
70 Anderson St Initial Workshop Feedback

Karen Snyder <karsny@yahoo.com>

Wed, Jul 27, 2016 at 3:01 PM

Reply-To: Karen Snyder <karsny@yahoo.com>

To: "shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov" <shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov>

Cc: Belinda Ray <bsr@portlandmaine.gov>, Munjoy Hill Neighborhood Organization <jay.norris@munjoyhill.org>, Anne Rand <randanne@aol.com>, "estrimling@portlandmaine.gov" <estrimling@portlandmaine.gov>, Jon Hinck <jhinck@portlandmaine.gov>

Hi Shukria,

At a request of some Bayside Neighbors, I attended the initial workshop last night of the 70 Anderson St new project. I was quite disheartened to see the same shenanigans going on with a Planning board where the impression to the local residents concerns were not taken seriously and a favorable bias to the developer. Last night's workshop illustrated this point.

For 70 Anderson workshop, the developer Jonathon Culley is asking for four waivers all ready knowing the current ordinances. The four waivers are:

1. The 7 parking spots are only large enough for compact cars. Would families that can afford these 3 bedroom townhouses really have compact cars? More like SUVs.
- Of course he only put in the minimum parking spaces based on the latest changes in the R6 on parking where it is not required to put in parking spots for the first 3 units.
2. The required street trees for this project is 10. He can only fit 4 on Anderson street sidewalk and no street trees on Lancaster St because the sidewalk is too tight because the townhouses are too big. But don't worry, he will have 6 trees between the buildings and he thinks this should qualify for street trees. No, six trees inside a property does NOT qualify as a street tree.
3. Not enough room for parking landscaping due to the tight spaces.
4. Lack of aisle way for entrances.

Culley is also only putting the minimum which is just one affordable house based on the Ensure Workforce Housing Fairness Act.

I am also concerned about Elizabeth Boepple who is a land lawyer and appears to be unfairly biased to developers especially since I heard her comments last night that the street tree ordinance is usually waived in favor of the developer. That seems quite a biased statement. What is the good of having street tree ordinances if the planning board continuously waives the replacement of trees on the sidewalks? Do they want to turn Portland into Manhattan concrete and steel environment for the rich only to live?

In conclusion, instead of the planning board being preoccupied with the color of the proposed townhouses, they need to address more substantial concerns of the local residents.

1. The adjoining neighbor who wants to put solar panels on roof and Culley's design could potentially block the sun for this neighbor.
2. The adjoining neighbors concern of the abatement of these buildings and how it will affect his children and the garden where he grows his vegetables.
3. Yet once again concern of affordable housing of Jonathan Culley and the minimum requirement of having one affordable house on this site based on the Ensure Workforce Housing Fairness Act.
4. The 4 waivers which the Planning Board didn't seem to concerned with and the impression that they will be waived quite easily these waivers for not having properly sized parking spaces, lack of parking landscaping, and the lack of street trees.

I suggest the planning board start focusing on making the developers actually adhere to the ordinances rather than being waived of ordinances since they are putting in "market rate" residences at the opposition of local residents.

Regards,

Karen Snyder

Munjoy Hill Property Owner