the existing parking spaces with no new curb cuts to break up the sidewalk.

OPENNESS & OUTBUILDINGS

Mr. Sarkis also states the following:

<<<

To clearly understand the design intent, when envisioning the improvements, please be mindful of:

• The openness and lines of site (sic) created by the removal of the existing fence and outbuildings. When removed, an additional 25' of front yard will be exposed, for the entire length of the Russia Street frontage.

>>>

The fence removed may be 25', but as mentioned above under "parking," the "entire length of the Russia Street frontage" is not open due to the added parking.

Also based on this bullet point the outbuildings and fence are again cited as "trades" for the thousands of square feet added. If this argument is made then any plans approved should come with a restriction that no such outbuildings or tall fences may be added later. Otherwise the argument is specious, of only temporary impact, and has no later recourse.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important and precedent-setting situation.

-Micah

Micah Donahue 16 Olive St., Newburyport (978) 491-7242

