

Nadia Khan

From: David A. Olson
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 3:51 PM
To: Marc C. Laredo; Scott F. Lennon; Jake Auchincloss; James R. Cote; Deborah J. Crossley; Gregory R. Schwartz; Richard Lipof
Cc: Nadia Khan; Alexandra Ananth; Michael Gleba
Subject: FW: Land Use

From: Laura Woodward
Sent: Tuesday, April 05, 2016 3:24 PM
To: David A. Olson
Subject: Land Use

Dear David, I was hoping you could forward my comments below to the Land Use Committee for the meeting tonight?

Thank you,

Laura Woodward

Dear Land Use Committee, I am writing with regard to the Newtonville Ave self storage facility. With larger projects going on, this one seems to have been lost in the shuffle. For your information, I am a direct abutter. My understanding is that zoning variance are supposed to be given if a project benefits the neighborhood/town overall, which I fail to see here. Hastily put together considering the timing, but here is a bullet point list of my and neighbors concerns:

- I do not have a necessarily have a problem with a self storage facility, but do with one that requires a FAR of 1.5. This is a residential neighborhood, with smaller houses abutting the property, and the proposed building would definitely not be to scale with the neighborhood. Zoning is established to preserve the character of the neighborhood and I see no reason a building this size could be considered appropriate by the Counsel.

They are proposing to cut an additional approximate 100 mature trees. I think given the conversation last night about saving a few at the library, this should stop this project in its tracks if they are being taken in exchange for such a large building. Again, a negotiation on size would preserve tree canopy.

I would assume they have come in with a maximum proposal, and must have a minimum. I would be interested in understanding if they intend to negotiate. They have given the impression of being very flexible and trying hard to save a few trees and please the neighborhood, but I have not seen one inch budge on the size of the building. I bought my house knowing that some day something else could go in there, but assumed the Counsel would comply with zoning and only allow something of a reasonable size.

- They are asking for a waiver of landscaping requirements around the parking area. I would consider this one of the more important requirements given that the parking will be facing a residential area.

- I would not want the light requirements to be waived without understanding their plan. The current lighting at the existing building has been upgraded and I have had to replace all shades facing that way to block the light.

Thank you for your consideration. It seems to me that a postponement of this matter tonight might be the best way to make sure the concerns of the neighborhood have been heard.