

March 16, 2018 Revised March 20, 2018

Mr. Michael Rooney
Boston Planning and Development Agency

Dear Michael,

Here are my observations regarding the proposed redevelopment of the 1120-1132 Washington Street, Lower Mills, referred to as the City Point Development.

As you know, approval of zoning variances sought for the City Point development is based on the benefits/burdens test – do the benefits of the proposed development justify the burdens placed on Lower Mills. The answer is no:

- The proponents have shown no interest in improving the quality of life in the community. After purchasing the residences they placed unmonitored sober houses within the acquired buildings as they tried to get approval of a redevelopment. It led to shootings, robberies, general disturbing the peace of abutters.
- The proposed structure will not have a positive impact on Lower Mills – the massing of the proposal will dramatically change the fabric of the neighborhood placing a more bulky, taller, multifamily building within a block of one, two and three family traditionally styled structures. It places the future of all of these buildings in jeopardy – increasing redevelopment pressure and threatening the quaint character of this outlying area of Lower Mills.
- The proponents have had no direct discussions with abutters to discuss what might be done to balance shadow, daylight or traffic impacts from the tripling of residential units currently located on the site – not even landscape buffers.
- They have proposed no community benefits – no traffic management actions that could mitigate the existing failing levels of service, preservation of the historic architecture, no contributions to the overall public realm like expanded streetscape improvements, no explanation of how their open space contributes to the larger urban design/open space strategy for Lower Mills (not ending up being a gap in the streetwall).

I have reviewed the PNF analysis and find it lacking in several areas:

Transportation - While I concur that traffic generated by 56 units of housing will not be huge, to assume that the project with its retail component will only produce 22/23 trips during the am and pm peak hours is a significant under estimate of trip generation. Also, the analysis fails to acknowledge the difficult traffic conditions that currently exist, specifically

- During the AM Peak, the River/Washington Street and Adams/Washington/Dot Ave intersections fail with multiple light cycles being required to move east bound on River, north bound on Washington and east bound on Adams.
- During the PM peak. The southbound move on Washington at River and through to Adams, the south bound move on Dot Ave and the westbound move on Adams all fail with the eastbound move on Adams having particularly long delays - well in excess of 240 seconds. And since these delays are a result of traffic operations, not v/c ratios, the introduction of the small numbers of vehicles into the mix will have a significant impact.

What is most troubling about the traffic analysis is the failure to recognize the poor traffic conditions and to propose potential mitigation that might improve conditions for existing and new traffic.

- Car sharing is mentioned yet there is not recommendation to add an onsite space to supplement the closest facility located at 209 Ashmont Street - especially since a zipcar at Peabody Square is not proximate to Lower Mills and will not be utilized.
- Adjustments to existing signal timing might allow better operation particularly at River and Washington but this too is not discussed.
- Restrictions on vehicles egressing the site during the peak hours could help reduce the potential for grid lock (strong possibility for exiting vehicles attempting to make a left turn to Washington).
- Parking management or owner restrictions on the number of vehicles owned per unit is not mentioned

Environmental Component: The environmental analysis is incomplete. There is a statement that the net new **shadow** will only effect the site and Washington Street public realm but no diagrams are provided to substantiate this claim. Of particular interest is the impact on the project's proposed open space that are directly north suggesting that this open space would be in shadow for most of the year. The Abutters on Richmond Street anticipate a new four-story structure that extend deeper into the site that existing structures will dramatically affect their properties. W/o the shadow diagrams, there is no way to confirm the potential impact on streets nor adjacent properties. A shadow analysis is requested.

The assumptions made regarding the **daylight** analysis are not correct. This section of Washington Street is lined by individual structures with side yards and heights not exceeding three stories. the proposed development will create a four story wall significantly altering the daylighting levels for pedestrians. The impact on Richmond Street will be even more significant, particularly for the single family residential properties - their rear yards will be significantly impacted.

Geotechnical Component: It is noted that ledge is visible to the rear of the site. Puddingstone runs shallow under the site and may significantly impact the feasibility of providing underground parking. Can this project proceed if ledge is found? And if there is an effort to remove the ledge, how does this impact existing structures and overall quality of life. Standard mitigation actions accompanying subsoil activities are not referenced. More information on subsoil conditions is required before any relief is granted.

Urban Design: The graphics do not show the massing of the proposed development in relation to the existing context. As one moves away from the former industrial uses sited along the Neponset River and former rail lines, the building form and massing transitions to primarily single family homes built to house cottage industry artisans. The development at the end of the 19th and early 20th centuries saw the introduction of two and three family residences. Some properties located on major thoroughfares were converted to business use but the scale of development has remained unchanged for two hundred years.

The proposed design is nothing like that existing fabric nor does it make any effort to respect that fabric. It brings no special qualities in massing or façade detailing that would match or elevate the architectural quality of Lower Mills. A simple street elevation showing the building in context would reveal the proposal is twice to three times the height of adjacent properties and the hodge-podge of details do not relate to the existing structures.

The building massing provides no special features – no height or massing setbacks that would moderate the physical presence on the street.

The facades are poorly designed:

- Mansard is an uncomfortable hat with no transition to the body of the building and no setback from the plane of the base, the purpose of a true mansard.
- There is an abundance of materials, too many, no rationale on application.
- The detailing is very crude – fascia boards have no profile; where did the center bay with the quoins come from?
- First floor commercial windows show no relationship to fenestration patterns on the upper floors.
- There was no effort to either preserve existing historically significant structures or integrate the massing or detailing of those buildings into the proposal.
-

In conclusion, the proposed building has no redeeming qualities and only negatively impacts the urban design of Lower Mills.

The **Historic Resources Component** does not adequately assess the historic roots of Lower Mills, the properties now occupying the site or the impacts the proposal will have on historic structures.

- The component fails to acknowledge the existence of a West Lower Mills Historic District designation where the property is located.
- It fails to acknowledge the history of the existing structures – information readily available in the City of Boston Environment Department's historic inventory and the Mascris site.
- The assessment fails to indicate any properties listed on national and state inventories within a mile and ½ mile radius of the site. This includes the Pierce and Baker Mills located on the Neponset, the Pierce House and St Gregory's Catholic Church.
- The analysis fails to track the historic background of Lower Mills - the industrial, agricultural and residential development.
- It makes the assessment that the architectural design complements and respects the existing fabric. How is this the case when the proposal overwhelms existing buildings in scale and the historic metaphors incorporated into the façade are misapplied and inappropriately proportioned.

The assessment "assumes" there will not be any adverse impacts on the existing resources. This is based on the use of design elements like a mansard roof, regardless of the fact that the mansard is poorly designed. The massing and detailing do not minimize impacts on the high design of Lower Mills particularly the architecture of the historic mill structures.

Conclusion

In the final analysis the PNF is shallow in its content and provides a minimally objective assessment of the proposal's Urban Design, Transportation and Environmental impacts.

There is no justification for the zoning relief as the City Point Development:

- Will not improve the traffic conditions proposing no mitigation,
- Proposes a building massing and façade design that does not reflect architecture of the area but presents the same tired features of cheaply built suburban apartment buildings.
- Proposes no mitigation to ease daylight and shadow impacts on adjacent residents,
- Sets a bad precedent for future development in the area by removing contextural structures with new development that is more dense and poorly massed, and
- Removes existing valuable traditional architecture making not attempt to preserve or integrate the structure into the development.

Without a true benefits strategy there is no reason to approve the variances, particular the density relief being sought.

Sincerely submitted
Thomas Maistros, Jr, Architect
1049 Adams Street
Dorchester

Michael,

I understand that you are the Boston Planning and Development Agency project manager for the proposed development of the land that once included the former Molloy Funeral Home: 1120, 1125, 1126, 1130r, and [1132 Washington Street, Dorchester Lower Mills](#)

I stand with many residents of Dorchester Lower Mills in opposing the demolition of the existing structures on the parcel of land proposed for development by City Point Center, LLC.

Preserving the streetscape of our historic village is paramount to maintaining the quality of our neighborhood for all who live here as well as for prospective property owners and residents. Real estate development that recognizes and values the character of Dorchester Lower Mills and seeks to preserve it will enhance the desirability of the neighborhood for all who live, work, and visit here. With the right kind of development, our property values will increase for the betterment of all.

With the wrong kind of development our village – and its historic character -- will be scarred for current and future generations.

What is the wrong kind of development?

Development that is of oversized scale for the geographic footprint, casting shadow on streets and abutting homes and creating traffic congestion. Development that clashes with the traditional style of the one-, two, and three-family homes of the village by introducing charmless, stereotypical contemporary structures to replace the existing structures. Development that is cheap and of poor quality with no thought to landscape and green space. Development that patently has no regard for community cohesion.

What the residents and shopkeepers of Dorchester Lower Mills want is smart, tasteful development that matches or enhances the look and feel of our community with well-balanced integration of green space and structures that mesh with the buildings, streets and byways, and natural environment that we enjoy today. And we want this community character preserved for future generations. It's our history, their history, and Boston's history. Please do not allow City Point Center, LLC – or any other developer – to wreck it.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Mary Carbonara

[1241 Adams Street #501](#)
[Dorchester MA 02124](#)





Michael Rooney <michael.rooney@boston.gov>

1120-1132 Washington St. Public Meeting

1 message

Daniel Sheehan [REDACTED]
To: michael.rooney@boston.gov

Tue, Feb 27, 2018 at 12:21 PM

Hi Michael,

My name is Dan Sheehan and I'm with the Dorchester Reporter. I was at the meeting at Carney last night and was just wondering about next steps in the process.

Obviously there were several concerns voiced by residents last night, and as you mentioned you will be relating these comments to the BLC and folks at the BPDA. Do you think there's a chance the Impact Advisory Board might meet again in light of these issues? What do you see as its role going forward?

Also, the BLC meets on the 13th to deliver their decision in regards to demolition, but last night a possibility of extending the comment period was discussed. Will that affect the date of the hearing? If not, what would the next part of the process look like following the BLC's verdict?

Sorry for all the questions! Please let me know if I should be directing any of them to someone else.

Good job handling a tough crowd last night, and thanks in advance for your response,

Dan

MEMORANDUM

TO: Boston Planning and Development Agency

FROM: Gary Tondorf-Dick

DATE: February 20, 2018

RE: Comments in Opposition to the proposed City point Development at 1120-1132 Washington Street, Dorchester Lower Mills, MA

CC: D. Michael Skillin, President, Dorchester Lower Mills Civic Association

I am opposed to this 57 unit Condominium development in its current form and size in part because it overshadows the historic Lower Mills 18th and 19th Washington Street neighborhood 4-5 story building that is urban, modern and commercial in scale and character and proposes to demolish three architecturally and historically significant Lower Mills Washington Street village neighborhood homes. These homes can be saved and remain in the front of the development which can be situated in the rear lot area of these homes. The two white houses are very old historical homes in Lower Mills. They are described in the Lower Mills West document on Lower mills history prepared by the Boston Landmarks Commission in 1994 as the historical narrative basis of a proposed lower Mills Historic District. The Lower Mills West document description of these houses reads: "AREA FORM from Boston Landmarks Commission prepared as part of 1994 Survey of Dorchester. Dated May, 1995 and recorded by Edward W. Gordon: Continuing southward along Washington Street are Greek Revival houses that are decidedly more stylish and substantial than the smaller and less ornate versions located west of Washington Street. Lower Washington Street's houses proclaim the importance of this thoroughfare, just before it reaches the commercial/industrial district at Pierce Square.

Substantial housing along this major artery includes the Federal/Greek Revival transitional house at 1127/1129 Washington Street-basically a 5-bay x 2-bay main block with rear ell and an unusual monitor roof (presumably a later addition). Also noteworthy is the L-shaped hip roofed Federal house next door at 1133 Washington Street and the altered (by vinyl siding) Greek Revival, L-shaped houses with narrow, end wall gables sited perpendicular the street at 1120 and 1126 Washington Street.

Historical Narrative

The residential area of Lower Mills West has significant historical associations with industries operating along the Dorchester and Milton shores of the Neponset River from ca.1780-1900.

Between 1770 and 1830, residential development was concentrated along the arms of the village's early roads, and a stretch of impressive houses lined Washington Street from River Street to the foot of Codman Hill. Another c. 1770s residence, disguised by Greek Revival additions, is the Haynes House at 1126 Washington Street, now the Milton Funeral Home. It is named for George Haynes who lived here during the mid to late 19th- century. Across the street at 1133 Washington Street (ca. 1800) was the

home of Henry L. Pierce (1825-1896). Mr. Pierce was the manager and eventual owner of The Baker Chocolate Company.

Statement of Significance

Lower Mills West

Lower Mills West qualifies as a remarkably intact area of Federal, Greek Revival and Italianate houses that were built for cabinet makers, varnishers, planers and others associated with the furniture manufacturing and building trades. Additionally, a number of this neighborhood's residents were employees of the Bakers Chocolate Co., Stephen Badlam furniture manufactory, Crehore Playing Card manufactory and other commercial concerns bordering the Neponset River. Although the small shops of these workers have disappeared from house lots, modest dwellings with landscape features such as mature trees, ample lawns and granite gate posts provide a glimpse of a middle class artisan/factory workers quarter which evolved between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars. Architectural/historical highlights of this area include the c. late 18th century Pierce farm house at 1027 Washington Street; the Federal style 1066 Washington Street (c. 1805), home to Anthony Otherman, founder of Methodism at Lower Mills, the early 19th residence Federal/Greek Revival double house at 1061/1063 Washington Street, home of Edward Hutchinson Robbins Reynolds, an apprentice of the well-known cabinet maker Stephen Badlam and talented maker of Empire style furniture in his own right; the c. 1800 residence at 1133 Washington Street of Henry L. Pierce, owner of the Baker Chocolate Company; the Italianate cottage at 12 Rugdale Street, home to cabinet maker Benjamin Adams and the Panel Brick Blue Hills Bank (1871) at Washington and Richmond Streets.

Bibliography and/or References

Maps/Atlases-1830, 1850, 1874, 1884, 1894, 1898, 1910, 1918 and 1933

This proposed development will negatively impact the neighborhood character and streetscape by altering by demolition a very significant part of the 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th century streetscape of Washington Street in Lower Mills village.

These significant historical houses can remain along Washington Street to maintain the historical character of the Washington Street Lower Mills Village while the new development is located in the large rear yard parking area.

Sincerely yours,

Gary Tondorf-Dick

17 Temple Street

Dorchester/Mattapan Lower Mills 02126

Email: [REDACTED] Cell: [REDACTED]

Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
2/22/2018	Alena	Kuzub-Eisen		Oppose	<p>To whom it may concern: We, Alena Kuzub-Eisen and Scott Eisen, are concerned with the development project at 1120-1132 Washington Street, Dorchester Lower Mills, MA and strongly oppose to the demolition of the residential houses at 1120-1132 Washington Street, Dorchester Lower Mills, MA. We are a young family and home owners at Lower Mills. We bought our house at 41 Old Morton Street in April 2017 because we absolutely fell in love with its preserved victorian features and the neighborhood. Lower Mills downtown contained between Richmond street, Washington Street and Adams Street has a distinctive, cohesive, intact historical look which nowadays many neighborhoods of Dorchester and Boston lost and lack. Of course, the brick buildings of the mills are the most recognizable staple of the area; however, other buildings, including Federal and Greek Revival style houses on Washington Street are historically and architecturally significant to the area and its appearance. This was noted in the Area Form from Boston Landmarks Commission prepared as part of 1994 Survey of Dorchester and recorded by Edward W. Gordon in May 1995. This document was the historical narrative basis of a proposed Lower Mills Historic District. According to it, the Malloy Funeral Home at 1126 Washington Street is a c. 1770s residence disguised by Greek Revival additions. It was named the Haynes House for George Haynes who lived here during the mid to late 19th- century. Across the street at 1133 Washington Street (ca. 1800) was the home of Henry L. Pierce (1825-1896). Mr. Pierce was the manager and eventual owner of The Baker Chocolate Company. These Greek Revival houses on Washington Street are "decidedly more stylish and substantial than the smaller and less ornate versions located west of Washington Street. Lower Washington Street's houses proclaim the importance of this thoroughfare, just before it reaches the commercial/industrial district at Pierce Square". Thus, it would be a big mistake to demolish these historical houses that were here for over 3 centuries. The demolition will significantly alter the appearance of the Washington street. We urge the Boston Planning and Development Agency and the project manager Michael Rooney to revise this development project and decide against demolition of the houses at 1120-1132 Washington Street, Dorchester Lower Mills, MA. The parking lots around the funeral home and behind the houses make for enough space to built an L-shaped apartment building. The historical houses should be included into the project, preserved and renovated to their historical glory. The developer then could rent them out for offices and commercial spaces or choose to turn them into condos. We completely understand the appeal of the area for future residents/condo owners as it offers charming historical looks, convenient location, proximity to public transportation and I-93, a supermarket, a CVS, public library, stores, restaurants, etc. However, we strongly believe that the Boston Planning and Development Agency and the developer should strive to preserve the history of the area which will be strongly appreciated by existing neighbors and new residents. Best regards, Alena Kuzub-Eisen and Scott Eisen</p>

2/27/2018	Thomas	Moriarty		Oppose	I oppose the plan as currently defined. My main objection to the plan is a lack of parking spots. On many of the surrounding side streets residents rely on street parking. This reliance has been ongoing for decades. It works out reasonably well at this point only because these are residential neighborhoods (not destinations for other would be drivers/parkers) and the amount of street frontage most houses have is adequate to accommodate the vehicles owned by people in those households. I feel strongly that the BPDA should hold this development to the 1.5 spot per unit zoning code to prevent overflow parking ending up on these residential streets. It was suggested in the meeting that the city is actively trying to limit new parking spots in an effort to discourage driving. I understand congestion is a big urban issue, but I think intentionally limiting spaces on new residential dwellings with the hopes that it will limit driving is misguided at best. The people who are going to buy these condos have cars already. Limiting the spots will not change that. They will simply seek parking in the surrounding neighborhoods and in doing so make their problem a communal problem. If you have any doubt that limiting spots doesn't correlate at all to limiting cars, just look at some of the other neighborhoods of the city (South Boston, North End, etc.). In summation, the BPDA should be attempting to hold developers to standards that protect the existing neighborhoods and not be granting unneeded zoning relief to big money developers, who in the end will walk away from all the problem or benefits of a project as soon as construction is complete. I recognize the need for housing in the city and I'm not objecting to the project in principle, but before I could support it I would ask that you please strongly consider addressing my parking concerns.
2/27/2018	thomas	browne	1974	Oppose	Investor.s just want to put condo's anywhere they want. I will be at every meeting fighting this. I was at the meeting last night. Your team did a traffic survey she said she was there at 3:00 pm traffic starts between 4-7 pm she had no clue we have cars coming up the wrong way on Old Morton st with 3 accidents and using quite streets as a cut threw . I brought up the question about the far right hand corner of the lot , you had no clue there was ledge ,slate and very large rocks. No answer Feel free to get back to me .Iwill not hold my breath on a reply
2/27/2018	thomas	browne	1974	Oppose	Investor.s just want to put condo's anywhere they want. I will be at every meeting fighting this. I was at the meeting last night. Your team did a traffic survey she said she was there at 3:00 pm traffic starts between 4-7 pm she had no clue we have cars coming up the wrong way on Old Morton st with 3 accidents and using quite streets as a cut threw . I brought up the question about the far right hand corner of the lot , you had no clue there was ledge ,slate and very large rocks. No answer Feel free to get back to me .Iwill not hold my breath on a reply
3/1/2018	Helen	McCarthy		Oppose	I attended the meeting on 2/26/18 at Carney Hospital. I know that something needs to be done with the properties at 1120-1132 Washington St. However, I do not believe that 57 units is the answer. The traffic is horrible right now and adding 60+ cars to the mix and to the neighborhood would be a disaster. A six story building will also be an eyesore to the dynamic to the neighborhood. Have they considered a more reasonable number of condos? A smaller building and more green space?? There needs to be a sufficient input from the abutters and the neighborhood. Sincerely, Helen C. McCarthy

3/1/2018	Marjorie	Goode		Oppose	I feel that to demolish 3 homes that have been part of the historic lower mills community would be loss to the neighborhood. This project should incorporate the three homes into it's development. The size of the project is to big, it should be scaled back to fit the community. The size now would be intrusive to the abutting residents, as casting shadows, and loss of privacy. I am also concerned about the construction phase of the project with regards to the surrounding homes and the impact the digging/blasting of ledge would have on their foundations. The parking planned for the residents and visitors to the site is not enough, which means that the overflow will go into the surrounding neighboring streets and burden the residents. Traffic is a problem now. I know you would like to believe that no one drives but they do and friends and family come to visit and stay over, where would they park? There are several projects being talked about or under construction in the lower mills area their impact should also be considered on the neighborhood. We should not keep letting developers come into the neighborhood and demolish homes to put up big box structures that do not enhance our historic lower mills neighborhood.
3/1/2018	Shamieh	Wall	1985	Oppose	57 units only 7 income restricted. 86 parking spaces. EIGHTY SIX! I thought the city of Boston was steering away from providing tons of parking in an effort to control costs and provide more affordable housing which this city desperately needs. This building doesn't need all of this parking. Lower Mills has a train station. Less parking MORE income restricted units. We dont need another unaffordable buiding going up in this city when there is such a need for affordable housing.

3/1/2018	Katherine	Keough		Oppose	<p>I am a direct abutter to this property and grew up at 1121 Washington Street until I bought my home in 1981 at 13 Richmond Street. The first time this property sold it was a sober house until the Civic Association stopped the illegal occupancy and they "could not make it profitable" and sold to the current owners. I have been a long standing member of the civic association and have been at every meeting regarding this property and have asked many times to meet with these owners with no response. I am very concerned with the plans for this site and these are my concerns. TRAFFIC. I currently have a driveway that I cannot use from 7-9am from 2-3 when school gets out and again from 4pm to 7. I have to park in the CVS because people are waiting past my house for the intersection of Washington, Morton, Richmond. I cannot get out of my driveway nor do the people let me. There is gridlock at all intersections in the neighborhood at the above times and this proposed building would have an impact on the already terrible traffic. The beeping which starts at 7am is constant and is understandable with the frustration of approx 4cars getting through a light every 4th turn. There is also a safety issue with emergency vehicles not being able to get down RichmondStreet when people park past the library and the street becomes a one lane street. No one wants to let the other person go and I have personally witnessed fist fights right in traffic. Even one more car is too many. OVER DEVELOPMENT- There are many Condos under development, Ashmont Station, Boston Home, Adams Street, RiverStreet, and we don't need another 57 units. If these condos aren't sold then what happens rentals? Renters don't have the same investment in a neighborhood as an owner. STYLE- the development is very modern and does not fit the Victorian style of the street and surrounding neighborhood. PRIVACY and SUNLIGHT- I have enjoyed planting a beautiful garden around the whole perimeter of my yard and under my kitchen window. As you know a garden needs sun to survive and this building would probably cost me most of that sunlight. I also stand to lose most of my privacy as I will be opening my back door to a 4 or 6 story building that will have a balcony with each unit. That is 28 balconies that will be looking directly into my backyard. I always knew that someone would develop this property if they bought it but I have concerns that I must lose all I have enjoyed for 37 years because "we have to build that big to make it profitable". Which was said approx 1 year ago at the civic meeting. UNTRUTHS- 1. The owners met with the abutter, untrue. I have asked multiple times with no response. 2. They have tested the blasting of the ledge, then 5 minutes later, no we are going to test the blasting. 3. There would be no impact on traffic, untrue. Tom Mastrois tested every fact the traffic consultant said and the results were very suspect. 4. The building would keep with the style of the neighborhood, untrue. The building is modern and the neighborhood is Victorian and gable styled. 5. They didn't know the cost of the units, untrue. At the civic meeting it was told to the attendees that they would be 800 square feet starting at 489,000 I talked to the lawyer after the meeting and requested again a meeting with the owners, again the lawyer promised to call me but I have not heard a word which only reinforces the belief that they do not care about the neighborhood or their neighbors. I will continue to attend the civic meetings and keep a close eye on this development that has a direct impact on my quality of life. I also would ask that you put yourselves in my shoes and take a really close look at my concerns. There has to be more focus on community and neighborhood and less on "profit" which it seems all these owners really want. I invested in this community when everyone was fleeing and I have never regretted it. I will also say it is so sad ever time I hear them say Malloy's because Mr Malloy so loved this neighborhood, he would hate to see what has happened to his legacy. Thank you, Kitty Keough</p>
3/6/2018	Mary	Coyle		Oppose	<p>Hi. I was at the meeting at the Carney Hospital last Monday (February 26) at which there were numerous valid concerns and complaints. What they are proposing is far too big for our neighborhood. Traffic is already horrible on Adams with cars heading towards Lower Mills. I understand that the property will have something there but there must be some type of compromise. Fifty-seven is just too much.</p>

3/6/2018	Mary	Coyle		Oppose	Hi. I was at the meeting at the Carney Hospital last Monday (February 26) at which there were numerous valid concerns and complaints. What they are proposing is far too big for our neighborhood. Traffic is already horrible on Adams with cars heading towards Lower Mills. I understand that the property will have something there but there must be some type of compromise. Fifty-seven is just too much.
----------	------	-------	--	--------	--