

**Linda M. Finucane**

---

**From:** Lesley Cohen <lesley.cohen1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 09, 2015 2:45 PM  
**To:** Linda M. Finucane  
**Subject:** Fwd: 143 Lincoln Street

Dear Ms. Finucane and Alderman Crossley,

We are writing you to inform you of our concerns about the proposed Special Permit requested by the owner and architect of 143 Lincoln Street. We live on Mountfort Road opposite the home and we are in direct view of the largest side of the structure being proposed here. We have invested an enormous amount of time and money to improve and beautify our home and landscape to restore its original Victorian intention. Others on this street are working to do the same. We are very concerned that this home will dramatically, negatively impact the character of our beloved neighborhood.

We attended the last Planning Committee meeting and expressed our concerns at that time. We do not feel as though the owner and architect have addressed some of these concerns and have added new problems which need to be addressed, as well. Below is a list of some of our concerns:

1. While the property proposes to be a single house functioning as a two-family home, it is actually TWO side-by-side, single-family dwellings.
  - a) this results in an very large size structure on a small plot of land .
  - b) this structure resides primarily on Mountfort Road (60 foot frontage) and it is not in character with the rest of the homes on the street.
  
2. The addition of two carports flanking the two-car garage - along with the large size of the proposed driveway - further suggests the fact that this is two connected houses that read like "row houses".
  - a) The carports is not in keeping with the surrounding homes and can have an adverse effect on property values.
  - b) the appearance of such a large paved area proposed for the driveway on such a small lot does add to the problem of the aesthetics of this proposed plan. It appears as though this could accommodate as many as 8-12 cars!
  
3. The attic ceilings are drawn as 6'11½". This feels like a tricky attempt to get around the seven foot requirement so they could keep the attic from being included in the FAR. The resulting size results in the same appearance, so this does not feel like it was done in good faith - but designed more as a way to get around the requirements.
  
4. At the last Planning Committee meeting, your committee recommended that the petitioners meet with the neighbors to discuss these plans. There has been NO attempt on the part of these petitioners to contact us.

We believe this whole building concept is an undesirable precedent-setting change to our neighborhood.

If this project moves forward against our expressed complaints, are there conditions that can be imposed to make this viable? Though we welcome an improvement to this existing structure, we know of no neighbor who supports this plan as it stands.

Thank you for reading (and, hopefully, addressing) our concerns.

Lesley and Arnie Cohen