



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Development at 3200 Washington St., JP

1 message

Jesse Leavitt <jessedleavitt@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 15, 2015 at 12:13 PM

To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Cc: matthew.omalley@boston.gov, Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov, TJackson@boston.gov, Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov, Jeffrey.sanchez@mahouse.gov, Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov

Dear Mr. McGuire,

Please see my comments below about the Arborview development proposal at 3200 Washington St., Jamaica Plain. I am a resident on Glade Avenue in Jamaica Plain and would like to see the family-oriented, multicultural nature of our neighborhood not deteriorate any further, rents not increase to the point of seeing people leave, and a strategic plan to increase the vibrant, unique cross-class community on this side of Washington St., in JP and Roxbury.

Though demands for deeply affordable housing in all units is unreasonable to ask of any developer, I do believe it's time to take a stand and say "Boston is not for sale to the highest bidder!" The BRA, according to some people who I have talked to who know better than I, has not built the trust of some Boston communities. It's time to set a new precedent, and the BRA is in a position to do this on a broad scale and will have community support - rather than simply saying this is the best we can do in the system that has existed (and oppressed marginalized people) for years.

Thank you for reading:

- **Community process until a strategic plan for neighborhood development** meets the needs of the community holistically, including respect for those who have lived there to be able to stay there and design consistent with family-centric neighborhoods. This should span from the Casey Overpass to MLK Blvd along Washington St. Ownership and decision-making by community residents should be prioritized in policy.
- If it must go forward sooner for reasons that should be made clear to the public:
 - **Increase affordable units from 11 to 19 on-site** at 3200 Washington St. This is reasonable within the framework of the
 - The affordable units at 3200 Washington should be defined by variable levels of Boston Median Income (not Area Median Income) that **average out to below 50% of BMI**, allowing for some to be higher and some to be lower, welcoming a range of residents.
 - **Increase # of 2+ bedroom units** for rent and for sale by decreasing # of 1-bedroom units. Offset losses by seeking family and low-income tax credits and first-time homebuyer partnerships (NACA would have residents supported for 10 years).
 - Explore and share financial feasibility of underground parking, and reduce # of spots that are not handicapped accessible. Increase green space to match the general neighborhood that has trees between almost every triple-decker.
 - **Leave 52 Montebello as a separate bid, and prioritize a non-profit developer or community coalition** to make all units affordable (using low-income tax credit as part of a bigger non-profit development package within the strategy of neighborhood development. It should not count as part of the affordable units at 3200.
 - **Just cause eviction laws.** Developers support just cause eviction laws in writing.
 - **Construction workers** should be 51% people of color, 15% women, prioritizing local residents to the project in addition to Boston residents.

Jesse Leavitt
7 Glade Ave #1
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

4/15/2015

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

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 353

Form inserted: 4/14/2015 11:39:51 AM

Form updated: 4/14/2015 11:39:51 AM

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: Priscilla

Last Name: Ellis

Organization:

Email: prillellis@gmail.com

Street Address: 16 Olmstead Street

Address Line 2:

City: Jamaica Plain

State: MA

Phone: (617) 522-5552

Zip: 02130

Comments: As a resident of the Egleston Square/Parkside neighborhood since 1978, I have seen big changes come to the community. Three deckers have been condo-ized, encouraging more affluent single people and families to move in. At the same time, long-standing residents have remained, committed to the diversity of the neighborhood. We want to protect and maintain this diversity, and to that end we ask the developers to: 1. commit 25% of the proposed development at 3200 Washington St to affordable units (This % would NOT include the proposed Montebello Road project.) 2. continue to work with the community and agencies like JPNDC, Urban Edge, City Life, and others, to coordinate efforts to expand affordable housing opportunities and a thoughtful master plan for the Egleston neighborhood. 3. use whatever architectural means necessary to reduce the "canyon effect" of tall buildings along the Washington Street corridor. Finally, we hope that the BRA will take seriously the input of residents and support responsible development in our neighborhoods - development for all, not just the wealthy and those to stand to gain from the profits of developers. Thank you for your attention.
Priscilla Ellis

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

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

Tue, Apr 14, 2015 at 3:09 PM

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 354

Form inserted: 4/14/2015 3:09:19 PM

Form updated: 4/14/2015 3:09:19 PM

Document Name: 3200 Washington St.

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



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Feedback on 3200 Washington Street Development

1 message

Wed, Apr 15, 2015 at 11:46 AM

Paola Faoro <PFaoro@agero.com>

To: "edward.mcguire@boston.gov" <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Cc: Remigio Picone <remigio_picone@dfci.harvard.edu>, sue pranger <granadagarden20@gmail.com>

Dear Mr. McGuire

I write on behalf of me and my husband who live on 5 Chilcott Place, regarding the proposed development for the Economy Plumbing site at 3200 Washington Street.

We write this letter to express our concerns regarding this project, mostly relating to:

1. SCALE

Because there is not a clear master plan for this area, allowing a project of this scale to happen would open a precedent for other investors and speculators to start buying lots and replicating other projects of similar scale in the area, without the provision of the necessary urban infra-structure.

2. HEIGHT

The designers are using the storage building as an excuse to propose a building that is completely out of scale for the area. They keep saying it's a 6-story building, but the definition is very unclear as the 6th floor is a mezzanine, so the final height will be more likely a 7-story building. We believe this height to be completely disproportionate to the character of the area, and — again, without a clear master plan we are concerned developers will feel they can build whatever they want, and this will completely transform the neighborhood for worse. If we allow this first to happen, it will be difficult or almost impossible to stop future initiatives.

3. PARKING

The question of scale and height leads us with a huge problem that is parking. Parking is ALREADY a current problem of the area, and I'm not sure how building a new building with less parking spots than units + a restaurant, are going to do any good for the area.

In summary, we live in JP, we love this neighborhood and we want to see it thrive and improve. However, we think that before any such buildings are discussed/approved, we need to have a master plan for the area, which will give us all a clear vision of how we want our neighborhood to develop and grow.

We appreciate the opportunity to send our feedback to this project and will look forward to hear about the next steps.

Best,
Paola

Confidentiality Note: This e-mail message and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by replying to this message and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.

4/13/2015

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

Form inserted: 3/30/2015 8:25:41 PM

Form updated: 3/30/2015 8:25:41 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: Abraham

Last Name: Landau

Organization:

Email: Abraham.landau1@gmail.com

Street Address: 101 Montebello rd #1

Address Line 2:

City: Jamaica plain

State: MA

Phone: (617) 939-6427

Zip: 02130

Comments: This project does not have adequate parking based on the number of units and retail space. It is going to cause a major bourdon on the community.

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: 279

Form inserted: 3/30/2015 8:19:02 PM

Form updated: 3/30/2015 8:19:02 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: Paul

Last Name: Wood

Organization:

Email: Pwood@paulwoodlaw.com

Street Address: 11 Olmstead St.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Comments on 3200 Washington Street, Jamaica Plain

1 message

Mon, Apr 13, 2015 at 12:40 PM

nhavelka@comcast.net <nhavelka@comcast.net>

To: edward.mcguire@boston.gov

Cc: Jullieanne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov, matthew.omalley@boston.gov, hannah.smith@boston.gov,

liz.malia@mahouse.gov, Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov

Dear Mr McGuire,

As a homeowner on Iffley Road for more than 10 years, I cannot support the project proposed at 3200 Washington Street, the site of the former Economy Plumbing company, the current E&J Auto, and the garages on Iffley Road. The proposed project is just too big for this location and does not return enough benefit to this neighborhood.

True, everyone welcomes the redevelopment of unoccupied and underutilized buildings and agrees that the garages on Iffley Road are a safety concern as well as an eye-sore. Also true, we must plan for enough affordable housing to stay the displacement of the people who live in the neighborhood now, especially since this neighborhood has become such a hot development prospect. On the plus side, this proposed development puts the site to use, provides new retail/commercial space along the Washington corridor, and brings 11 affordable rental units. The developers have also proposed a simultaneous plan to rehab the adjacent 6-unit building at 52 Montebello and turn it over to JPNDC or Urban Edge as affordable rental housing.

However, the proposed development is, I believe, not appropriate to this neighborhood and will likely be detrimental for several reasons.

Height At more than 70 feet, the proposed towers are more than twice as high as Washington Street is wide and also twice the height of the other predominantly three story buildings along Washington Street between Forest Hills and Egleston Square. Iffley Road is the back side of this development and the experience from here is especially dark and unpleasant. The proposed buildings tower between Iffley Road and the rest of JP to the west and south, cutting us off visually and figuratively. It's a shame that the developers did not meet with the Iffley/Chilcott neighborhood much earlier, before designing a massive tower in our faces.

Other 4-story buildings are in development on other underused parcels along Washington Street and one 5-story building is in process near Forest Hills. A new building of the height and density of 3200 Washington might be appropriate at Forest Hills or Jackson Square or even on Columbus Avenue or the Southeast Corridor where streets are wider and housing is not contiguous, but not here.

The developers refer to the height of the old Franklin Brewery building across the street (now Extra Space Storage) but not to its uniqueness, interesting architectural details or history. In my opinion, any comparison to this historic, handsome, and outstandingly huge remnant of the neighborhood's industrial past is not relevant. This development must not set

a precedent for new buildings of this size along Washington Street.

Density With an FAR over 3.0, this building far exceeds the norm for this neighborhood and is comparable to only a couple of apartment buildings in the area. Those rival buildings stretch from one edge of their lots to the other with no open space or setback. This should not be replicated.

We would have 150 to 200 new neighbors on this small lot all of whom are, except for the 3 affordable units on Iffley, coming and going from a single entrance on Washington Street. It's mind boggling to realize that's as many people as currently live on all of Iffley Road. I fear that since the entrance faces Washington Street and most units are not affordable, it's likely that these new residents will not integrate with the neighborhood around them.

Density and height are not acceptable compromises for affordability. Other projects along the Washington corridor have proved feasible while providing as much or more affordable opportunities.

Parking The developers are proposing about 1 parking place per 2 apartments and no parking for the proposed restaurant and hardware store. There is already a parking crunch on these streets. Again, other current developments promise much more. What's more, we will be losing the garages on Iffley Road which have long been used by local residents and businesses for off-street parking, legally or not. Regardless of proposed bike racks on the sidewalk, a bike storage room for residents, and a zip car spot, it's disingenuous to think that people who can afford these apartments won't have cars and that people in affordable units won't need cars too. What business will look at a location with no on-street parking? And there will need to be a loading zone for any business and also for people coming and going from the towers, thus less parking on Washington Street itself. The impact on available parking will be huge and painful.

Open Space The developers tout their plan's open space but it's all private, either roadside space dedicated to the proposed restaurant or interior courtyard inaccessible to public. Their wide sidewalks on Washington are no wider than existing, and on Iffley the sidewalk is a minimal 6 feet. To their credit, they propose trees on Washington and vertical plantings on the the north side of the building. Yet, other proposed developments are proposing much more. This is not enough to mitigate the impact of such a large building in our midst.

Planning I recognize that this neighborhood is changing. Not only are the older folks who grew up and raised their families here moving on or being forced economically to move out but also the secret is out that this is a pretty safe and walkable neighborhood of a friendly scale and green surround. The pressures of gentrification are here. I believe it's important to thoughtfully introduce changes incrementally, not to shoehorn a massive change in one stroke when an opportunity presents. Besides 52 Montello there are 3 other properties on Washington within a block of this one being purchased by developers right now. It's very important and not too late to set a tone that does not destroy the reasons people wanted to live here in the first place.

Lastly, the 3200 Washington Street project must be unlinked from the 52 Montebello project. I fear that proponents are using the latter as a carrot for the former. We need both

4/13/2015

City of Boston Mail - Comments on 3200 Washington Street, Jamaica Plain

an affordable project at 52 Montebello Road and a less tall, less dense, and more affordable project at 3200 Washington Street.

We deserve a better proposal and a better project.

Sincerely,

Nancy Havelka
40 Iffley Road
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130
617 522-7899



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Concerns re: 3200 Washington St.

1 message

Sat, Feb 28, 2015 at 11:31 AM

Reva <rlevin@live.com>

To: "sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us" <sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us>

Cc: "jullianne.doherty@cityofboston.gov" <jullianne.doherty@cityofboston.gov>, "edward.mcguire@boston.gov" <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Dear Sonia,

I have just returned from a community meeting last night (Feb 25) re: the proposed development at 3200 Washington St. I live near the intersection of Washington and Forest Hills Streets in a residential neighborhood of triple deckers, private houses and small business stores. I am seriously disturbed by the large scale plans for this project and its rushed public input procedures.

In my opinion, it is way out of proportion for the neighborhood, will adversely impact parking in the area (which is already difficult), will further chase lower income people away from this neighborhood, and will add more Orange Line ridership into an already taxed system. I'm not opposed to developing the Economy Plumbing parcel. In fact, I welcome it. But I do oppose such a large project in a 2-3-4 story residential neighborhood.

It is clear that the Roxbury/JP Washington St. corridor is now a clear target for development. A reasonable idea would be to have a planning process that incorporates the whole corridor and not just approval/disapproval of individual projects. Don't you agree? That would mean slowing down the process to allow for better planning with more community buy-in.

Instead, 3200 Washington St. seems to be rushing toward a conclusion. For instance, I always read the Gazette but I don't recall learning about the Letter of Intent (apparently filed December 23, 2014) or a public call for participation in the neighborhood feedback group.

The 3200 Washington St. project says to me that we have runaway development without a rational process that would incorporate development needs as well as the long-term considered input of current residents.

One more thing: I understand that the IAG group was supposed to have 13 members and only has 9 active members. In a development as initially controversial as this one, these committee positions should all be filled. There are 3 vacancies and apparently one member who apparently now lives out of state.

City of Boston Mail - Concerns re: 3200 Washington St.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Reva Levin
14 Forest Hills St.
617.983.5972



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

BRA: 3200 Washington Street - Comments

4 messages

Fri, Mar 27, 2015 at 2:48 PM

Adam King <adam.michael.king@gmail.com>

To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Cc: Eglestonsquare@gmail.com, Julieanne.doherty@cityofboston.gov, matthew.omalley@cityofboston.gov

I attend the community meeting regarding the 3200 Washington Street plans. I currently live a few blocks away from the proposed project. I wanted to voice my concerns with the size of the project. If you are driving on the Casey Overpass (RIP), you will see that the Storage center across the street is by far one of the tallest buildings from JP all the way into Boston. It does not make sense, and does not fit with the neighborhood, to have such a monstrosity plopped down in this location. Additionally, the architect made absolutely no effort to blend the architecture in with the rest of Egleston or JP. I am all for new developments, but in 20 years we are going to look at this building and think it has the equivalent beauty of City Hall.

That being said, I would be supportive of a small development that looks more like the surrounding community. We strongly need more residential units in this neighborhood, and I think if the developers at least addressed the size and scale issues that many in the community have, we would welcome them moving forward on this project.

Finally, I want to say that I think it is ridiculous that Stephen Lussier was appointed to the Impact Advisory Group. He is a realtor with Arborview Realty, the agents of which are planning the 3200 Washington Street development! I think it is simply inappropriate and the clear conflict of interest should mitigate against taking his input into account.

Regards,
Adam King

59 Forest Hills St.
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130
617-899-0681

Additional information about this project is posted on the Boston Redevelopment Authority website at <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/projects/development-projects/3200-washington-st>

Fri, Mar 27, 2015 at 2:48 PM

Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

To: adam.michael.king@gmail.com

I will be away from my desk today.

--
Edward M. McGuire III

Project Assistant
Boston Redevelopment Authority
1 City Hall Ave | Ninth Floor | Boston, MA 02201
Office: (617) 918-4251

Fri, Mar 27, 2015 at 3:53 PM

Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>
To: Adam King <adam.michael.king@gmail.com>



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Against the development at 3200 Washington St. JP

1 message

mt2106@columbia.edu <mt2106@columbia.edu>

Fri, Apr 10, 2015 at 8:58 PM

To: edward.mcguire@boston.gov

I am a current tenant of Arborview Realty, and I am 100% against this development in Jamaica Plain. While I have been happy as a renter of one of their units, over the years that I have been a resident in Jamaica Plain, I've seen Arborview's developments all over the neighborhood which are fundamentally and effectively changing the face of this community for the worse. They are making it impossible for families and communities that have called Jamaica Plain their homes for decades to live here because of their upscale units that are priced well out of the range of working class folks and the artist communities that are at the heart of what Jamaica Plain is. I received an email from Arborview which went out to all their tenants, requesting us to come to this website and write letters of support, stating that we must know how difficult it is to "find nice housing due to the lack of sufficient rental units in Boston." This absolutely infuriates me because what really is the problem is the lack of affordable housing available in Boston and particularly in Jamaica Plain. Their email does not discuss that only ELEVEN of the 76 units will be "affordable" at 3200 Washington Street - and "affordable" to Arborview means families making \$60,000 a year. \$60,000 a year is a middle class salary, and expecting the working class communities that have called this area of Jamaica Plain their home to afford this is appalling, disgusting and greedy. I fail to see that Arborview has the neighborhoods' interests in mind, and only care about making themselves richer. They are completely disregarding the people they will displace as they covert this neighborhood into something unrecognizable to the true residents of Jamaica Plain.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

3200 Washington Street Development1 message

Sun, Apr 12, 2015 at 12:40 PM

Joan Becker <becker02130@gmail.com>

To: edward.mcguire@boston.gov

Cc: Susan Pranger <susan.d.pranger@gmail.com>, Jullieanne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov, matthew.omalley@boston.gov, hannah.smith@boston.gov, Tito.Jackson@boston.gov, liz.malia@mahouse.gov, Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov, sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us

Chilcott Place – Granada Park Neighborhood Association

Edward M. McGuire III, Project Assistant

Boston Redevelopment Authority

1 City Hall Ave | Ninth Floor | Boston, MA 02201

Dear Mr. McGuire

We write on behalf of the Chilcott Place – Granada Park Neighborhood Association. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed development of the Economy Plumbing Site at 3200 Washington Street. After extensive review of the project details and several meetings with the developers and their team, we do not support the project as currently proposed. We have five core concerns:

- Lack of a comprehensive master plan for the Washington Street Corridor. It impossible to evaluate how this project will impact development and the quality of life in our immediate neighborhood and more broadly the impact it will have on the corridor. We note that three parcels in our immediate vicinity have recently sold and plans for these are unknown—Jackson Glass, 3195 Washington; Pin Bochinche Restaurant, 3160 Washington, and 6 Chilcott Place.
- Size. The project is too big—both in terms of height and in terms of the number of units.
- Parking. Insufficient parking spaces are provided for the proposed project.
- The impact on traffic congestion and existing parking shortage
- Affordability. While we appreciate that the developers are committed to include more affordable units that is legally required, issues of affordability are complex and we are concerned about the impact that such a concentration of high market rate units will have on the affordability of existing rents and homes as well as the cost of goods and services in the area.

While members of our Association are in agreement in their opposition to the project as currently proposed, these core concerns weigh differently for people so we have encouraged them to write individual letters. We will be doing the same.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

3190-3204 block of Washington Street development

2 messages

Sun, Apr 5, 2015 at 5:36 PM

laura smith <laura_c_smith@hotmail.com>
 To: "edward.mcguire@boston.gov" <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Dear Mr. McGuire,

Please accept this email as my expressed concerns regarding the planned development at 3200 Washington Street in Jamaica Plain, MA. I am a homeowner living on Olmstead Street in Jamaica Plain; my street is one street over from, and parallel to Montebello St. I attended a meeting regarding the development of 52 Montebello Street a couple months ago at BPD District 13 and this is where I first learned of the planned development for 3200 Washington Street. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the meeting to discuss this planned development on April 1st and wanted to voice my concerns regarding this development to you via email. My primary concerns regarding the development fall into 4 categories- #1 size of the building; #2 lack of parking; #3 affordability/usage and #4 proposed design. I have provided very brief comments regarding each of my concerns below:

1. Size of building- Put simply, 5-6 stories and 76 units is far too large of a development for our neighborhood. I encourage the developers to drastically scale back both the height and number of units in their proposed development. I would like to see no more than 40 units built and no building more than 3 stories high. Our neighborhood has a certain charm that has drawn in many great homeowners to the area over the past several years and the current proposal would negatively impact the look and feel of our neighborhood.

2. Lack of parking- 41 parking spaces for the proposed 75 units and retail space is not adequate. I encourage the developers to incorporate at least 1 parking spot per unit and include substantial parking to accommodate the proposed retail spaces. Currently, the parking situation in the surrounding neighborhoods and along Washington St is very troublesome as many homes do not have off-street parking and establishing new off-street parking for current residents in the neighborhood is not an option. The developer is responsible for ensuring enough parking is available for the residents of the proposed development and retail space without negatively impacting residents currently living in the neighborhood; however, the proposal as it currently stands would severely limit the ability for current homeowners to find on-street parking.

3. Affordability/Usage- the current proposal is for 76 units, 18 of which would be affordable housing and 60% would be rentals. I am pleased to see that the developers have limited the affordable housing units to 18 units (approx. 24%); this is a respectable number of units. That said, I encourage the developers to reduce the number of rental units from 60% to no more than 40%. Long-term growth and development in communities and neighborhoods stems from homeownership. Renters turn over frequently and do not have the vested interest in their surrounding neighborhoods as homeowners do. In order to preserve our neighborhood and nearby parks, I would like to see more homeowners than renters in the new development.

4. Proposed design- the current design of the proposed development is very disappointing with what appears to be a cinder-block looking facade and rather unattractive balconies which are not appealing to the eye and do not blend well with the neighborhood. I encourage the developers to consider building structures that are more in-keeping with the surrounding neighborhoods. Both Montebello and Iffey St primarily consist of 3-story, 3-6 condo unit buildings, and I would like to see the proposed development compliment these buildings rather than take-away from.

I hope you find my comments above both brief and focused. While I absolutely support the idea of developing

4/13/2015

City of Boston Mail - 3190-3204 block of Washington Street development

and reviving the Montebello and Iffey St neighborhoods, I think it is critical to develop it in a way which does not negatively impact those living in the area. This is a wonderful part of Jamaica Plain and I genuinely hope the developers take into consideration the opinions of those who live and own in the neighborhood.

Thank you for your time.

Laura Smith

Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>
To: laura_c_smith@hotmail.com

Sun, Apr 5, 2015 at 5:36 PM

Thank you for your email. I am currently out of the office and will be returning on Tuesday April 7th, 2015.

--
Edward M. McGuire III

Project Assistant
Boston Redevelopment Authority
1 City Hall Ave | Ninth Floor | Boston, MA 02201
Office: (617) 918-4251



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

RE: Comments RE: 3200 Washington St. Proposed Development

1 message

Mon, Apr 13, 2015 at 8:27 AM

Thomas, Dan <Dan.Thomas@jacobs.com>

To: "edward.mcguire@boston.gov" <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>, "Briancesco, Angelo" <angelo.briancesco@deerns.com>, "kairos.shen@boston.gov" <kairos.shen@boston.gov>

Cc: "Doherty, Jullieanne (Jullieanne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov)" <Jullieanne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov>, "matthew.omalley@boston.gov" <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, "hannah.smith@boston.gov" <hannah.smith@boston.gov>

"Tito.Jackson@boston.gov" <Tito.Jackson@boston.gov>, "liz.malia@mahouse.gov" <liz.malia@mahouse.gov>, "Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov" <Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov>, "sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us" <sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us>, "jhanley@mqmllp.com" <jhanley@mqmllp.com>

Ed,

It is with some regret that I write this second letter to the BRA regarding the proposed development at 3200 Washington St. in Jamaica Plain.

The last time we saw or heard from the BRA was at the community meeting on April 1, at the Egleston Square YMCA. This meeting was monopolized by the developer's presentation for more than an hour, and then the public comments were cut short by you, as you had another engagement. Our state representative Liz Malia was in attendance, and professed her concern for the public review process, and asked that another meeting be scheduled with the neighborhood, and that the public comment period be extended beyond the April 15 deadline. The BRA has not responded to either of these requests.

At a previous meeting, the neighbors had asked for some input from the BRA, specifically a target number for the amount of housing planned for the Washington Street corridor. While we understand that the plan is not fully developed, we feel that it is not unreasonable to have a stated goal. Instead, at the April 1 meeting, you stated that you were not a planner, and were only carrying the community comments to the BRA for review. But not all of the comments, as you could not stay to hear them.

As noted in my previous letter below, the public review process on this project has been severely compromised. Meetings have been scheduled and cancelled. The first public BRA meeting was combined with the first IAG meeting, which limited the effectiveness of both agendas. The developers claim to have met with a wide range of community organizations, but they do not respond to the legitimate concerns of the neighborhood. They have met in private session with the BCDC to review the design, but the community concerns are not represented in that review.

We reiterate our concerns regarding the size of this project, and its impact on Jamaica Plain and the Egleston Square neighborhood. And we ask for some indication from the BRA and the City of Boston as to your intentions for this project, this process, this neighborhood, and the city as a whole.

Still respectfully,

4/13/2015

City of Boston Mail - RE: Comments RE: 3200 Washington St. Proposed Development

Dan Thomas

23 Chilcott Place

Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

From: Thomas, Dan

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 11:19 AM

To: 'edward.mcguire@boston.gov'

Cc: Doherty, Jullianne (Jullianne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov); 'matthew.omalley@boston.gov'; 'hannah.smith@boston.gov'; 'Tito.Jackson@boston.gov'; 'liz.malia@mahouse.gov';

'Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov'; 'sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us'

Subject: Comments RE: 3200 Washington St. Proposed Development

To Edward McGuire, BRA Project Manager re: 3200 Washington Street Proposed Development

As long term residents of the Washington Street area, we are both enthusiastic and concerned regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Washington Street corridor, and especially 3200 Washington St. As you are probably aware, there are conflicting views on the project among the stakeholders, developers and various committees in the neighborhood. We are concerned that the views of the abutters, who will deal with issues now and in the future, are represented.

We have concerns on many levels, which are listed below:

- Lack of a Master Plan for the Washington Street Corridor
- Elimination of Commercial Properties for development of neighborhood retail
- The excessive size of the project, in massing, height and density
- Setting a precedent in the absence of a master plan
- Impacts on Traffic and Parking
- Impacts on an overloaded Transit System
- Lack of significant tangible benefits to the community
- A minimal commitment to affordable housing
- Public access to review process

We start with the mayor's stated objective to locate substantial parcels of housing along the Orange Line and Red Line transit corridors. Referencing the PNF for 3200 Washington St., page 7-20 Table 7-4, there are eight projects listed along the Orange Line corridor: six project totaling 556 units which are listed as Board Approved, plus two projects adding up to 41 units which are under review. The project at 3200 would add another 76 units. We are looking at a total of 673 units of transit oriented development that have been proposed in the absence of a master plan for this area. As each of these projects has been presented to the public, there has been a contentious debate between the developers and the neighborhood residents.

All of these developments have required a revision to the Zoning, because they are in violation of the designated use and dimensional regulations defined in Article 55. In each case, the project proposes multi-family dwellings/mixed use in areas previously zoned as commercial or light industrial. And in each case, the development does not provide parking spaces for residents in the ratios described by the zoning code. This is a double-edged problem, in that commercial properties are developed as residential, increasing the density of the

neighborhood, and these commercial properties are no longer available to provide services to support the neighborhood within walking distance of the housing. As a result, residents must have access to cars or increased transit opportunities to get to groceries, hardware, doctors, and other necessities. But there are no parking spaces for new residents, so this increases pressures on the adjacent neighborhood.

The adjacent neighborhood is zoned for multi-family residential, in either 2 or 3 units on 4000 SF lots. Much of the area is composed of solid old housing stock, many of the building dating to the late 19th century. The projects recently approved by the BRA all have an FAR (floor-area-ratio) from 1.59 to 2.12, while the proposed building at 3200 is listed at FAR 3.09. This means that the project is three times as dense as allowed under the current zoning, and 1-1/2 times as dense as the largest project on Washington St. approved by the BRA to date. These mega-developments change the scale of the neighborhood, and will have a detrimental effect on the character of the area, which has made it so desirable. The residential facade of Washington St. is a very consistent array of three-story houses with attics and basements that contribute to a height of less than 50 feet from the street. This arrangement is consistent from Forest Hills to Egleston Square, and newer residential developments along Washington Street to Dudley Square have respected this height and density.

In contrast, the proposed building at 3200 Washington is listed at both 70 feet and 74'-11" in height in the PNF, but this is measured at a mean elevation around the site. The actual height above Washington St. is in excess of 80 feet. The developer states that the height, and "new obstruction values" are mitigated by the large width of Washington St. We note that the street is only 40 feet wide, with 10 foot sidewalks on each side. By any of these measures, the project is taller than the width of the street. The developer offers opinions regarding Wind, Shadow and Daylight in sections 1.3.4, 1.3.5 and 1.3.6 on page 1-7 of the PNF, but we take issue with the idea that a building that exceeds the allowable height of the zoning envelope by more than 30 feet, and the current height of all other existing residential properties by three stories, is "consistent with and typical of the surrounding neighborhood".

There are several properties near this project site, which have recently been purchased by commercial developers, notably 3160 Washington St. and 3195 Washington St. We are concerned that approval of a project of this height and density will encourage these developers, who will also claim that their properties are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, even though they are displacing single story commercial properties. Setting a precedent that so exceeds the existing zoning regulations will create a high-rise corridor in Jamaica Plain that does not currently exist.

The next item that we would like to address is the project's impact on transportation. The developers promote a transit oriented development, but their sole contribution is an MBTA Charlie Card with \$35.00 per lease unit, and a parking to unit ratio of 0.47 overall. The PNF is unclear regarding distribution, but there are a total of 36 spaces, with either 3 or 8 spaces dedicated to three units, and 28 or 33 spaces for 73 units in the main building, which will be leased to the residents. This transit oriented development will provide new residents with 15 trips on the T, but it does nothing to address the needs of the neighborhood, which will have to absorb the overflow of cars that cannot rent a space with their apartment.

In addition, page 7-30 of the PNF lists peak hour vehicle trips of 21 in the AM and 30 in the PM, and page 7-39 lists peak hour transit trips of 20 in the AM and 25 in the PM. Since there are 76 units, and 152 bedrooms, we are left to wonder how the other residents will commute on a daily basis. Our conclusion is that these estimates are grossly understated.

There is a larger question here, which is not addressed in any of the documentation. Given the recent performance of the T, in admittedly a brutal month of winter weather, we have become acutely aware of the limits to the trains' capacity. Even under normal conditions, we have found that adjusting one's commute to avoid "peak hour" is important if you want a seat on the train, and as it stands today, I have been on many trains

4/13/2015

City of Boston Mail - RE: Comments RE: 3200 Washington St. Proposed Development

that cannot accept passengers at Jackson Square, as they are filled to "crush" capacity. What will be the cumulative effect of 673 transit oriented housing units, and more to come, on the ability of the T to service the community? This situation has already been documented in Cambridge, where aggressive development at the Alewife area has overloaded trains at the Alewife terminus, and limited the capacity of the transit system to serve Davis, Porter, Harvard, and inbound stations. Developers who are adding housing and passengers are doing nothing to increase the capacity of the system; it is just leeching on a public amenity. These efforts do not improve conditions for either the current residents or the new tenants.

Finally, there is the question of benefits to the neighborhood. There is a ground floor retail and restaurant, but no public space shared with the city. All open space on the project is inside the site, and private. The project as defined will contribute 11 affordable units out of 76 total, 14.4%, one more unit than the minimum required by law. The developer has a proposal for six more units, but has not committed to that proposal to date, pending negotiations with the City of Boston DND. As currently structured, for all its purported community outreach, the project has minimally responded to concerns about affordability, retail and traffic, but has adamantly refused to address concerns regarding the size of the project, its density or its impact on its neighbors.

In addition, the public review process has been compressed and compromised by the winter weather. For one meeting, the neighborhood was flyer'd and people notified, only to have it cancelled at the last minute by snow. When rescheduled, it was combined with an IAG meeting, and was held in an overcrowded space, with significant loss of time and process to both the public meeting and the IAG. The next meeting, scheduled for Thursday 3/19, has been cancelled again, but not rescheduled. And there has been no modification to the deadline for public comment of April 3. Please ensure that the public is properly represented in the review process.

In conclusion, we would support a project at this address that was no higher than five stories, provided 50 units, had an FAR of no more than 2.12 (68,000 SF), provided a parking ratio of 0.72 (36 total), and provided 10 affordable housing units. And we ask that the BRA formulate guidelines for the development of the Washington Street corridor as soon as possible.

Respectfully,

Dan Thomas

23 Chilcott Place

Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

comment on Eggleston development

1 message

Wed, Apr 1, 2015 at 10:43 PM

Becky Pierce <beckyp44@verizon.net>

To: edward.mcguire@boston.gov

Cc: mayor@boston.gov, letter@globe.com

Dear Mr. McGuire—I was at the meeting tonight at the Eggleston Y and didn't get to speak, because you had other things to do than stay long enough to hear out the concerned residents, including the many young people present.

You heard loud and clear from the neighborhood, what you already knew, that putting up the proposed development with over 80% luxury apartments—which the developers refused to admit they will rent for \$3000+ a month or some such astronomical figure, to rich white people from outside of Boston, at a huge profit for themselves—will accelerate the rent increases in the neighborhood and force out the remaining low and moderate income residents including virtually all of the people of color.

The BRA should not be in the business of gentrification, or aiding development for profit at the expense of Boston residents who are not rich.

You should not approve any development that is not 75% or 80% affordable, based on the Boston income standards, so that the development doesn't gentrify and displace and drive up housing costs for surrounding residents.

Trinity Financial put up a development on this scale at Ashmont station, that was over 80% affordable rental units and the rest luxury condos (ground floor commercial space, 4 floors of apartments renting from \$988, studio, to \$1468 for a 3-bedroom, and one floor of luxury/market condos; they said this was 60% of the Suffolk County mean income.). They are planning a similar scale with similar percentage and rents of affordable units in the planned development for the Ashmont Tire site, a block away from the Carruth Building at Ashmont Station.

Why can't the BRA require something similar of a JP developer, or of one anywhere in Boston—that they build mostly affordable units in any new development if they want your approval? You need to stand up for the people of Boston, not the profits of the developers. It would be better to leave that site vacant if no developer will build on it without putting up mostly low-income-affordable units. It worsens rather than alleviates Boston's housing shortage, to put up luxury units for rich people mainly from outside of Boston, while we current low and moderate income people are forced out.

Thanks you for your consideration.

---Becky Pierce

Codman Square, Dorchester

617-282-3783

Mr. McGuire:

I am contacting you today regarding development in my neighborhood of Egleston Square. I am a Boston resident, and I live at 8 Woodside Avenue, just a few blocks down from the proposed development at 3200 Washington Street.

I have lived in the community for years, and have been struck by the warm, tightknit feeling of the neighborhood. I speak daily to neighbors who I encounter while walking down the street or strolling in the park. Now that the weather has warmed up, I expect that daily games of dominoes that are usually held on a card table outside of my front door to resume. I am very impressed with the diversity in the area, both economically and racially. This is something that I do not see in other parts of Boston and certainly not in the metro area.

The intimate feeling in the community is directly related to the fact that so many people have lived here for generations. But I'm afraid this is coming to an end.

I'm very concerned about the availability of affordable housing. My landlord just raised the rent 25%, and I am trying to figure out if I can afford stay in the neighborhood I love so much. However, I am much more concerned about all my neighbors, many of whom are couples with children. The truth is, I am a single man with no children, so my expenses are less than many families. It's scary to think about the future for people in my community. If I am facing financial difficulty as my landlord is attempting to bring my rent up to "market rates," I can't even imagine what my neighbors with children are facing.

We need the BRA to show leadership on this issue by requiring developers to produce more housing at affordability rates that truly reflect the income in the existing neighborhood. That's why I support 100% affordable housing at 50% Boston Median Income at 3200 Washington St. I also believe there should be a written agreement and backup plan for developing deeply affordable housing at 52 Montebello Road, as well as a back-up plan to develop 6 more units within the 3200 Washington Street development. Frankly, for the developer to claim that rehabbing 52 Montebello increases the total number of affordable units available seems disingenuous. If the developer and the city are really committed to supporting people in the neighborhood, we need to see more affordable units in 3200 Washington.

Also, to protect families who have been living in Egleston for years, there should also be just cause eviction laws. Finally, I request that the community process for input on the development be extended until October 2015. I was at a BRA facilitated community meeting recently where dozens of people did not get a chance to have their voice heard. I believe that for government to function effectively, we need to ensure that voices are not silenced. It was disappointing to hear the BRA representative say he could not extend the meeting because he had a personal commitment, especially because those of us who were in the room will not and cannot leave the neighborhood after a meeting is over. We live there. The city should demonstrate that it is just as committed to listening to us as to developers. Extend the community process period.

Over the decades, we've seen lower income communities bear the brunt of unfair housing policies, whether it was redlining by banks or federal funds channeled to new developments in

the suburbs rather than to cities where they were most needed. Now that land in JP and Roxbury is becoming more popular to developers, we are seeing the same phenomenon.

It is time for development policies to reflect community needs, not the needs of developers.

Thanks for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Matt Allen
8 Woodside Ave
JP, MA 02130

4/27/2015

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



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.

3 messages

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

Wed, Apr 15, 2015 at 8:22 AM

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 355

Form inserted: 4/15/2015 8:22:25 AM

Form updated: 4/15/2015 8:22:25 AM

Document Name: 3200 Washington St.

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

Origin Page Url: /projects/development-projects/3200-washington-st?utm_source=Neighborhoods&utm_campaign=96cb2e30d1-3200_Wash_IAG_Meeting4_14_2015&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_bccda74844-96cb2e30d1-123188005

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Jacks

Organization:

Email: Robin.jacks@gmail.com

Street Address: 71 McBride St #1

Address Line 2:

City: Jamaica Plain

State: MA

Phone: (901) 240-1423

Zip: 02130

Comments: Make more of this development affordable housing. Jamaica Plain and Boston overall is rapidly becoming unaffordable. I've been priced out (as of June), as has almost everyone I know. This neighborhood is a working class neighborhood. This development will push along the already dire gentrification happening there. A pitifully small number of units in this building are currently slated to be affordable. This is unacceptable.

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

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

Wed, Apr 15, 2015 at 2:24 PM

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 358

4/15/2015 2:24:30 PM

4/27/2015

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

Address Line 2: 1

Joan Becker

City: Jamaica Plain

12 Chilcott Place

State: MA

Phone: (617) 943-1970

Zip: 02130

Comments: I write in regards to the proposed development of the Economy Plumbing Site at 3200 Washington Street. I bought my home on Chilcott Place in 1985 and have lived here since 1986. After extensive review of the Economy Plumbing project details and several meetings with the developers and their team, I do not support the project as currently proposed. Absent a comprehensive master plan for the Washington Street Corridor, it is impossible to evaluate how the project will impact development and the quality of life in my immediate neighborhood and more broadly the impact it will have on the corridor. Three parcels within 2 blocks of my home have recently sold—Jackson Glass, 3195 Washington; Pin Bochinche Restaurant, 3160 Washington, and 6 Chilcott Place. Plans for these are unknown. While I appreciate that the developers are committed to include more affordable units than is legally required, issues of affordability are complex. More than 50 of the units will be market rate, and Centre Street, not Egleston Square, rates. I am concerned about the impact the concentration of high market rate units will have on the affordability of existing rents and homes as well as the cost of goods and services in the area. Because the conversation about affordability is not happening in the larger context of a master plan for the corridor, issues of economic development and who benefits from the jobs the Economy Plumbing project and others will create are not being discussed. The solution to affordability hinges on making it possible for low income families to become middle and upper income families. I do appreciate what the developers/architects are trying to do aesthetically and their efforts to be green/incentivize more sustainable lifestyles. The problem is that the project is too big—both in terms of height and in terms of the number of units. In addition, there are insufficient parking spaces relative to the proposed number of units. Both the increased number of cars parking in the building and the overflow onto the surrounding streets will negatively impact already bad traffic congestion and the existing parking shortage. I urge the BRA to move forward immediately with the approved study and master planning process for the Washington Street Corridor. We need the right balance of development and we need development committed to real economic development. That can't happen if each project is evaluated outside this larger context.

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

4/13/2015

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

Address Line 2:

Paul wood

City: Jamaica Plain

Pwood@paulwoodlaw.com

State: MA

11 Olmstead St.

Phone: (617) 504-1963

Zip: 02130

Comments: I am against this project. There are not enough parking spaces. The vast majority of Bostonians own cars. Parking is tough enough especially in the winter. Traffic on this part of Washington is presently a nightmare. Add 76 units and retail and it will be unbearable. The height will be the beginning of turning this section of Washington St. into a canyon. And let me add that I oppose this project against my own financial interest. Our little condo will surely increase in value with all this high end development moving in. I say no, don't destroy the diverse character of JP. Don't let it become the next South End!

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov

May 1, 2015

Mr Edward M. McGuire III
Project Assistant
Boston Redevelopment Authority

RE: 3200 Washington Street Article 80 Review (Amended)

Dear Mr. McGuire:

I am providing comments on the proposed development of 3200 Washington Street as part of the Article 80 review process. These are based on: review of the PNF document submitted by the developers to the BRA, on changes since then made known by the developers, and on community meetings. The views expressed are mine but they do draw upon principles for reviewing development proposals used by the Union Avenue neighborhood, a neighborhood also greatly affected by developments along the Washington Street corridor.

The developers are to be commended for: tackling a difficult site; considerations of affordability; creating an interesting outdoor plaza on the second level; addressing the streetscape; promoting urban wild; and providing a level of public transportation subsidy.

Nevertheless, I do not support this project going forward in its present state of design for reasons explained more fully in the amended enclosure and which can be categorized as: excessive height in relation to fit with the neighborhood scale; emergent planning along the Washington Street corridor; an uninteresting facade design that does not advance the architectural character and distinction of the neighborhood; insufficient consideration of vertical flow and other building functions, practicalities, and amenities; and unresolved issues with the garage design, traffic, parking, and street-side deliveries.

The proposed design of the project has many problems and issues that are not satisfactorily or sufficiently addressed; a few have had no public discussion at all. Several are competing and quite contentious, and moderation and balance are essential prerequisites to their resolution. The developer's proposal does not yet benefit the neighborhood nor emergent planning for the Washington corridor.

Sincerely

Alan Benenfeld
36-B Union Avenue
alanb284@cs.com

Enclosure

cc:
Jullieanne Dougherty
Councilor Matt O'Malley
Representative Liz Malia
Senator Sonia Chang-Diaz

**Comments on 3200 Washington Street Article 80 Review
(Amended May 1, 2015)**

Height

1. This proposed behemoth of a building fronts an entire block of Washington Street between Iffley and Montebello. At 75' and seven stories, this building is sited within and also abuts zones coded for 35 feet and three-stories, it is entirely out of scale and out of character with the neighborhood. Let's not be fooled by developer-speak that it is only six stories plus mezzanine, when that sixth story is basically double-height, kinda like saying it's only \$6.99 and not \$7.00. Even if the building were just six stories without "mezzanine", that would still be twice the allowable zoning height and still out of character and out of fit with the existing neighborhood.

2. The developers apparently take as their starting point the Franklin Brewery building, standing at 87 feet in height on Washington (exclusive of parapet and exclusive of the several-story additional height at the rear portion of the building seen in PNF Figures 3.3 and 3.5 and visible from Washington, and argue that their proposal is designed to be a height mediator between the Franklin building and the smaller neighborhood scale. That has just a ring of truth. It is also true, however, that the Franklin building, built in 1894 and pre-dating the earliest zoning code, is also being taken as license to propose a 75' seven-story building diagonally opposite. The choice of 75' has far less to do with mediation and everything to do with not crossing the building code threshold and requirements governing a high-rise structure. If the developer's argument carries that their mediating-height, seven-story building should be granted a zoning variance, then it would certainly heavily influence future development along both the eastern and western sides of Washington north and south of this site. Such development collectively would be even more out of character with neighborhood scale. The Franklin building is an anomaly and its height has been the bane of much of the neighborhood. A single, historic anomaly is enough; it ought not be compounded by offering up others in the name of mediation.

3. From the Stony Brook T walking up Boylston or Minton to Washington, you pass through a neighborhood of mostly two or three story residences which continue across Washington and up the hillside with only the Franklin building standing out as an egregious intrusion. Proposing to add a 75' high building on Washington, more than twice the zoning code allowance, which, if approved would likely be precedent-setting, only adds to the perception of a barrier. Barriers came down when the elevated Orange Line along Washington Street came down. Overshadowing the street with buildings twice as tall as code is out of scale with the neighborhood.

4. The height issue is further exacerbated by the fact that the roof parapet as well as the headhouse and other roof appurtenances are excluded by definition from the height calculation. Exclusions from height also occur for the Franklin building. The reality for the neighborhood is that both the proposed building and the Franklin building are not just perceived to be, but in actuality are taller than the definitional height measures given in the proposal.

5. I am not opposed to granting a code variance for height on this particular site provided that the seven story proposal is scaled back, preferably to four stories. and that any story above three is set well-back

from all of the building's street edges, certainly much more than the token setback very recently proposed by the developer for the sixth story at one corner of the building.

Affordability and the Washington Street Corridor

6. Affordability is understandably an important and vocalized issue. I support affordability but not at the expense of so altering neighborhood scale with randomly sited, parcel-by-parcel placement of tall, dense structures that will last well-beyond a century or two. Affordability (limited to 50 years) is a complex as well as regional issue without easy resolution and it begs many questions, often unanswered, such as affordable for whom. When market rate units are the preponderant majority (75% - 87%) in buildings with only a smaller percentage (13% or even 25%) of affordable units, the larger problem remains. Parcel-by-parcel variances, most especially approval of variances substantially at odds with existing code, however well-intentioned, are isolated efforts at resolving affordability issues at the scale needed, yet those variances would only introduce long-lasting physical characteristics that fundamentally alter rather than respect neighborhood scale and set precedent for yet other parcel-by-parcel projects to do the same. Once built, few will look at a physically and visually out-of-scale building and recall it's that way because its developer received excessive variances in exchange for increasing the number of affordable units.

7. Fortunately, there is activity now underway as the city works with the Urban Land Institute to bring an ordered and thoughtfully considered sense of planning to the development and revitalization of the Washington Street corridor between Egleston and Forest Hills. While this extremely important activity will not be concluded in time to fully affect 3200 Washington Street, it would be a serious mistake to ignore the sense and direction of recommendations likely to emerge from this planning process. One such recommendation is to recognize that Washington Street is not monolithic and that to be successful, development must be respectful of surrounding neighborhoods. There is some suggestion that larger-sized development would better occur at the Forest Hills end of the corridor rather than at the Egleston end. This initial sense is in accord with those, such as myself, who believe that the current proposal for 3200 Washington, most especially its height, is not in keeping with the scale of the neighborhood.

8. I have been reflecting on the stand-alone, three-unit Iffley building which in its design is very respectful of neighborhood scale. Only one of the three equally-sized ownership units is designated as affordable. What provisions would be in the condo documents so that this one affordable unit owner is not disadvantaged by two market-rate unit owners, especially in consideration of downstream association dues and assessments for short and long term operational, maintenance, and improvement costs? From this perspective, wouldn't it be better for all three units to be designated for affordable purchase, as has been proposed for other reasons in a back-up plan? It would increase affordable ownership opportunities for two families.

Facade Design

9. There are two interesting features of the facade design: the slightly offset angles of the two towers from each other; and the view between the towers to the second-level plaza (although it can be seen essentially only from directly across the street. That said, the facade design is notable only for its blandness. It doesn't excite. It may be different from the neighborhood, but it does not add to the character of the neighborhood nor to its distinction.

10. By contrast, the Franklin building diagonally opposite has a richly ornamented and greatly distinctive facade. The only acknowledgement (height aside) of the Franklin building is the choice of one supposedly matching vertical band of color from its masonry. Of course, 3200 ought not mimic and certainly not copy Franklin but there's no wink or nod to any of the many design elements of Franklin; the one limited color band is such a weak attempt that it's almost better not doing. 3200 shrinks in near anonymity rather than provide strength of its own, even in a contemporary design that stands up to Franklin; it neither compliments nor complements it. This is a lost opportunity.

11. There is an over-reliance on and an unimaginative use of different cladding colors to provide differentiation along the facade. Too many contemporary buildings have employed color, especially in broad swathes, to rather jarring effect. In the absence of seeing any large rendering/projection with color accuracy, it's impossible to gauge what 3200 will really look like in this regard. Nevertheless, a facade differentiated predominantly by cladding color is far less interesting and attractive than surfaces incorporating texture, reliefs, patterns, or other geometric design elements.

12. A great many buildings in Jamaica Plain have a strong cornice, often with decorative molding, that provides upper definition to the building. There is no sense from renderings that 3200 provides even a contemporary interpretation of such a defining feature and the building facade seems all the weaker by comparison with others in the neighborhood.

13. The Iffley face of the building is set back from the property line and also offers landscaping and hanging greenery. The Montebello face of the building has no such features and to all appearances gives a cold shoulder to the neighborhood on that side.

14. The double height windows on the 6+ floors of tower B only serve to accentuate the height of an already too tall building.

Vertical Flow and Functionality -- Two Buildings or One

15. Each of the 6-story towers is served by a single elevator, a minimum requirement of code. There are 34 units in Tower A and 39 in Tower B, spread over floors 2 through 6 (none on the common floor 1). There may well be nearly 200 residents total (100- in A and 100+ in B). There will be visitors for these residents. There will be deliveries direct to units of packages, peapods (groceries), pizza, post, and a potpourri of other items, including furniture. There will be building and unit maintenance and cleaning personnel with equipment, and trash removal for items too big for a chute. Residents themselves will have strollers, wheelchairs, walkers, luggage, groceries, sports equipment, and yet more to bring in and out. There will be times when an elevator is out of service for repair or maintenance, or otherwise reserved for some hours for a tenant's move-in or move-out. The point, obviously is that there will be demand and contention for single elevator access, as well as times when elevator access is not available at all. A 'perfect storm' of contending reasons is unlikely; nevertheless, with but a single elevator surges of some frequency are highly likely. In a six-story building, taking to the stairs is not a universal solution, and grin and bear it by tenants and service providers does not foster happy outcomes.

16. A possible solution to the situations identified in item 15 is to have a single tower with a vertical transport core of two elevators which relieves the situation of one elevator down for repair/maintenance. Further, one of the two could be designated a service elevator for building maintenance personnel and for heavy or bulky deliveries as well as move-in/outs. When that elevator is not in use for such purposes, it could be available for general tenant, visitor, and light delivery use. This would mean eliminating the space between the towers but it would result in a far more functional building including the possibility of a single mechanism of trash removal from both wings. Further, thoughtful redesign could still preserve the angling of the two component wings either side of the vertical transport core.

Safety and Surveillance

17. The neighborhood's safety and security is affected by the provisions for safety and surveillance in this building and on its grounds. Except at the most general level, such provisions have received scant discussion to date. There is no lobby-person to vet and control building access and an on-site superintendent cannot perform such a function except sporadically or by happenstance. This means far greater reliance on technology for monitoring and permitting entry from the several entrances/exits from the street, from the bicycle rooms and garage, and from the plaza level. How will deliverers and visitors be announcable to and communicate with units and gain building entrance or otherwise be able to leave packages or notices of failed deliveries? How would entry by tailgating be minimized? Would it be possible to communicate with units from the garage entrance to the lobby? How would surveillance video be monitored and by whom and with what frequency? Would units have access to more than lobby door video? Would weekend guests of tenants be given keycards or other means of access? These are but a few of many practical issues for which the devil is in the details which can compromise safety and security, and also privacy, and about which too little has been presented and discussed. Blind faith in a developer's intentions does not assuage neighborhood concerns.

Garage

18. The garage and internal parking design is quite awkward at best. Entry and exit are negotiated from/to inclined streets which limits visibility. Because of these inclines, will there be sufficient vehicle clearance on the uphill side of the garage doors? Entry and exit doors are not in a straight line; entry requires an immediate jog and turn. The garage floor is not a level plane but slopes slightly. Will there be clearance into the garage for the occasional necessity for service and tow vehicles? Parking spaces close to the exit seem problematic, especially if the exit door would be openable by floor or other motion sensors. Would there be sufficient clearance between parking spaces for a driver to be able to, for example, set up a child's car seat? There does not seem to be any provision of space by the entrance to the lobby for one or two cars to be able to unload groceries or other packages, let alone passengers, before parking. By the same token, how would passengers, especially those needing assistance, be able to be picked up by the lobby door without a vehicle backing up to that spot? Who would have access to the garage? Will there be pedestrian access to/from the street to the garage? What surveillance would the garage have? Will there be a communication system from the garage to units as in the main lobby?

19. Figure 3-18 in the PNA shows how cars, pedestrians, cyclists, skateboarders traveling down Montebello have little visibility of exiting vehicles because of streetside parking close to the exit.

20. The placement of trash storage, pick-up and removal from within the garage has been discussed but not yet fully resolved.

Street Parking, Deliveries, and Traffic

21. Will there be differentiation between streetside passenger and service delivery loading/unloading. Preference should be given to designated passenger zones placed closest to the building entrance, perhaps with deeper sidewalk cuts to keep passenger vehicles further from the traffic lane. Will there be sufficient space to simultaneously accommodate more than one passenger vehicle and more than one service vehicle at a time?

22. Allowing passenger pick-up/drop-off from within the garage, especially important during inclement weather, should be considered.

23. The traffic study claims nil impact from 400+ residences known to be under development further down Washington with yet more to come. This strains credulity.

24. Providing a subsidy to encourage use of the T is commendable but to be truly effective it should be on-going and not just one-time.

Building Amenities and Practicalities

25. This is a building with upwards of 200 residents. There is no provision for a function room for building-wide tenant meetings and holiday parties. Such a room could also be used for community meetings, and by tenants who might wish to host a gathering too big to fit into their unit.

26. Other than bicycle storage, there is no space for tenant storage of other items.

27. There is no discernible space to accommodate an office for the superintendent to conduct business with tenants or maintenance providers.

28. There is no discernible designation in the lobby of: an area for people waiting indoors for taxi or other vehicle pick-up; for left parcels; for luggage carts to convey groceries and other heavy packages; and for a left-parcel room.

29. The space between the inner and outer street doors seem too small to easily accommodate those with packages at hand attempting to communicate with a unit while also permitting passage of tenants who may well have packages of their own or strollers in tow.

30. To the extent that these and yet other practicalities require a reconfiguration or addition to lobby space, it could affect the larger design of the first floor, including garage.

Miscellany

31. There are no discernable areas for lockers, equipment storage, restrooms, or other use by maintenance and cleaning personnel.

32. There is no discernible emergency egress from the retail and restaurant spaces.

33. The accessibility path from street to the restaurant level (PNF Figure A1) is shown in a rendering (PNF Figure 3.21) as leading directly into and being blocked by outdoor seating.

34. The tower A elevator and the stairwell share the same immediate entry/egress corridor space in the lobby (see PNF Figure A1). It does not seem wide enough, barely wider than a door. Even if it should conform to code minimums, without redesign it is a likely point of contention and conflict among those waiting or trying to pass through.

35. Data reported in the PNF Climate Change Resiliency and Preparedness Checklist, Section B.1 Analysis, shows a range of 9 to 88 degrees occurring in a three day sequence twice a year. That seems to under-represent actuality when temperatures have certainly gone lower and higher several days running and more than once a year.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Keep Egleston affordable and support the residents who live there!

1 message

Lor Holmes <leholmes9@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 28, 2015 at 4:31 PM

To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Cc: Matt O'Malley <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, Ayanna Pressley <Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov>, TJackson@boston.gov, Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov, Jeffrey.sanchez@mahouse.gov, Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov, eglestonaffordablehousing@gmail.com

Dear Mr. McGuire

I lived in Egleston from 1980-1996. Although I have been priced out of the housing market and no longer live there, I retain a strong connection and love for the neighborhood and the people who have made it a great community. I raised three brown children in Egleston who attended the Hernandez and Margaret Fuller schools. Our community went through some very difficult years when violence, drugs and difficult relations with the police had all of us worried for our children's safety. Police shootings in our neighborhood did not make the national news in those days.

So we started organizing. I am very proud that residents successfully fought to have our public library reopened and the YMCA built in Egleston. I served for many years with the Egleston Square Neighborhood Association and was part of putting together the first Egleston Mainstreets Program. I am proud that the youth of Egleston have had such a strong role in creating a welcoming neighborhood and are leaders working to preserve the neighborhood now.

I support their key demands and implore you to do all you can to address these issues. (1) **100-50 at 3200**: 100% affordable housing at 50% Boston Median Income at 3200 Washington. (2) **Written agreement and backup plan for 52 Montebello**. A written agreement to build deeply affordable housing at 52 Montebello Rd, and a written agreement with a backup plan to build 6 more units in 3200 Washington St. (3) **Just cause eviction laws**. Developers support just cause eviction laws. (4) **Community process until October 2015**, including monthly community meetings and public comment.

Please join with the people who have made so much progress to keep Egleston affordable and vibrant.

Lor Holmes

leholmes9@gmail.com

617-291-5855



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

3200 Washington comment

Julianna Brody-Fialkin <jbrodyfi@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 30, 2015 at 4:05 PM

To: Edward.McGuire@boston.gov

Hi Mr. McGuire,

I tried to submit this through the project site on the BRA website, but for some reason it wouldn't accept it. Below are my comments. Please feel free to email with any questions and I would request an email response that you have received this. Thank you so much.

Julianna

Good afternoon,

My name is Julianna. I live on Montebello Road and have for the past 10 years and grew up by Forest Hills. This development would obviously impact me significantly and I think my perspective as a longtime JP resident also adds weight to what I will be saying.

I have increasingly mixed feelings about this proposed development. I agree that our neighborhood is in dire need of renovated and simply more housing. I think that some aspects of the design are very exciting, including the potential small restaurant and retail space and the focus on green space and sustainability. I was impressed the developers have agreed to help relocate E&J Auto in response to the criticism that they would be displacing a local business. However, I do not think these sway me in support of a project that concerns me as much as this one does. I understand the perspective that the route to more affordability is to increase supply, however, I have not seen this become true in the housing market, and I do not think that this development adds enough units to really affect that kind of impact on pricing.

My main concerns, which I think I share with many of my neighbors and others involved in our community, are size, parking impacts, and affordability/displacement. This will be an incredibly impactful development, specifically for we who live on Montebello and Iffley Roads.

Parking is already challenging, and adding cars from up to 76 units, with only 36 on-site spots and 8 new street spots will certainly increase this. I think that the developers have shown their commitment to encouraging non-car transportation, but have not seriously considered the true parking needs and effects of their proposal.

I think the size of the project is incongruous with the rest of the neighborhood and I do think that precedent is something we need to consider and worry about. A 6-7 story building is just something I'm disinclined to support on my street. I also have been disappointed in the developers' unwillingness to discuss negotiating this point. I have been to a number of community meetings with them and they have never come down significantly on height or units. This is a point I would be willing to reconsider as a compromise in ensuring affordability, but that has also never been a real offer from the developers. Some options for this compromise could be a guarantee on rent control for the market-rate apartments or increasing the number of affordable units on site.

The main concern I have, and I think again that this is true for my neighbors, is the impact this proposed project may have on the affordability of housing in Egleston Square. There are not enough affordable units in this project. I appreciate that the developers have offered to take over the 6 units at 52 Montebello. It would be phenomenal for that abandoned building to be developed quickly and at no cost to the city. However, I do not think it's genuine or in good faith to discuss how that brings up the percentage of affordable units to almost 25%. It, in fact, keeps the percentage to around 14% as it is adding an extra 6 units to the mix. This is a point that has never been discussed in community meetings. I really believe that this project will lead the way for increasing rents and house prices.

I am certainly in favor of development in my neighborhood and even on that site. I just have not felt like this proposal, despite the numerous meetings, has really engaged in a process that truly addressed community concerns. I hope the end result will be better suited to our community.

Thank you.



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.

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

Thu, Apr 30, 2015 at 12:42 PM

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 383

Form inserted: 4/30/2015 12:41:23 PM

Form updated: 4/30/2015 12:41:23 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: Brett

Last Name: Nava-Coulter

Organization: Mr.

Email: bl_nc1@yahoo.com

Street Address: 74 Montebello Road

Address Line 2: 1

City: Jamaica Plain

State: MA

Phone: (650) 255-8856

Zip: 02130

Comments: Would the developer consider allotting another set of units for 70 , 80. or 90% of market rate? This would allow some additional affordability to the development but also offer greater profits that additional affordable rate units wouldn't? Has a decision been made on incorporating composting into the buildings waste systems? I would strongly urge the developer to consider both these suggestions. As they have said in the past they feel a sense of responsibility to the community in which they are building. If they are sincere about this, it is their duty to make choices that will not lead to current residents being driven out of the neighborhood due to rising rental and sale prices. Additionally making choices that are environmentally sustainable should be the moral imperative of all developers. I commend the team on the ecological choices they've made so far and encourage them to consider what more could be done to make the unit green in every sense.

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Project Comment Submission: 3200 Washington St.

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

Thu, Apr 30, 2015 at 12:01 PM

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

CommentsSubmissionFormID: 382

Form inserted: 4/30/2015 12:00:18 PM

Form updated: 4/30/2015 12:00:18 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: Antonio

Last Name: Cruz

Organization: Egleston Square Resident

Email: lethal_enforcers@yahoo.com

Street Address: 8 Weld Avenue

Address Line 2:

City: Roxbury

State: MA

Phone: (617) 522-1692

Zip: 02119

Comments: I'm a lifelong resident of Egleston Square. Born and raised there. I applaud the developers for taking up this huge development. My concerns are the size of the development and parking. If the developers are willing to scale back on the size(height is way too high) and increase the parking for the development, I think the development will be a success. Your consideration on this matter will be greatly appreciated. Thanks

PMContact: Edward.McGuire@Boston.gov



Edward McGuire <edward.mcguire@boston.gov>

Proposed 3200 Washington St development in context

1 message

Sarah Horsley <sarah.horsley@gmail.com>

Fri, May 1, 2015 at 2:36 PM

To: edward.mcguire@boston.gov, Jullianne.Doherty@cityofboston.gov, matthew.omalley@boston.gov, hannah.smith@boston.gov, Tito.Jackson@boston.gov, liz.malia@mahouse.gov, Liana.Poston@mahouse.gov, sonia.chang-diaz@state.ma.us, Sheila.dillon@boston.gov

Dear Mr. McGuire et al,

I am writing with comments about the proposed development at 3200 Washington Street. I have included my specific concerns below, but first I'd like to lay out some context:

I grew up in the Egleston Square area in the 1970s and 80s. After being away for a while in the 1990s-2000s, I moved back in 2005. I am now raising a child in the neighborhood. I strongly believe that the racial, ethnic and class diversity of the neighborhood and the residents' care for each other helped shape my own lifelong commitment to social justice.

It has been very difficult to witness the gentrification of my childhood community. Although I am proud that my neighbors fought for and achieved improvements, such as a safer and more vibrant Franklin Park, I am angered that so many families have been pushed out by ever increasing housing costs.

Because income and wealth are still so tied to race and ethnicity in the United States, this displacement has fallen disproportionately on people of color. Thus Jamaica Plain is increasingly becoming more white and more wealthy. This is not right! Regardless of racial background or financial means, everyone should have access to the parks, public transit, lively local businesses, and other wonderful resources in JP.

More importantly, we can immediately take steps to slow this displacement. In regards to 3200 Washington Street, I urge you, as government officials, to take the following 3 steps:

1) not only strictly enforce the Inclusionary Development Policy, but advocate with the Mayor to expand the IDP so that at least 25% of all units are affordable. The 3200 Washington developers are correct that with 14% affordable units, they have met the City's current IDP requirement. But this is not enough! For years, the JP Neighborhood Council has advocated increasing the IDP percentage to 25%. And it is more than reasonable, given the current housing crisis for low- and moderate-income families in Boston (as documented by City Life/Vida Urbana, Boston Tenant Coalition and others at recent City Council hearings sponsored by Councilor Tito Jackson). Consider also that there are youth and other residents so concerned about the lack of affordable housing in Egleston Square that they are advocating that any development at 3200 Washington be 100% affordable.

2) Insist that the developers include 25% affordability on site at 3200 Washington Street, in addition to any collaboration they may undertake on the six unit Montebello Road property. If the developers choose to undertake the Montebello Rd. project in conjunction with a Community Development Corporation, that is terrific. But the City should require all developers to meet a 25% IDP requirement within their proposed development.

3) Urge the Walsh Administration to promptly pursue all resources and avenues to preserve and create affordable housing in JP and across the City. For example, can the City work with CDCs and other nonprofits to redevelop vacant properties such as Montebello Rd. at a lower cost? Additional resources to put toward affordable housing could include a larger IDP requirement, potential Community Preservation Act funds, and community land trusts. And of course something has to be done to reign in the corporate landlords who are rent gouging throughout the City.

I do laud the developers of the proposed 3200 Washington for holding a thorough community process and including strong transit-and bicycle-oriented plans in their proposal. In addition, it seems they are willing to make

5/5/2015

City of Boston Mail - Proposed 3200 Washington St development in context

efforts for local hiring and to work with current Egleston Square businesses to ensure that they benefit from the proposed development, for example, by moving into the larger retail/restaurant space.

Residents and government officials will need to be vigilant to ensure that the developers follow through on local hiring and supporting local businesses, as well as a long-term commitment to transit-oriented development. But I believe that the most critical piece is to press the developer and the City to expand the affordable housing requirement.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Sarah Horsley
nearly life long Egleston Square resident
Current address: 34 Brookside Ave., #1, Jamaica Plain

TO: Edward M. MaGuire III
Boston Redevelopment Authority

FROM: H. Steven Colburn
38 Olmstead Street
Jamaica Plain, MA



DATE: April 23, 2015

RE: Comments on the 3200 Washington Street development

I have several concerns about the possible new apartment building at 3200 Washington Street. I have lived in this neighborhood for over 35 years, I love the wonderful mix of people here, I love the feeling on the street, and I want to maintain this beautiful people-atmosphere.

My first concern is that the large building with relatively high rents in most units could upset the balance that we have enjoyed and supported over the years. I know that a small percentage of the units are required to be "affordable," but I am afraid that the significant increase in the density of expensive housing will change our balance.

A related concern is that this building strategy will be copied by others, making the trend continue and leading to a community split between the "haves" and the "have-nots." I am specifically concerned that the influx of people who can afford to live in the market-rate units will also drive prices up in the area for all kinds of goods and services and that this could make it even more difficult for people with limited incomes to stay in our community.

Another concern is that the density of cars will increase and available parking spaces will increase, especially if more people in the neighborhood are dependent on cars and parking spaces.

I do not know how to control these factors, especially the price of housing. I do not even know the anticipated rent levels for the market-rate units. But I do hope that the BRA will appreciate the special nature of our community and try to maintain its wonderful diversity that includes not only economic level but also racial, ethnic, sexual, etc.

Please help.

