

From: Lorraine Iovanni <l.iovanni@comcast.net>

Sent: Monday, January 29, 2024 11:02 AM

To: Christopher Olney <olneyc@manchester.ma.us>; Gail Hunter <HunterG@manchester.ma.us>

Cc: Greg Federspiel <federspielg@manchester.ma.us>; Marc Resnick <ResnickM@manchester.ma.us>; Ann Harrison <harrisona@manchester.ma.us>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re: Request for Data/MBTA Zoning

Good Morning Chris and others,

Welcome Mr. Resnick.

Thank you for the comprehensive response. I was looking for the best estimate. I understood this data point was available from the start of discussions last year. I understand that these units are not calculated into the density equation. Just a flat number. I understand the overlay strategy and the modeling with Innes. The density models will increase the number of units overall in any event. My interest goes to population and growth for the Town. I am not interested in expansion beyond the State mathematical requirements.

From the start of the TF process and on many occasions, residents were told that we were close to the # of units (multifamily). I have not seen a good estimate. I believe the last number I heard from the Jan 11 meeting of the TF was 585 units required by the State calculations as one data point. Please correct me if I have misheard, as you know the audio is not perfect.

While I understand the approach to identifying smaller parcels. This snapshot of what Manchester by the Sea has already in place seems to suggest that if we are "close", we are simply close to the number...looking through the population lens.

I believe that this data was at hand via our prior Town Planner, Ms. Ware. I certainly do not expect our Town staff to expend extraordinary time on counting from property cards. (I am avoiding a PRR for this reason and do not intend to do one.)

I truly believe that a snapshot is foundational for any discussion with residents, whether on email as I am doing or in a TF Meeting (where I can ask) or on a site walk. It's an expected question to be asked and answered.

If I were sitting on the TF, I would ask for an estimate of the data as a start. I am uncertain whether Mr. Resnick has an interest, to familiarize himself with the Town. If you do not have the data at hand, so be it.

As an aside, I wholeheartedly concur with the TF approval to permit Ms. Philbrick to coordinate with other Resilience Coastal Communities under jurisdiction of MBTA Zoning Law to seek any relief, if possible.

As an aside, I do believe Mr. Hall's proposal to Gordon College outside a public hearing with the PB and SB is premature. The document will be posted for residents as Gail recently mentioned. However, this type of proposal whether connected to the MBTA Zoning or not needs a full discussion with residents with the PB and ConCom due to the watershed area. Any proposal of this level and significance should be done with signatory by the SB or the Town Administrator (perhaps Town Counsel review), not a resident, whether sitting on the TF workgroup or not. I commend Mr. Hall on his creativeness, but we certainly have not vetted the watershed, vernal pool areas, traffic impact on Pine St (paving from the fire access road off Pine St), public safety and impact on our schools, etc...20 acres equal 15 units per acre by right...300 units of multifamily by right with cars? Please ensure that the full PB and the ConCom meet to discuss this proposal so residents may input on protection of the watershed. This is no different than 40 B. The site visit by Sarah Mellish (ZBA), Steve Gang (ConCom) and others to this site should have been announced such as the density walk and the public invited, as part of the MBTA Zoning communication plan.

Chris, thank you again for your hard work. You may want to share my thoughts with the full TF and PB.

Regards,

Lorraine

Lorraine Iovanni

20 A Pine St