

Dianne Boisvert

From: Peter Mackin <petemackin@gmail.com>
Sent: June 21, 2020 9:20 PM
To: Andrew Port; Katelyn E. Sullivan; Dianne Boisvert
Subject: [Ext]NHC 6-25 Meeting, DOD Advisory Review for 93 State Street

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Director Port,

Could the Planning Office please forward my comments to Chairman Richards and all members of the Historical Commission.

We live at 13 Prospect Street, directly across the street from the proposed massive addition to the Institution Of Savings Bank. As you review their latest plans for this large brick building, I would like to make sure you have our perspective and the feelings of many residents of Newburyport's South End that oppose the construction. I also hope that commission members have had the opportunity to walk the area and visualize the proposed structure.

The current proposal feels like IFS is dropping the new Merrimac Street city parking building just 15 steps from my front door. It is a huge brick structure as wide as 1/3 of a football field and almost 30 feet high! (*4.5 feet higher than their previous proposal and the same height as the roof of the original bank on State Street*). While the original State Street bank structure is setback 50 feet from the curb providing a dramatic, attractive landmark for citizens & visitors, this proposed building will be only 7 feet from the curb, creating a tunnel feeling for pedestrians and those driving on Prospect Street. It will tower over all the homes on Prospect St, Otis Place and Garden St.

I am not an authority on architecture in these matters and I certainly trust the judgment of the Newburyport Historical Commission. Likewise, I am not an authority of famous paintings. But, just as the beauty of the Mona Lisa can't be truly appreciated by viewing it 6 inches from one's nose, I don't believe the historical architecture of this tall, massive building can be appreciated on our narrow, one way Prospect Street with the building's wall just 7 feet from the curb and on-street parking.

It is not our desire to negatively impact the bank's operations and it should not be the bank's desire to negatively impact the historical look and feel of their neighbors or South End residents walking downtown. If the Institution Of Savings must build additional office space in the current location, we ask why not a tasteful, one story office structure, no higher than 15-16 feet high, well setback from the curb with all employee parking underground. A 30 foot high building blends into the landscape and feel of State Street. Put that same 30 foot high building mere feet from private homes and it will devour our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Peter Mackin

13 Prospect Street

Dianne Boisvert

From: Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>
Sent: June 22, 2020 1:56 PM
To: Andrew Port
Cc: Dianne Boisvert; Katelyn E. Sullivan
Subject: [Ext]NHC 6-25 Meeting, DOD Advisory Review for 93 State Street

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Director Port,

I would like to submit the below letter to the Newburyport Historical Commission Chair. Would you be able to forward, or share his email address? Many thanks,
Claire

Dear Chair Richards,

I reside at 4 Otis Place, Newburyport, right next to the Institution for Savings' proposed 16,000 square foot, 2-story addition. I oppose the construction of the expansion as it stands now because of its massing. The size and scale of the addition is inappropriate and would compromise the historical integrity of the immediate neighborhood and Newburyport's downtown. Even if the bank was to improve the addition's design to be more in character with the neighborhood's Greek Revival and Victorian architecture, the criteria for approval would fall short because the main issue with the current proposal is the addition's massive size.

I hope the Commission considers the negative impact that such a structure would have on the neighborhood and city going forward. My concern is that if this proposal is approved as is, others of similar size will creep their way into our city, slowly diminishing its historic character.

Thank you for your consideration.

Claire Papanastasiou
4 Otis Place
Newburyport, MA 10950

--

Claire Papanastasiou
617.416.3377
claire.p.claire@gmail.com

Dianne Boisvert

From: Colleen Turner <turnstyler@gmail.com>
Sent: June 23, 2020 8:05 AM
To: Andrew Port; Katelyn E. Sullivan; Dianne Boisvert
Cc: Colleen Turner Secino
Subject: [Ext]IFS Plans: 93 State Street...Still Too Big. Still Too Tall. Still Too Much.

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Director Port:

For inclusion in the June 25, 2020 meeting written comments. Could the Planning Office please forward my comments to Chairman Richards and all members of the Historical Commission? Please confirm receipt. Thank you. —Colleen Turner Secino

June 23, 2020

Dear Chairman Richards:

Back on February 13, 2020, we the concerned abutters on Otis Place, Garden & Prospect Streets went to a well-attended Newburyport Historical Commission meeting held in the auditorium of City Hall. You and your fellow members let everyone comment and prepared a very detailed report with recommendations to the Institution for Savings to revise their plans for 93 State Street with two goals: “better complementarity with the historic (1872) structure, and improved massing.” This did not happen.

The current plan before you is their best response. It does not complement the existing 1872 structure. Its massing has not been improved. It literally throws a beautiful historic neighborhood into the dark ages. This sheer immensity of the structure dwarfs every facing home, turning one-way Prospect Street into a dark tunnel-like entrance to the South End. The setbacks are virtually non-existent. The look and feel fails to enhance the existing Victorian, Greek Revival and Italianate homes. This is not an addition to the community, but a blight to the essence and historic look and feel so many have worked for years to preserve here in Newburyport.

I am concerned not only as an abutter, but as a resident of Newburyport. This type of industrial structure is not suited to any downtown neighborhood.

This is what the IFS' proposed 16,000-square-foot, 30-foot high, 100-foot-long building looks like compared to the surrounding structures on the corner of Prospect Street and Otis Place:



I am opposed to this iteration as presented and ask that you, too, reject this current plan that, most importantly, disregards Commission-encouraged guidance from your earlier report to address massing.

Thank you for your consideration.

Colleen Turner Secino
15 Otis Place
Newburyport, MA 01950

Respect Our Historic Neighborhood
@SaveHistoricNBPT

Dianne Boisvert

From: Stephanie Niketic <niketic@airkiosk.com>
Sent: June 24, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Glenn Richards; Andrew Port; Katelyn E. Sullivan; Dianne Boisvert
Cc: Thomas Kolterjahn
Subject: [Ext]NHC 6-25 Meeting, DOD Advisory Review for 93 State Street
Attachments: 02-10-2020_93 State_NPT Letter to NHC_reduced.pdf; MIMAP Zoning.png; Sanborn 1894 Propect-Otis-Garden.png; Sanborn Map 1894_2.png; nwb_ak_reduced.pdf

external e-mail use caution opening
Newburyport Historical Commission

Re: NHC June 25, 2020 - 93 State Street Revised Plans - DOD Advisory Review

Dear Chairman Richards and Commission Members:

I am writing to you, anticipating the public may not be allowed to speak during your meeting.

For reference, I am attaching the Newburyport Preservation Trust (NPT) written comment to you on February 10, 2020. It focuses on the issues of size, scale, and proportion of the proposed addition to the bank. The applicants have not addressed these issues in their revised plans.

As NPT wrote, an addition that is “as large or larger than the historic building” does not adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The proposed addition is larger than both the historic bank building and its 1980 addition, combined.

The DOD requirement that new construction not be disruptive to the integrity of its setting is not met. The setting for this building includes a historic residential neighborhood. Most of this neighborhood is not in a business district, but in an underlying residential district of the DOD. I have attached a MIMAP zoning view of the neighborhood to illustrate this. (Abutting buildings tinted in orange are in the R-3 zone.)

The setting for this building is also State Street, a major, historic public way. It has been argued that the addition, as set back, will significantly "recede" from this view. I don't think that will be true. The 3-D snapshots provided by the applicants provide a "bird's eye" view of this elevation, which is a diminishing perspective. But, for those of us at street level, there will not be this effect.

It has been argued that historically there were buildings along the south side of Prospect Street. This is true. However, they were all wood-frame houses. I have attached screenshots of the 1894 Sanborn Fire Insurance map to illustrate this. By 1980, when the Prospect streetscape was documented for Newburyport's 1984 National Register Historic District nomination, all of these buildings adjacent to the bank were gone, except 14 Prospect Street, a Greek Revival at the corner of Prospect and Otis (now also gone). As long as Prospect Street has been part of a National Register district, this section of the streetscape has been open, and likely so as a result of the bank's actions.

A 16,000 square foot parking garage/building will suffocate and industrialize this setting, and I hope you will consider this in your review and report.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Niketic
93 High Street
Newburyport

Attachments:

- NPT letter of February 10, 2020
- MIMAP zoning screenshot
- 1894 Sanborn Fire Insurance map screenshots
- 1980 MHC Inventory Form G. - Prospect Streetscape