

February 17, 2021

Planning Board of Newburyport
C/O Ms. Bonnie Sontag, Chair
Via Email

RE: 93 State Street proposed addition by the Institute for Savings

Dear Members of the Planning Board,

My name is Tara Cederholm and I reside at 20 Fruit Street in Newburyport. I am writing again to the Planning Board to urge you to decline the application by the Institution for Savings for a Special Permit to construction the proposed addition at the rear of their lot at 93 State Street. For just over a year the Planning Board has engaged in a very thoughtful, iterative and deliberative process with the Institute for Savings. During that time the Newburyport Historic Commission has issued no fewer than four reports on the proposed project the most recent of which states "the commission finds that the proposed design does not conform to the Secretary's Standards, and therefore cannot recommend that a Special Permit be granted." The challenges presented by the site, the onsite parking requirements for the city, and its location in a dense and historic neighborhood and within the Downtown Overlay District (DOD)-requiring compliance with the United States Secretary of the Interior Standards - have proved simply insurmountable with the size and scale of the building the Institute for Savings wishes to build.

Over the course of the past year the members of the planning board have repeatedly requested that the applicant reduce the size and scale of the building. Yet at each step in the process only minor and often cosmetic changes were made to the proposal.

The Historic District Commission have repeatedly requested that the applicant reduce the size and scale of the building, as well as adjust the materials to be more in keeping with the residential buildings adjacent to the site. Again, at each step in the process only minor changes were made to the proposal. One iteration did move towards more appropriate materials, but the most recent proposal is back to inappropriate brick and sandstone. The scale and massing of the building has not changed enough to comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

The abutting neighbors on Prospect, Otis and Garden Streets have also repeatedly requested that the applicant reduce the size and scale of the building. Again, only minor changes have been made.

After a full year of lengthy and thoughtful discussions on this topic it seems reasonable for the Planning Board to now decline this application for a Special Permit. The Historic District has made it clear that none of the various proposals even comes close to conforming to the Standards. I urge you to decline this application.

Sincerely,

Tara Cederholm

Dianne Boisvert

From: Pamela Kipp <pamkipp@gmail.com>
Sent: February 17, 2021 3:40 PM
To: Dianne Boisvert
Cc: Colleen Turner; Peter Mackin; Stephanie Niketic
Subject: [Ext]Please Reject IFS Request for Expansion of 93 State Street as Proposed

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Planning Committee,

I would like to add my name to the list of neighbors and interested parties in recommending against approval of IFS's revised plan for expansion at 93 State Street.

The proposed building is still too massive - it is larger than the original historical structure at 93 State Street and its massing and height conflict with both the original building and the surrounding neighborhood. Any proposed structure must be subordinate to historic adjacent buildings, and the proposed project does not meet this requirement. Please take into account the Historic Commission's findings (1/28/21) stating it **cannot** recommend a Special Permit be granted.

In addition, the parking garage door is very out-of-keeping with the neighborhood.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Best,

Pam Kipp
11 Tremont Street