

Dianne Boisvert

From: Katelyn E. Sullivan
Sent: July 01, 2020 6:46 PM
To: Dianne Boisvert
Subject: FW: [Ext]RE: Opposition to IFS Expansion as Proposed

Please see the below comment for our files. It looks like Bonnie wants this posted to the site.

From: bsontag@comcast.net [<mailto:bsontag@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2020 6:09 PM
To: 'Pamela Kipp'
Cc: Katelyn E. Sullivan
Subject: [Ext]RE: Opposition to IFS Expansion as Proposed

external e-mail use caution opening
Pam,

Thank you for your message. In future when you wish to communicate about an application before the Planning Board, would you please do so directly to the Planning Office. I've cc'd Katelyn Sullivan, Planner, so that she can post your message on the web site.

Thank you,
Bonnie
Cell: 978-992-6261

From: Pamela Kipp <pamkipp@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2020 6:03 PM
To: bsontag@comcast.net
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to IFS Expansion as Proposed

Bonnie,
I just located your email, please consider my email below concerning opposition to the IFS Expansion.
Thank you,
Pam

Begin forwarded message:

From: Pamela Kipp <pamkipp@gmail.com>
Date: July 1, 2020 at 4:51:05 PM EDT
To: Leah McGavern <lmcgavern@gmail.com>
Subject: **Opposition to IFS Expansion as Proposed**

Leah,

I tried to write to Bonnie Sontag, Chairman, but could not locate an email address for her, and hope that it's ok to route this letter through you as Vice Chairman of the Planning Board. I hope to attend the Zoom meeting tonight, but as I will be in transit, I wanted to voice my opposition in writing, as follows:

The massing and scale of the expansion as proposed are completely out of character with the neighborhood and do not meet the "Procedure, requirements and criteria for review of proposed new construction and alterations" in the downtown overlay district. I walk down Prospect Street from State Street to my house on Tremont Street daily, and admire the historic charm of the houses on Prospect Street and Otis Place, as well as Garden Street. The size and scale of the IFS expansion dwarf these homes. In addition, there are likely to be air conditioning units placed on the roof of the expansion which would be out of character with this beautiful neighborhood in the DOD.

I agree with all the points made in the following letters:

- Mark Griffin to Chairman Sontag dated June 1, 2020
- William Sheehan to Chairman Sontag dated May 28, 2020
- DOD Supplemental Report from the City of Newburyport Historical Commission dated June 25, 2020

Furthermore, I do not understand why a project of this magnitude with such an impact on the quality of life of so many Newburyport residents/taxpayers is being done via a Zoom meeting rather than waiting until it can be done in person. I have to wonder if there is "political favor" at hand that has accelerated the IFS application.

Please turn down the applicant's request.

Thanks,

Pam Kipp
11 Tremont St.
Newburyport
pamkipp@gmail.com

Dianne Boisvert

From: Rick Pollak <rpollak2@yahoo.com>
Sent: August 05, 2020 7:54 AM
To: Dianne Boisvert; Katelyn E. Sullivan; Andrew Port; Dianne Boisvert; respectourhistorineighborhood@gmail.com; Rick Pollak; Mary Pollak
Subject: [Ext]Opposed -Institution for Savings Expansion

external e-mail use caution opening

SUBJECT LINE: Opposed - Institution for Savings Expansion

8/5/2020

Bonnie Sontag, Planning Board Chair

Office of Planning and Development

c/o planning@cityofnewburyport.com

Glen Richards

Newburyport Historical Commission

c/o kesullivan@cityofnewburyport.com

Andrew Port

Planning Director

c/o aport@cityofnewburyport.com

Reference: Public Hearing for Special Permit(s) made by the Institution for Savings in Newburyport for property located at 93 State Street/ Assessor's Map and parcel 14-40. 1. Site Plan Review (2020-SPR-02), 2. ITIF Special Permit (2020-SP-01), 3. DOD Special Permit (2020-SP-09)

Dear Ms. Sontag, Mr. Richards and Mr. Port:

After review of the latest IFS plans on 8/3/2020, I continue to be opposed that a decision of this magnitude be determined via an audio-only, digital forum out of accessibility and due process concerns.

Additionally, the new proposed addition ignores the scale and massing concerns I originally had. The roughly 16,000-square-foot (??) addition is too large and lacks reasonable setbacks on all abutting sides. I ask that you vote against the proposed site plan as presented.

Please see my previous emails, letters and photos regarding this expansion. Concerns involve noise pollution from the generator and ground level, air conditioning, setbacks, high structure blocking sun on my property, flood water into my backyard (drainage), and the banks removal of the previous tree view we had from the back yard. It is unclear to me in the new plan where the generator and additional air conditioning units are located and is there any noise prevention concerns being addressed. Also the diesel exhaust from the generator.

Please confirm receipt of this message and its addition to the public record.

Richard and Mary Pollak, owner abutters

1, 3, 5, and 7 Garden St.

Phone 978-884-2995

Rick Pollak

Dianne Boisvert

From: Peter Mackin <petemackin@gmail.com>
Sent: August 19, 2020 9:12 AM
To: Dianne Boisvert; Dianne Boisvert
Cc: Jared Eigerman
Subject: [Ext]Oppose Institution For Savings August 5th concept design

external e-mail use caution opening

To: Bonnie Sontag and Planning Board Members,

The August 5th concept design by the Institution For Savings for its downtown expansion was a huge disappointment to the abutters and South End neighbors. The bank continues to miss our primary concern: the size, and scale of such an intrusive expansion into our neighborhood.

We are not opposed to the expansion of the Institution For Savings. Although the bank has not seriously considered other construction options, We have expressed a number of other suggestions, listed for your consideration:

1. Same location: A single story (14-16' height) with proper setbacks eliminating any "tunnel effect" on Prospect Street and providing an acceptable and sensitive corner on Otis Place.
2. Clock tower location (A): A large 2-3 story brick building would "fit" on State Street where most other buildings are similar.
3. Two single story (14-16' height) buildings – one for parking in current location and the other for offices at the clock tower location.
4. Loan Building, 81 State Street: Expand the height of the current IFS Loan Building on the corner of Prospect Street. This would easily accommodate workspace for seven additional employees.
5. Industrial Park or another location: Build in a different Newburyport location.

Again, after our initial requested meeting with IFS officers back in January, the bank has never communicated directly with neighbors or even acknowledged our concerns. They have not presented the Planning Board with any alternative options other than the employee parking lot and superficial changes, such as the clapboard design presented August 5th. Just as the city chose not to construct the new city parking building in the Greene Street lot because the mass, size, height and scale would have changed the historical fabric of Newburyport's downtown business area and Brown Square, this proposed massive bank building should be denied for the Prospect Street & Otis Place corner location.

Abutters and concerned neighbors continue to appreciate all the Planning Board's efforts to understand the situation and determine what is best for Newburyport and all parties concerned.

Thank you,

Peter Mackin

13 Prospect Street

petemackin@gmail.com

Mobile: 714-655-9173

Dianne Boisvert

From: Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>
Sent: September 22, 2020 10:54 AM
To: Andrew Port
Cc: Dianne Boisvert; Mark Griffin; Colleen Turner Secino; Claire Papanastasiou
Subject: [Ext]Oct. 21 Planning Board Meeting/93 State Street

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Mr. Port,

At the Sept. 16 Planning Board meeting, I heard permission granted to allow an unnamed applicant an unspecified time slot for a video presentation at the October 21st meeting. Assuming the applicant in question is the Institution for Savings and recognizing that the Institution's rights of representation should be at all times equal to and not greater than those of the members of the public most heavily impacted by the Institutions plan's, I respectfully request that provisions be made for the following:

- A) Limiting the time available for the video presentation, and
- B) Allowing equal time to anyone willing to speak during the public comment portion regarding this agenda item. Equal time being, in this case, equal to the time the applicant is allowed to state its case, verbally, or all forms of presentation media.

In addition, I request that public commentary be limited to the citizens of Newburyport.

Sincerely,

Claire Papanastasiou
4 Otis Place
Newburyport

--

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

Dianne Boisvert

From: Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>
Sent: October 06, 2020 9:13 AM
To: Katelyn E. Sullivan; glennprichards@comcast.net; Andrew Port; Dianne Boisvert
Subject: [Ext]Opposition to IFS State Street location expansion

external e-mail use caution opening

Good morning,

I am writing in opposition of the Institution for Savings' 16,000-square-foot proposed addition to its downtown Newburyport location along Prospect Street and Otis Place.

The proposed building is simply too large and will negatively impact the historical character of the neighborhood. What's more, I am concerned about other neighborhoods along State Street, specifically those on Charter, Essex and Temple streets. If the IFS is permitted to expand at such magnitude, what would prevent other businesses along State Street to do the same? It's a slippery slope. I also wonder how this massive addition would have been received if it had been proposed by a private developer and not the bank, which continues to leverage its reputation and influence in the community to its benefit. The IFS brand within the Newburyport community is separate from the issue at hand.

I look forward to the Oct. 8 meeting and appreciate the time you all dedicate to preserving the unique historical character of our beloved city.

Thank you,

Claire

--

Claire Papanastasiou
4 Otis Place, Newburyport
617.416.3377
claire.p.claire@gmail.com

Dianne Boisvert

From: Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>
Sent: October 05, 2020 4:38 PM
To: bsontag@comcast.net
Cc: Mark Griffin; Colleen Turner Secino; Andrew Port; Dianne Boisvert
Subject: [Ext]

external e-mail use caution opening

Dear Planning Board Chair Sontag,

Please see below my initial email regarding the Institution for Savings' Sept. 16th request and approval to show a video at the Oct 21 Planning Board meeting. I inadvertently neglected to send to your email address and am forwarding it below as well as reiterating my request in this email. Recognizing that the Institution's rights of representation should be at all times equal to and not greater than those of the members of the public most heavily impacted by the Institutions plan's, I respectfully request that provisions be made for the following during the Oct. 21 meeting:

- A) Limiting the time available for the video presentation, and
- B) Allowing equal time to anyone willing to speak during the public comment portion regarding this agenda item. Equal time being, in this case, equal to the time the applicant is allowed to state its case, verbally, or all forms of presentation media.

In addition, I request that public commentary be limited to the citizens of Newburyport.

Sincerely,

Claire Papanastasiou
4 Otis Place
Newburyport
617.416.3377

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 22, 2020 at 10:54 AM
Subject: Oct. 21 Planning Board Meeting/93 State Street
To: <aport@cityofnewburyport.com>
Cc: <planning@cityofnewburyport.com>, Mark Griffin <mwgesq@comcast.net>, Colleen Turner Secino <respectourhistoricneighborhood@gmail.com>, Claire Papanastasiou <claire.p.claire@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. Port,

At the Sept. 16 Planning Board meeting, I heard permission granted to allow an unnamed applicant an unspecified time slot for a video presentation at the October 21st meeting. Assuming the applicant in question is the Institution for Savings and recognizing that the Institution's rights of representation should be at all times equal to and not greater than those of the members of the public most heavily impacted by the Institutions plan's, I respectfully request that provisions be made for the following:

A) Limiting the time available for the video presentation, and

B) Allowing equal time to anyone willing to speak during the public comment portion regarding this agenda item. Equal time being, in this case, equal to the time the applicant is allowed to state its case, verbally, or all forms of presentation media.

In addition, I request that public commentary be limited to the citizens of Newburyport.

Sincerely,

Claire Papanastasiou
4 Otis Place
Newburyport

--

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

--

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

Dianne Boisvert

From: Peter Mackin <petemackin@gmail.com>
Sent: October 19, 2020 2:59 PM
To: Andrew Port; Dianne Boisvert; Katelyn E. Sullivan
Subject: [Ext]Letter to NBPT Planning Board

external e-mail use caution opening

Please share this with the Planning Board well prior to the Weds night 10/21 Zoom Meeting. Thank you.

Bonnie Sontag & Newburyport Planning Board Members,

We oppose the Institution For Saving's construction plan. Their latest building proposal appears to be even more massive than the prior 2 versions. The Planning Board's decision will have a permanent impact on our historic downtown neighborhood and will set a precedent for other future downtown building additions.

The major issue for neighbors has always been height, size, and scale of this huge structure in this limited space.

Why is it so high? The ridge/peak of the building is 37 feet and higher than the height of the 1870's structure and all residential homes. IFS has never answered the question of why they could not put the entire employee indoor parking below the street level. The current building foundation plans are less than 8 feet down. Going down another 16 feet, could reduce the overall height of the proposed above ground structure to 21 feet. This would be a significant improvement in not overpowering the residential streets.

Regarding height, IFS fails to show any drawings of the internal space directly under the 37 foot peaked portion of the roof(s) of their structure. Is that an extremely high cathedral ceiling for the 2nd floor office area? Or is there a 3rd floor office space with considerable square footage not described in their plans? In comparison, my home, 13 Prospect Street, has a lower peak/ridge, roof eve and we have 3 floors above ground with an attic. Is it possible to reduce this internal vertical space and effectively lower the proposed outside roof height that dwarfs the smaller neighborhood homes?

Not only is this plan higher than the prior versions, it now has a much expanded footprint. IFS incorporated an internal corridor on the Prospect Street side, extending the building to the narrow sidewalk, within 6.5 feet of the street and removing all landscaping. (By comparison, the sidewalk width on our residential side of Prospect Street is 9 feet). This lack of setback exaggerates the "tunnel" effect for both motorists and pedestrians. The IFS renderings without parked cars and traffic fail to reflect the reality of the daily street congestion. The bank's renderings fail to show views of the building when abutting residents are standing in their backyards on Otis and Garden streets. The loss of sunlight will be significant.

Michael Jones, CEO, originally stated the reason for the expansion was to establish room for a new 93 State Street museum to house artifacts from the bank's 200 year history. A rotating historical display in the lobbies of each of the 15 IFS branches would share that history with far more of its customers. A bank museum and office space for only 7 additional employees doesn't justify constructing such a massive addition in such a small area. 60% of the proposed new space will be an indoor employee parking garage.

It is ironic, that the Institution For Savings proposes a museum to preserve their history, while they eradicate the historic nature of the neighborhood surrounding it.

Despite requests to the IFS from the Historic Commission and the Planning Board to reduce the size of their expansion, the bank has chosen to EXPAND IT.

In summary, we do not oppose the bank's ability to grow, but we oppose a gigantic structure that dwarfs our homes.

Thank you and we look forward to hearing the discussion on Weds night.

Peter & Maureen Mackin

13 Prospect Street