VOTE YES ON ARTICLE 4 Limit Hotel to 20 Rooms

Citizen's Petition – signed by over 300 Rockport Residents and another 200 on Change.org

- Developer originally promised residents "20-22 sleeping room hotel" with no mention of a restaurant or rooftop bar (April 18, 2017 Select Board Meeting). Developer increased size to 35 rooms, then reduced to "26 luxury suites". Don't be fooled, hotel is still the same size as 35 rooms.
- Would not block century old scenic Harbor view or deface western wall of historic Shepherd Building.

Would reduce resident's tax burden without overwhelming historic downtown with an oversized building.

Will preserve public parking for residents and other visitors to existing restaurants, galleries, concert series and library.

Developer & Town official's proposed hotel



An appropriately sized 20 room hotel maintaining view

PRSRT STD

ECRWSS U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

EDDM Retail



Postal Customer Rockport, ME 04865

RESIDENTS SUPPORT THESE PETITIONS!

It has been said that these petitions are "an attempt by a small group of individuals trying to stop downtown boutique hotel". Over 325 Rockport voters from all five neighborhoods signed the petitions and many more do not share the developer's or our Town officials' plan for "revitalizing" our historic downtown and quiet harbor with an oversized hotel. Why wouldn't the boards want to listen to the people they serve. To vote only for "what the Select Board and Planning Board recommend" is how they get agendas passed without you knowing it. Please vote not just what is the "Select Board and Planning Board Recommended Positions", but what YOU recommend!

How to vote absentee: Pick up your form directly from the town office or call 236-0806 and request a voting form to be mailed to you. Your form requires two stamps and must be **received** (not just postdated) or dropped off at Town Office by August 18th.

Keep this voting card for voting reference

VOTE YES ON ARTICLE 3.

Requiring an Independent traffic study by a qualified professional paid by developer, not taxpayers' dollars.

Citizen's Petition - signed by over 320 Legal Rockport Residents and another 200 on Change.org

Why wouldn't you want a traffic and parking study done?

- Residents are already concerned with traffic, parking, pedestrian and cyclist safety on Central St., including double parking by delivery trucks. Rockport Police Department expressed concerns over hotel location due to two accidents which have occurred at the blind intersection of Central and Main St, where hotel valet drivers and delivery trucks will be turning.
- It is already difficult to park if you come into town for an evening event, even without a hotel.
- The adequacy of parking and safety concerns related to traffic caused by proposed development are long term and cumulative.
- Parking and vehicle circulation impacts from development should be reviewed and studied by qualified and unbiased traffic engineers.

VOTE NO on Article 9. A "YES" vote would place historic buildings at risk by exempting them from landscaping, architectural design and parking area requirements (section 1001). It would also eliminate all landscaping for parking lots, resulting in ugly barren lots in our neighborhoods (section 1004).

VOTE NO on Article 6. A "YES" vote would allow developers to provide remote parking for guests by operating "transit buses" or "valet parking" services throughout residential streets instead of providing parking on site or within reasonable walking distance as currently required. (803.5). And would completely eliminate all requirements relating to the Town's upgrading of public ways, including giving notice to those residents whose homes abutt the project! (section 803.4)

For more information, contact FOR (Friends Of Rockport) info@friendsofrockport.org and www.friendsofrockport.org.

A nonprofit organization promoting smart growth of Rockport while preserving its iconic historical architecture,

beautiful quiet harbor and scenic views.

Things to watch for in the November Town Election: The Select Board is seeking to eliminate off street parking requirements for downtown developers and create the needed additional parking at the taxpayers' expense.