

CreationDate	Your Name	What is your ho	What is your race	What is your age?	Comments on the draft Plan:	Comments on the draft zoning map:	Planning Department Response
3/19/2026	Matt Rice	Own my home	White	30-39	<p>I am really excited about this plan to bring more homes, retail, and restaurants to Hyde Park. We are incredibly lucky to have two commuter rail lines running through Cleary Square. This neighborhood can support more people and the density that creates a vibrant neighborhood people want to spend time in.</p> <p>I have a few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Neighborhoods Associations do not speak for the neighborhood. They are disproportionately made up of folks who do not want to see any changes happen in neighborhood. There are plenty of folks in Hyde Park who would like to see more housing, restaurants, and things to do around the neighborhood.</li> <li>2. We will need more frequent transit to support more people in Cleary Square. Our trains are already packed and while I think the traffic is exaggerated, more residents will bring more cars to the neighborhood</li> </ol>	<p>We should allow for density around the train station. If the Providence/Stoughton trains ever get more frequent, this is a great place to house more Bostonians.</p>	
3/23/2026	Milan Patel	Own my home	Asian/Pacific_Isl	50-59	<p>As an active developer and property owner along the Dana Avenue corridor in Hyde Park, we have direct experience with the physical and market realities that shape what is developable and financially viable along this street. We respectfully submit the following three comments for consideration by the Planning Department and Zoning Commission.</p> <p>Comment 1: Allow Residential Uses Along Dana Avenue in the S4 Sub-District The S+S framework requires Active Use(s) to occupy 50% of building frontage in the S4 sub-district.</p> <p>We request this requirement be removed for Dana Avenue and that ground-floor residential be permitted. Dana Avenue is one-way with limited pedestrian throughput, making viable retail activation unlikely. Mandating commercial use on this street will produce vacancies, not activation. Allowing residential use gives the market flexibility to determine the appropriate ground-floor mix while supporting the City's housing production goals.</p>	<p>As an active developer and property owner along the Dana Avenue corridor in Hyde Park, we have direct experience with the physical and market realities that shape what is developable and financially viable along this street. We respectfully submit the following three comments for consideration by the Planning Department and Zoning Commission.</p> <p>Comment 1: Allow Residential Uses Along Dana Avenue in the S4 Sub-District The S+S framework requires Active Use(s) to occupy 50% of building frontage in the S4 sub-district.</p> <p>We request this requirement be removed for Dana Avenue and that ground-floor residential be permitted. Dana Avenue is one-way with limited pedestrian throughput, making viable retail activation unlikely. Mandating commercial use on this street will produce vacancies, not activation. Allowing residential use gives the market flexibility to determine the appropriate ground-floor mix while supporting the City's housing production goals.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
3/23/2026	Milan Patel	Own my home	Asian/Pacific_Isl	50-59	<p>Comment 3: Prohibit Contractor Yard Uses Within the S4 Sub-District</p> <p>We request that contractor yard uses—outdoor storage or staging of construction equipment, materials, fleet vehicles, or trade supplies as a primary use—be listed as prohibited in the S4 sub-district use table. Contractor yards generate noise, heavy truck traffic, and visual blight incompatible with the residential character S+S seeks to build. They consume developable land without contributing housing or neighborhood activation, and their presence suppresses private investment in adjacent parcels. Any existing contractor yards within S4 should be treated as legal nonconforming uses with no right of expansion.</p>	<p>Comment 3: Prohibit Contractor Yard Uses Within the S4 Sub-District</p> <p>We request that contractor yard uses—outdoor storage or staging of construction equipment, materials, fleet vehicles, or trade supplies as a primary use—be listed as prohibited in the S4 sub-district use table. Contractor yards generate noise, heavy truck traffic, and visual blight incompatible with the residential character S+S seeks to build. They consume developable land without contributing housing or neighborhood activation, and their presence suppresses private investment in adjacent parcels. Any existing contractor yards within S4 should be treated as legal nonconforming uses with no right of expansion.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>A contractor yard would likely be considered "Storage of Supplies and Scrap" which is already a Forbidden use in S4.</p>

3/23/2026	Milan Patel	Own my home	Asian/Pacific_Isl	50-59	<p>Comment 2: Increase Maximum Stories from 4 to 5 in the S1 Sub-District at 50' Height Limit</p> <p>The S+S framework proposes a 50-foot height limit with a 4-story cap in the S1 sub-district. We request the story limit be increased to 5 stories within that same 50-foot envelope. We own 7 and 11 Dana Avenue, both 4-story buildings within 40 feet—demonstrating ~10-foot floor-to-floor construction is achievable here. The additional 10 feet of height allowance under S1 is sufficient for a fifth story using the same floor plate. A 4-story cap within 50 feet wastes the allowable envelope and suppresses housing yield. We request the standard be revised to “up to 5 stories within a 50-foot maximum height.”</p>	<p>Comment 2: Increase Maximum Stories from 4 to 5 in the S1 Sub-District at 50' Height Limit</p> <p>The S+S framework proposes a 50-foot height limit with a 4-story cap in the S1 sub-district. We request the story limit be increased to 5 stories within that same 50-foot envelope. We own 7 and 11 Dana Avenue, both 4-story buildings within 40 feet—demonstrating ~10-foot floor-to-floor construction is achievable here. The additional 10 feet of height allowance under S1 is sufficient for a fifth story using the same floor plate. A 4-story cap within 50 feet wastes the allowable envelope and suppresses housing yield. We request the standard be revised to “up to 5 stories within a 50-foot maximum height.”</p>	<p>S1 is intended to be a 4-story district. The reason the height limit in feet is 50 ft is to allow flexibility for taller floor to ceiling heights, which is especially important for buildings with ground floor commercial uses. The additional height allowance in feet also allows space in the zoning envelope for things like roof decks, while still limiting the building to 4-stories.</p>
3/24/2026	Andrew Farnitan	Own my home	White	30-39	<p>I am fully supportive of this plan, especially the effort to bring additional housing and commercial space to Cleary Square. I look forward to seeing more neighbors, more customers for local businesses, and more retail options and cultural amenities. I'm also excited about the potential for transportation improvements to make the square more pedestrian friendly.</p>	<p>I am fully supportive of the draft zoning plan, especially the S4 zones around the intersection of River Street and Hyde Park Ave, and adjacent to Fairmount Station. I would also support a higher S5 zone on the parcels closest to the two train stations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
3/27/2026	Andrew P	Own my home	White	30-39	<p>This plan would greatly benefit the neighborhood. As a Hyde Park resident, I appreciate that the plan includes sidewalk improvements and increased tree canopy in addition to new housing opportunities.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
3/31/2026	Eve	Own my home	Other	30-39	<p>Reading through the thorough and thoughtful report, I'm incredibly impressed and touched by the care shown for the community. As a resident of Cleary Square, I'm excited by the vision of a revitalized neighborhood. The plan reimagines the status quo to serve our current needs better, and move us towards a brighter future by unlocking the rich culture and natural green resources all around through deliberate, intentional urban planning and design. Those worrying about additional vehicle traffic or parking miss the forest for the trees. Yes, congestion is awful today. But a more walkable, bike-able neighborhood means fewer cars needed for every errand. New residents supporting more vibrant local restaurants and businesses benefits us all. Building more parking incentives more, not less traffic.</p> <p>I'm thrilled by the dream of new tree-covered walking areas and green space along the river, bustling arts and nightlife, and Hyde Park being THE destination on the commuter rail from downtown.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
4/3/2026	Colin Parmalee	Own my home	White	30-39	<p>I strongly support this plan, which will bring much needed housing to areas close to transit, and strengthen the neighborhood core</p>	<p>Would like to see SC areas adjacent to S4 adjusted to S3 or S3-6</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
4/7/2026		Own my home	White	30-39	<p>I strongly support the proposed changes of the Squares + Streets zoning in Cleary Square. My only feedback is that I wish that there were an S5 district included somewhere, and that higher allowable density was reflected near the commuter rail stations. I also wish that there were more amenities for bikes, as was originally in the proposal. It is great that the plan does not have mandated parking minimums. Southwest Boston is a great place to live and we should have zoning like this to allow more folks to enjoy it.</p>		<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

4/10/2026	MARK J GIANNÀ	Own my home		50-59	<p>I strongly support redeveloping Cleary Square. As a lifelong Hyde Park resident of 56 years, I believe our community deserves investment and improvement. However, I have serious concerns.</p> <p>Seven stories is too tall and out of character. Limiting buildings to four or five stories would better preserve the small-town feel we value.</p> <p>Parking is already a problem, and any new development must include adequate on-site parking so residents aren't further burdened.</p> <p>Development should also remain on main streets. The proposals at 85-87 and 63 Walnut Street are in residential areas and do not belong there. These projects would overlook private yards, block sunlight, and take away the privacy and quality of life residents deserve.</p> <p>We all want to see Hyde Park improve—but not at the cost of the very qualities that make it a great place to live. Development must be thoughtful, balanced, and respectful of the people who already call this neighborhood home.</p>	<p>I also strongly believe that development should remain on the main streets. The proposed projects at 85-87 and 63 Walnut Street are in residential areas, and they do not belong there. These are homes, not commercial corridors. People have invested their lives in these properties, and they deserve to have their privacy respected. Large buildings with balconies overlooking private yards will take that away, while also blocking sunlight and reducing the open, breathable space that residents rely on.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
4/10/2026	Thomas Hanno	Own my home	White	40-49	<p>Hi, I'm not actually sure which plan this comment should go on, but I wanted to advocate for more housing, more bike lanes, and abolishing parking minimums. We desperately need to increase the supply of housing and make it easier for people to walk, bike, take the bus, and take the train.</p> <p>I've seen people on Facebook complaining about buildings being too big or not having enough parking, but we're right next to a reliable bus line that takes you right to the orange line! Plus the commuter rail. We have to adapt and this plan looks good to me. (Although I'd take a separated bike lane so I don't fear for my life and my kid's lives.)</p>	<p>(same comment as the other page)</p> <p>Hi, I'm not actually sure which plan this comment should go on, but I wanted to advocate for more housing, more bike lanes, and abolishing parking minimums. We desperately need to increase the supply of housing and make it easier for people to walk, bike, take the bus, and take the train.</p> <p>I've seen people on Facebook complaining about buildings being too big or not having enough parking, but we're right next to a reliable bus line that takes you right to the orange line! Plus the commuter rail. We have to adapt and this plan looks good to me. (Although I'd take a separated bike lane so I don't fear for my life and my kid's lives.)</p>	Thank you for your comments.