

Dianne Boisvert

From: Katelyn E. Sullivan
Sent: December 06, 2021 8:05 AM
To: Dianne Boisvert
Subject: Fw: [Ext]22-24 Olive St project - public comment

For the record.

From: Kathleen Sullivan
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 7:57 AM
To: Katelyn E. Sullivan
Subject: FW: [Ext]22-24 Olive St project - public comment

From: Micah Donahue [<mailto:micahtonahue@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, December 3, 2021 9:18 PM
To: Andrew Port; Kathleen Sullivan
Subject: [Ext]22-24 Olive St project - public comment

external e-mail use caution opening
Please forward and file for the ZBA.

To whom it may concern -

I write today in further opposition to the proposed construction project at 22 - 24 Olive Street.

Simply put, this project is too large in massing and lot coverage for our tight neighborhood, and thus will be more detrimental than the current property to its residents. Specifically I am concerned about the following:

1. Although separated by a 2-story hallway, the combined mass of this new building will forever change the immediate impression of this NHC-deemed historic landmark in our neighborhood. A passerby would need to know to look “past” a huge addition to see the original Old Ladies’ Home in its current significant grace.
2. Using removal of the existing non - conforming structures’ square footage to justify the new building does not rationalize the proposed increase in building VOLUME (cubic feet) massing of the structure. If comparing the original building to the proposed new design, it appears much larger than the delta in square footage would suggest. As one member of the NHC said of the original similar (slightly larger) design, “It is an abominable appendage.”
3. Using past non-conforming nearby properties to support further prohibited infill would be using past bad decisions to justify future ones. Instead, the ZBA here has the opportunity, the power, and the responsibility to protect this historic neighborhood from greedy non-resident developers interested only in maximum profit. This was clearly evidenced when at the 11/23 hearing Ms. Mead evaded answering the ZBA’s simple question, “Why does it have to be so big?” — because the only answer is “to extract maximum profit and walk away.”

I respectfully request this application be denied for these reasons. The ideal course of action in my opinion would be to replace the two current rear additions with a more carefully designed (and possibly longer) one to achieve a modest increase in square footage, if needed.

Sincerely,

-Micah Donahue

16 Olive St. Newburyport, MA 01950

(978) 491-7242

--

Micah Donahue

(978) 491-7242

micahdonahue@gmail.com