

Public comment: Overall, pretty good presentation. Liked the ideas about attention to appropriate materials, including brick. Strongly agree with no surface parking in Precinct 2. Thought the ideas for Heath Street MBTA turnaround were weak. Community requests for the extension of the green line should feature more prominently in corridor study materials. In general, [the study] is getting pretty good.

Public Comment: Disappointed that the guidelines didn't talk about more trees, especially in Precinct 1. Trees are a very effective, low-cost tool to improve streets. More trees should be included.

Public comment: Ditto to Public Comment #2. Need more references to trees. Also liked the terminal views concept.

Public comment: Asked about the process for 105 S. Huntington.

BRA Response: 105 S. Huntington Ave. continues to be processed at the BRA under Article 80 review requirements, but it is the hope that the Framework from this corridor study will inform the final outcome. It has not yet been approved by the BRA Board or the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Public comment: Concerns about the quality of life if there will be increased density with new projects coming into the corridor (i.e., more traffic, increased shadows along the corridor. Need for vitamin D from the sun). Supports low-rise development only. "One of the benefits of the area is light. It is healthy and provides vitamin D to pedestrians. I would like to see any development be low-rise and low-density."

Public comment: Congestion along S. Huntington Avenue. There weren't implementable ideas about how to deal with this. Nothing in the guidelines about pursuing residential parking permits on side streets off of the corridor, or regulating the unrestricted parking on S. Huntington Avenue (especially Precinct 1). Instead, to add capacity to the roadway, the unregulated parking lanes could be removed. A priority should have been made for Green Line improvements. There was no reference to Colbert Street or Craftson Way. BRA is missing the biggest issues here. Also concerned about the concept in the slides shown about removing left turns from South Huntington onto Huntington.

BRA Response to immediate comment above: The proposed elimination of left turns for northbound South Huntington to westbound Huntington was simply an idea put forth and would require consensus from the community as well as with the city's traffic management staff. The intent is to improve intersection capacity for vehicles and improve E line operations. We heard from many community members that the E line should be prioritized and this concept could be one of many ideas in that regard. We heard strong opposition from some community members as well the other night on this concept. Any changes and redesign to this intersection would require a lengthy public planning and redesign process prior to deciding on any changes.

Public comment: Request for new parking regulations on South Huntington should be in the Framework recommendations, borrowing from the regulations in place currently for Huntington Avenue. Parking should be two-hour max, with an exemption from time limits

for cars with resident stickers. This would be consistent with regulations on Huntington Avenue. It would be a benefit to both local business owners and local residents.

Public comment: Residential parking permit stickers were suggested for not only the side streets off of the corridor, but for S. Huntington Avenue itself to deter commuters who park all day and take up spaces in front of active businesses (1st Precinct especially).

Public comment: Would have like to have seen more emphasis on historic preservation, not on a general scale, but specifically directed at identifying actual buildings in the corridor for historic preservation.

Public comment: Generally pleased with the framework and the height recommendations. Like the idea of splitting the corridor into three precincts for clearer character identification of each area. Mentioned that the VA, MSPCA and the Goddard House all promised the community certain public realm improvements that never happened and it is frustrating to residents (i.e., brick wall at the MSPCA, front parking at the Goddard, etc).

Public comment: Disappointed that the Green Line extension did not make it into the draft Framework while knowing that all of the breakout groups in meeting #2 suggested it. Would like to see it become incorporated into the Framework as a long-term recommendation.

Public comment: Suggested that the City's Transportation Dept needs to improve on their signaling at certain intersections. While they try to maximize flow for traffic, it sacrifices safety for pedestrians. There needs to be pedestrian-only signaling for the S. Huntington Ave. / Huntington intersection and Heath Street / S. Huntington intersection.

Public comment: Asked if the BRA had heard from MSPCA about any future changes (BRA response was that we had not). Wants to see that brick wall come down so as to connect the property to the adjacent neighborhood. The dog run is useful for residents and was also grateful that the former 10' brick wall along S. Huntington Ave came down, but there are other improvements that could be made. Said that the Day Street residents actually wanted the wall to remain.

Public comment: This planning process needs to keep moving and wrap up soon; it is taking longer to plan this than it's taking to plan the Winter Olympics. What is the schedule? There are projects ready to move forward, and people ready to invest in areas that we've been waiting decades to see investment in. We shouldn't delay this longer than necessary.

BRA Response: We'll need to refine the study after listening to comments tonight. We will come back about in about a month to have one more meeting in the community (*unknown date and time and location at this time*). Then, we'd like to bring the final Corridor Study to the BRA Board on April 11, 2013 for adoption.

Public comment: Really pleased with almost all of it. Carving out three precincts for deeper study is good. Not enough to address cycling safety. Specific cycling interventions to add include: carving out more road space and putting safety filler into the MBTA tracks to prevent wheels getting stuck, especially where cyclists need to cross the tracks. How better to accommodate bikes in Precinct 1 - noted that there is not enough room for bike lanes north of Heath Street split.

Like the idea of special height zones: the specific benefits/trade-offs (and the enforcement of such benefits) for height need to be memorialized. BRA mentioned the Harrison-Albany Plan from the South End

(<http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/pdf/PlanningPublications/Harrison-Albany-Corridor-Strategic-Plan-June-2012.pdf>) which memorialized development incentives into the zoning in exchange for community amenities. The S. Huntington Avenue Corridor Framework would be similar to this idea; however, the Framework does not rezone the area.

Public comment: Height recommendations seem good. Asked for photos or images of what the heights would look like in precincts 1, 2 & 3 for final meeting.

Public comment: Would like to see what you would like to see saved. Does this lay out the parameters for what the neighborhood would like to see protected?

Public comment: The exchange of developers giving back to the community for going above the guidelines is a good idea. But this needs to be memorialized. Also, holding developers accountable to delivering on what they promise to do, in exchange, is important.

Public comment: On bicycles: it works in Precinct 1. The bike path next to the J-way is a great transportation route for cyclists. The bike planning should consider providing better east-west routes across to that path, to use in addition to, and as alternate to, South Huntington. For example, improvements on Bynner Street could provide such a connection.

The final Framework will have:

- Long-term guidelines that can be implemented when the timing and funding is ripe.
- Immediate action items to be implemented in the near term.

The Framework will lay out an implementation plan with agencies/parties responsible for implementing the action item in a specified timeframe:

- Short-term – up to four years;
- Mid-term – five to eight years;
- Long-term – more than eight years.