



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

in regards to 3200 washington street

1 message

Bonnie Rovics <zenmassage@gmail.com>
To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Thu, Apr 2, 2015 at 12:07 PM

Dear Edward,

Thank you for hosting the public meeting last night. While I am in support of dense housing, transit friendly apartments, and okay with tall buildings, especially on washington street. My concerns are two fold, one is that I do not feel like the developers have achieved 25% or more "real" affordable housing, meaning both basing on Boston's median income, African and Latino median income in this region being even lower than Boston, a unit measurement for affordable housing that is real to the units in the apartment buildings and not partially based on a house they do not have ownership of yet, and takes into account the actual crisis and the neighborhood they wish to build in. The developers keep quoting other projects, many of which we are all aware are not in lower income and disparate neighborhoods in a housing crisis. If they want to build in Egleston they should address the actuality of Egleston.

My largest concern is what the other 65 units will be rented at, are they striving for the highest market rate? is there any commitment to something relatively affordable? Are those units going to attract a whole new level of upper middle class gentrifiers? who are the renters we're looking at? I'd love to see some numbers on expectations and a commitment to something within reason for JP residents to consider renting.

thank you

Bonnie Rovics

--

Bonnie Rovics, OBT/LMT
Deep Touch Massage and BodyPlayWorkshops
www.DeepTouchMassage.com



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.

3 messages

Tue, Mar 31, 2015 at 3:38 PM

no-reply@boston.gov <no-reply@boston.gov>
To: BRAWebContent@cityofboston.gov, Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 281

Form inserted: 3/30/2015 8:37:46 PM

Form updated: 3/30/2015 8:37:46 PM

Document Name: 3200 Washington St.

Document Name Path: /Development/Development Projects/3200 Washington St.

Origin Page Url: /projects/development-projects/3200-washington-st

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Wood

Organization:

Email: Jennowood@gmail.com

Street Address: 11 Olmstead St., #1

Address Line 2:

City: Jamaica Plain

State: MA

Phone: (978) 879-7029

Zip: 02130

Comments: I do not oppose this project fundamentally. Egleston Sq is changing just as is JP. However especially after this winter, I am very concerned about parking. The proposed 36 spaces for 76 units is disrespectful of current and future residents. I suggest that the developers prove where these additional cars will park. Given Boston's transit system it is probable that the vast majority of these units will have at least one car each, let alone visitors to the retail establishments. I emlore of you to consider requiring additional parking at least one spot per unit. Maybe one day Boston will become a car-less city but that day has not yet come. Thank you for your consideration. Jennifer Wood

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

no-reply@boston.gov <no-reply@boston.gov>
To: BRAWebContent@cityofboston.gov, Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Tue, Mar 31, 2015 at 3:38 PM

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 280

**Boston Water and
Sewer Commission**



980 Harrison Avenue
Boston, MA 02119-2540
617-989-7000

March 12, 2015

Mr. Edward McGuire, Project Manager
Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston City Hall, 9th Floor
Boston, MA. 02210

Re: 3200 Washington Street, Jamaica Plain
Project Notification Form

Dear Mr. McGuire:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (Commission) has reviewed the Project Notification Form (PNF) for the proposed redevelopment project located at 3200 Washington Street in Jamaica Plain. This letter provides the Commission's comments on the ENF.

The proposed project site is a 32,412 square foot parcel of land with two structures. One building is a vacant two-story structure formerly occupied by a plumbing supply company with a single-story attached garage. The other building is a one-story automobile repair shop.

The project proposed by 3190 Washington Street LLC and Exchange Authority LLC (WSEA), involves demolition of the existing structures and construction of a 100,000 square foot mixed use residential/retail development consisting of a 76 residential units with 5,364 sf. of street level retail space. On-site parking for 33 cars will be provided in an underground parking garage. The development will consist of three buildings with two buildings on Washington Street and one on Iffley Road. The two buildings on Washington Street will each be six-stories high. The building on Iffley Road will be a three-story building with three townhouses and dedicated on-site parking for three additional cars.

For water service, the site is served by a 12-inch water main in Montebello Road, an 8-inch water main in Washington Street and an 8-inch water main in Iffley Road. The water mains in Washington Street and Iffley Road were installed in 2003. The water main in Montebello Road was originally installed in 1900 and was cleaned and cement lined in 2005. All of the water mains are served by the Commission's Southern High pressure zone.

For sewer and storm drain service, the site is served by a 10-inch sanitary sewer and a 12-inch storm drain in Montebello Road. Washington Street has a 15-inch storm drain and a 15-inch sanitary sewer and Iffley Road has a 10-inch sanitary sewer and a 12-inch storm drain.



The PNF states that wastewater generation for the proposed project will be 21,820 gallons per day (gpd) and water demand is estimate to be 24,000 gpd.

General

1. Prior to demolition of any buildings, all water, sewer and storm drain connections to the buildings must be cut and capped at the main pipe in accordance with the Commission's requirements. The proponent must then complete a Termination Verification Approval Form for a Demolition Permit, available from the Commission and submit the completed form to the City of Boston's Inspectional Services Department before a demolition permit will be issued.
2. All new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at WSEA's expense. They must be designed and constructed in conformance with the Commission's design standards, Water Distribution System and Sewer Use Regulations, and Requirements for Site Plans. To assure compliance with the Commission's requirements, the proponent must submit a site plan and a General Service Application to the Commission's Engineering Customer Service Department for review and approval when the design of the new water and wastewater systems and the proposed service connections to those systems are 50 percent complete. The site plan should include the locations of new, relocated and existing water mains, sewers and drains which serve the site, proposed service connections as well as water meter locations.
3. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in cooperation with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority and its member communities, are implementing a coordinated approach to flow control in the MWRA regional wastewater system, particularly the removal of extraneous clean water (e.g., infiltration/ inflow (I/I)) in the system. In April of 2014, the Massachusetts DEP promulgated new regulations regarding wastewater. The Commission has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for its combined sewer overflows and is subject to these new regulations [314 CMR 12.00, section 12.04(2)(d)]. This section requires all new sewer connections with design flows exceeding 15,000 gpd to mitigate the impacts of the development by removing four gallons of infiltration and inflow (I/I) for each new gallon of wastewater flow. In this regard, any new connection or expansion of an existing connection that exceeds 15,000 gallons per day of wastewater shall assist in the I/I reduction effort to ensure that the additional wastewater flows are offset by the removal of I/I. Currently, a minimum ration of 4:1 for I/I removal to new wastewater flow added. The Commission supports the policy, and will require proponent to develop a consistent inflow reduction plan. The 4:1 requirement should be addressed at least 90 days prior to activation of water service and will be based on the estimated sewage generation provided on the project site plan.



4. The design of the project should comply with the City of Boston's Complete Streets Initiative, which requires incorporation of "green infrastructure" into street designs. Green infrastructure includes greenscapes, such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other landscape plantings, as well as rain gardens and vegetative swales, infiltration basins, and paving materials and permeable surfaces. The proponent must develop a maintenance plan for the proposed green infrastructure. For more information on the Complete Streets Initiative see the City's website at <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>
5. WSEA should be aware that the US Environmental Protection Agency issued a draft Remediation General Permit (RGP) for Groundwater Remediation, Contaminated Construction Dewatering, and Miscellaneous Surface Water Discharges. If groundwater contaminated with petroleum products, for example, is encountered, WSEA will be required to apply for a RGP to cover these discharges.
6. The Commission will require WSEA to undertake all necessary precautions to prevent damage or disruption of the existing active water and sewer lines on or adjacent to the project site during construction. As a condition of the site plan approval, the Commission will require WSEA to inspect the existing sewer lines on site by CCTV after site construction is complete, to confirm that the lines were not damaged from construction activity.
7. It is WSEA's responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site to determine if the systems are adequate to meet future project demands. With the site plan, WSEA must include a detailed capacity analysis for the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site, as well as an analysis of the impacts the proposed project will have on the Commission's water, sewer and storm drainage systems.

Water

1. WSEA must provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, commercial, industrial, irrigation of landscaped areas, and air-conditioning make-up water for the project with the site plan. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. WSEA should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.
2. WSEA should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular, WSEA should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If WSEA plans to install in-ground sprinkler systems, the Commission recommends that timers,



soil moisture indicators and rainfall sensors be installed. The use of sensor-operated faucets and toilets in common areas of buildings should be considered.

3. WSEA is required to obtain a Hydrant Permit for use of any hydrant during the construction phase of this project. The water used from the hydrant must be metered. WSEA should contact the Commission's Meter Department for information on and to obtain a Hydrant Permit.
4. The Commission is utilizing a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. For new water meters, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, WSEA should contact the Commission's Meter Department.

Sewage / Drainage

1. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Nutrients has been established for the Lower Charles River Watershed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). In order to achieve the reductions in Phosphorus loading required by the TMDL, phosphorus concentrations in the lower Charles River from Boston must be reduced by 64%. To accomplish the necessary reductions in phosphorus, the Commission is requiring developers in the lower Charles River watershed to infiltrate stormwater discharging from impervious areas in compliance with MassDEP. WSEA will be required to submit with the site plan a phosphorus reduction plan for the proposed development. WSEA must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.

In conjunction with the Site Plan and the General Service Application the WSEA will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:

- Identify best management practices for controlling erosion and for preventing the discharge of sediment and contaminated groundwater or stormwater runoff to the Commission's drainage system when the construction is underway.
- Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control or treatment structures to be utilized during construction.



- Provide a stormwater management plan in compliance with the DEP standards mentioned above. The plan should include a description of the measures to control pollutants after construction is completed.
2. The Commission encourages WSEA to explore additional opportunities for protecting stormwater quality on site by minimizing sanding and the use of deicing chemicals, pesticides, and fertilizers.
 3. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission. WSEA is advised that the discharge of any dewatering drainage to the storm drainage system requires a Drainage Discharge Permit from the Commission. If the dewatering drainage is contaminated with petroleum products, WSEA will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the discharge.
 4. WSEA must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.
 5. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) established Stormwater Management Standards. The standards address water quality water quantity and recharge. In addition to Commission standards, WSEA will be required to meet MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards.
 6. Sanitary sewage must be kept separate from stormwater and separate sanitary sewer and storm drain service connections must be provided. The Commission requires that existing stormwater and sanitary sewer service connections, which are to be re-used by the proposed project, be dye tested to confirm they are connected to the appropriate system.
 7. The Commission requests that WSEA install a permanent casting stating "Don't Dump: Drains to Charles River" next to any catch basin created or modified as part of this project. WSEA should contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.
 8. The PNF states that a restaurant will be a component of the project, grease traps will be required in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. WSEA is advised to consult with the Commission's Operations Department with regards to grease traps.



9. The enclosed floors of a parking garage must drain through oil separators into the sewer system in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. The Commission's Requirements for Site Plans, available by contacting the Engineering Services Department, include requirements for separators.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,

John P. Sullivan, P.E.
Chief Engineer

JPS/RJA

cc: J. Hanley, McDermott, Quilty & Miller, LLP
M. Zlody, BED via e-mail
P. Larocque, BWSC



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.2 messages

no-reply@boston.gov <no-reply@boston.gov>

Wed, Apr 1, 2015 at 3:50 PM

To: BRAWebContent@cityofboston.gov, Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 321

Form inserted: 4/1/2015 3:50:20 PM

Form updated: 4/1/2015 3:50:20 PM

Document Name: 3200 Washington St.

Document Name Path: /Development/Development Projects/3200 Washington St.

Origin Page Url: /projects/development-projects/3200-washington-st

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Herot

Organization:

Email: eric.bra@herot.com

Street Address: 155 AMORY ST # 3

Address Line 2:

City: ROXBURY

State: MA

Phone: (617) 645-0538

Zip: 02119

Comments: If we, as a community, really care about affordability, we must always consider the costs of our requests to developers. These costs have a significant impact on the overall cost of housing in our neighborhood. In light of this, I wanted to explore how parking will affect the cost of this particular development. My theory is that parking in the neighborhood around 3200 Washington is actually too plentiful already to justify the cost of displacing potential housing units in order to build more of it. Partly this is because parking on the street is free and unregulated across most of JP, and partly it is because the total number of existing on and off-street spaces in the neighborhood already exceeds the total number of cars in the neighborhood. Here are some numbers that should support this theory: Neighborhood Data: - Average housing value in JP: \$385/sq-ft This Development: - New parking spaces proposed: 36 - Average space consumed per space (including ramps and lanes): 290 sqft - Expected parking rental rate: \$75-100/month - Final cost of the new development: \$20m The Math: - 290 sq-ft of housing in JP is worth, on average, about \$111,650 (or \$528/month @ 3.92% over 30 years) - If \$100/month were a mortgage payment, over 30 years its value would be \$21,250 - This works out to a lost "opportunity cost" of about \$90,400 per parking space. - 36 spaces x \$90,400 per space = \$3.25m, or 16.3% of the \$20m project cost Caveats: - The housing price estimate is for JP and may not be indicative of 3200 Washington - The estimate also doesn't account for weather or not the space includes covered off-street parking on site. This may cancel out differences due to location. - In order to actually replace the garage, this housing would need to be "garden level" which would also depress its value. - 290 sq-ft per space accounts for all area

4/13/2015

City of Boston Mail - Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.

required, but the price of housing doesn't account for common areas. That said, most garages use more space for moving the cars around than for actually storing them. Conclusion: Cont'd...

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

no-reply@boston.gov <no-reply@boston.gov>

Wed, Apr 1, 2015 at 3:51 PM

To: BRAWebContent@cityofboston.gov, Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 322

Form inserted: 4/1/2015 3:51:23 PM

Form updated: 4/1/2015 3:51:23 PM

Document Name: 3200 Washington St.

Document Name Path: /Development/Development Projects/3200 Washington St.

Origin Page Url: /projects/development-projects/3200-washington-st

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Herot

Organization:

Email: eric.bra@herot.com

Street Address: 155 AMORY ST # 3

Address Line 2:

City: ROXBURY

State: MA

Phone: (617) 645-0538

Zip: 02119

Comments: ...Cont'd JP has a housing shortage, not a parking shortage. The extremely low rental value of private parking in this neighborhood makes it one of the least valued land uses other than simply allowing weeds to grow in a field. This low value (especially compared to housing) implies low demand. We should not be requiring developers to build for a demand that simply does not exist, especially in lieu of building more housing. Additionally, the street parking shortage will actually not be addressed by building more covered parking because there is no incentive to pay to park in the garage as long as on-street parking is free and easy to find. Most importantly, requiring the developer to build this parking--which will sell for very little because it must compete with the free parking--comes at a significant cost. By my estimate, requiring parking on this site means that units which would have cost \$418,000 will now cost \$500,000. In short, assuming that eliminating the parking garage allowed for an additional story of living space to be built, we could save every new buyer in this building an average of \$80,000 by allowing them to use the existing parking resources in the neighborhood. Thank you for taking the time to consider this.

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Redevelopment Roxbury

1 message

Claudia <claudia.nosuperman@gmail.com>
To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Mon, Apr 13, 2015 at 8:27 PM

My name is Claudia and I've been a resident of Jamaica Plain for two years. While I am a resident of Jamaica Plain, this letter is addressing my neighbors in Roxbury.

Right now I'm really concerned about the housing developments that are proposed to come into Roxbury. The 76 unit will only accommodate about 11 individuals for low income housing. Low income housing is 60,000 for these developments. The Boston Public Health Commission reported that in 2010 Roxbury was primarily comprised of female head of household families with children younger than 18 totaling 51% these families are below the poverty line and 1/4 of the population has less than a high diploma in Roxbury. While there are those who have degrees this only reflects 1/4 of the population. More mixed income housing needs to be created and it needs to reflect the income of the neighborhood, 60,000 does not reflect that.

I am urging you to please keep these concerns in mind as you make decisions that will impact the families here. I have also reached out to my Senator -- Sonia Chang-Diaz about my concerns and I hope to attend future meetings.

Sincerely yours,
Claudia

--

TO: Ed McGuire, Project Assistant, Boston Redevelopment Authority
FROM: Executive Committee, Egleston Square Neighborhood Association
DATE: April 30, 2015
RE: 3200 Washington Street, Article 80 Large Project Review

This is an informational letter to the BRA to share general feedback expressed in meetings sponsored by the Egleston Square Neighborhood Association (ESNA) regarding the proposed development of 3200 Washington Street.

The mission of ESNA is to improve and strengthen Egleston Square as a stable neighborhood that is economically and racially diverse. ESNA provides a forum through which residents may focus attention on issues concerning the community. Specifically, ESNA's goals are to promote sound social and economic growth, provide a healthy physical environment with safe and attractive streets, and access to affordable housing. We also strive to support the youth and elderly.

Members of ESNA's Housing Committee and the joint ESNA/Egleston Square Main Street Economic Development Committee have been following and discussing the proposed development of 3200 Washington Street since last summer. The proponents made a presentation about the project at a well-attended ESNA meeting in July, and the ESNA committees met with the proponents of the development on multiple occasions since that time and provided numerous questions and comments about the project. Each month, the Housing Committee reported on the status of the project at the ESNA general meetings. At the last two monthly meetings, we devoted a significant portion of the agenda to community discussions regarding 3200 Washington Street. ESNA, with the help of neighborhood and block associations, also helped outreach to residents for the IAG meeting held in February 2015 at the Brookside Community Health Center and the well-attended BRA Article 80 public meeting on April 1.

These meetings generated much discussion and sharing of information. Discussions were often intense and passionate, which speaks to the controversial aspects of this development.

There were many viewpoints on whether or not the proposal should be modified, as well as on the extent of the modifications that should be adopted. Given the lack of a predominate viewpoint on the development as a whole, the ESNA membership was unable to support a particular position.

Rather than forego the opportunity to present a recommendation to the BRA, ESNA's Executive Committee is submitting this letter to outline the varied sense and tone of the information gathered at our community meetings.

These topics were the major points of discussion:

Key Design Concerns

Some residents supported the originally-proposed building height and found the number of proposed units reasonable. Other residents believed that this project is too high and too dense for our neighborhood, which consists mainly of 2, 3, and 4 story structures.

In our meetings, the proposed height and density of the project was often linked to maintaining the level of affordability offered by the developers. As a result, many felt there was not sufficient discussion about height and density for this project. Other design issues normally discussed with a developer were also overlooked.

We do acknowledge that the developer has made substantive changes to the project since it was first presented to the community, including a reconfiguration of the garage entrance and exit (an idea that was first suggested by community members at the July ESNA meeting), as well as a redesign of the sixth floor and mezzanine of Building B, to help address concerns about visual impact. Nevertheless, many neighbors feel that these changes do not go far enough.

Affordability Concerns

There was strong opinion in support of affordable housing in this development. Opinions ranged from those who want 100% affordable units to those who want the developers to meet 25% affordability. Others wanted a specific number of affordable units.

Discussions regarding the number of affordable units comprised a significant part of every meeting. There was considerable conversation

regarding the possible direct and indirect impact of displacement of long-time Egleston residents and businesses that might result from this proposed development. Some residents felt that the provision of new market rate rental units is an important strategy to help meet growing demand and to address the loss of rental units in Jamaica Plain over the past two decades. Others felt that the rents likely to be charged by the developers would prompt owners of existing rental units to ask more for those units, making the neighborhood less affordable.

Renovation of 52 Montebello Road (6 units)

Some ESNA community residents supported the developers' plan to submit an application to the Dept. of Neighborhood Development (DND) to renovate these 6 affordable units. Many of these individuals support the developers' proposal to count these 6 units as part of their commitment to the project's affordability offering. Others believed that, given the size of the project and the need for affordable housing in the Egleston area, the counting of these 6 units should be excluded from the developers' affordable housing total.

There was general consensus that the developers should provide a back-up plan for their affordability proposal in case they do not obtain rights to renovate the 52 Montebello Road property.

Traffic & Parking

It is ESNA's hope that the City will implement an updated traffic study for Egleston Square and the Washington Street corridor that incorporates anticipated new construction and possible increased traffic congestion.

Clearly, there will be an impact on traffic and parking in our area with this proposal. For some, this is the price one pays for a new housing development. For others, this represents a lack of sufficient urban planning for an already densely-populated neighborhood. The ESNA/ESMS Economic Development Committee reviewed the proponent's transportation demand management program and suggested that it could be strengthened by providing an annual alternative transportation subsidy (versus a one-time Charlie Card); by providing two guaranteed spaces to Zipcar or another car-sharing company; and by ensuring direct lobby access for both bike rooms.

Environmental Concerns

Egleston residents respectfully request to be informed and involved in the resolution of environmental issues before, during, and after the construction phase. Residents have requested that Memoranda of Understanding be established between residents and the developers regarding environmental and construction issues.

Master Plan for the Washington Street Corridor

There is strong opinion in favor of a comprehensive planning effort by the City to address zoning, housing, and transportation for the neighborhood. In light of the many new developments anticipated for the Washington Street corridor, residents strongly believe it is especially important to have a unified plan for the area. The lack of any modern framework to manage the change coming to Washington Street puts every resident in a reactive position when new development is proposed. There is no shared foundation of facts which we can reference, there is no reliable explanation of how individual developments may or may not relate to neighborhood goals and broader citywide plans, and the conversations are imbued with fear about how the neighborhood is changing instead of hope for achieving a shared vision. Instead of standing on common ground, we are struggling to speak the same language.

It is also essential that planning efforts engage the entire diverse community -- renters and owners, merchants and shoppers, native born and immigrant, old and young, and people of different races and economic backgrounds. Having a Master Plan reassures everyone involved that both neighborhood goals and broader citywide plans are being adhered to. We ask the BRA to move quickly on the planning process itself and to follow it quickly with implementation of new zoning and transportation improvements so that we can move beyond the current development review process, whose main products are neighborhood discord and project delay, to a more rational and predictable process for growing opportunity in our community. Since before Mayor Walsh's inauguration, Egleston Square community groups have been advocating for such a plan; we have been promised it is forthcoming, yet here we fifteen months into the administration and there is no clear movement to make it a reality.

Preventing Displacement

When new developments occur, we all must ask "What can we do to protect the existing community?" This is a question for cities everywhere, this was a question often asked in our meetings. This is an issue for the

community, for the BRA, and for the City to contend with. Some business and property owners see 3200 Washington Street as having a positive effect on their business and property; and some residents see this project as an important example of how to achieve the ambitious goals set forth by Mayor Walsh's Housing Plan released last year. Some others -- homeowners and tenants alike -- believed that the quantity of affordably-priced housing, already low, will further diminish as a result of this proposed development. They expressed concern about the ability of long-term residents of the Egleston area to remain living here.

Finally, ESNA members support improving housing conditions in Egleston Square. In addition, residents strongly agree that the Economy Plumbing site should be developed. At the same time, our organization wants to maintain the diversity of our neighborhood and support development structures that complement it.

As indicated by this letter, there is a mix of viewpoints about this proposed development in our community. We trust that the BRA will consider these issues when reviewing the 3200 Washington Street project.

We have also encouraged all our members and neighbors to submit individual comments to the BRA.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for taking these comments into consideration as you contemplate this development.

Sincerely,

ESNA Executive Committee Members:



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

I oppose the 3200 Washington St development as proposed

1 message

Benji Mauer <benmauer@gmail.com>

Fri, May 1, 2015 at 9:08 PM

To: "Edward.McGuire@boston.gov" <Edward.McGuire@boston.gov>
Cc: "matthew.omalley@boston.gov" <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, "Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov" <Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov>, "TJackson@boston.gov" <TJackson@boston.gov>, "Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov" <Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov>, "Jeffrey.sanchez@mahouse.gov" <Jeffrey.sanchez@mahouse.gov>, "Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov" <Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov>

Hi there,

I'm Ben Mauer. I live at 190 Green St just a couple blocks from the proposed development at 3200 Washington St. I've lived here for the past 4 years and in JP for the past 13. I strongly oppose the development as its currently proposed.

Egleston Square has its own rhythm and culture. It's truly one of the most unique commercial and residential area in the entire city. It has a powerful history, bopping barber shops and great food at prices that real people can afford.

The development as proposed flies in the face of that vibrancy, community spirit and affordability. The neighborhood council recommends 25% of a development be affordable. The developer isn't offering anything near that, and refuses to commit in writing to develop the property at 52 Montebello Rd. On top of that, they did not support a just cause eviction ordinance, even though it would help mitigate the inevitable displacement that would arise due to speculation.

And so I would not support this development unless:

1. The developer commits to 25% affordable housing at 50% of the Boston Median Income at 3200
2. A written agreement to develop 52 Montebello, with a backup of building an equivalent number of affordable units at 3200 if 52 does not work out
3. A continuation of the community process until September including monthly public meetings and an extension of the public comment period.

I urge you to stand with Egleston Square require these reasonable modifications to their proposal before approving it.

Ben Mauer