
70 Anderson St.

jp_monro@myfairpoint.net <jp_monro@myfairpoint.net>

Mon, Jul 25, 2016 at 4:20 PM

Reply-To: jp_monro@myfairpoint.net

To: shukriaw@portlandmaine.gov

Cc: Deb Andrews <DGA@portlandmaine.gov>, Ryan Senatore <ryan@senatorearchitecture.com>, Caitlin Cameron <ccameron@portlandmaine.gov>

Dear Shukira,

I am opposed to insisting that the ground floor be raised in the new residential construction at 70 Anderson Street, despite its being a listed R-6 infill standard and despite the recommendation based on that standard by Caitlin Cameron. Here's her citation:

" **Not met.** - A-3 Relationship to the Street: The building placement is consistent with the spacing of the residential fabric – slightly setback from sidewalk to allow for stoops and provide some privacy. **The ground floor is not raised and is not consistent with residential development patterns.**"

I object based on our experience on May Street, with the newly constructed house of Barack and Mimi Olins. They were required to raise their ground floor according to this standard, I believe.

What have been the effects? Does the building better reflect existing buildings as a result? No. On the contrary it has been made more markedly different for two reasons.

First, it was already going to be as tall a building as any other on the street. Now it has been made even taller. (Indeed, here on May Street it's tall skinniness is the primary way it distinguishes itself from other buildings. It was unfortunate that standards were applied to make it conform even less in this most prominent regard.)

Second, an exposed concrete frost wall no more reflects neighboring buildings than clapboard down to the ground. In fact, I would argue that it is less representative of neighboring buildings, since none of them have exposed concrete, and exposed concrete simply accentuates the modernity of the Ollins's building and would presumably do the same on Anderson Street.

A third objection is that the additional costs of shifting from a slab to a frost wall, combined with additional entry steps, grading and filling is not insignificant.

In short, I can see no countervailing value for this imposed additional expense.

As a result, I would urge the applicant to apply for a waiver of this standard, and I would urge you on the planning staff to recommend its acceptance by the Planning Board.

Respectfully,

Peter Monro, 32 May St. 04102

(207) 318-6052 jp_monro@myfairpoint.net