

## **104 Walter Street RFP Public Meeting**

### **February 23, 2021**

### **Public Comments**

#### *Affordable housing:*

- Thank you for the work that you're doing. I'm incredibly excited for the opportunity for affordable housing, and I am in strong support of ownership rather than rental. When we look at the data from the City, we're seeing that Roslindale is among the lowest neighborhoods in terms of income restricted units, and in particular homeownership. In early community meetings, we've had Habitat for Humanity and local community development organizations express interest, and we're interested in the opportunity to build wealth. In particular, I would love to see some deeply affordable units. I would also love to prioritize families of color, given statistics that show that the median net worth of black families is \$8 compared to over \$200k for white families. If we want to be serious about a commitment to racial equity, this is an incredible opportunity to help black families build wealth in an already diverse and welcoming neighborhood.
- I'm supportive of the affordable housing.
- Agree with Claire that affordable rental should be an option for consideration.
- I would like to see 1-2 units affordable for very low income residents, not just low income.
- I think it's very important for units to be appropriately sized for families. The need for housing is for family housing.
- I think that having a rental option -- even if it is only 1 unit -- would enable people who may not be able to qualify for purchasing a home. They need affordability also. Unfortunately, so much of Roslindale is becoming condo-ized, and there are plenty of single family, duplexes, etc. I believe immediate abutters were among those insisting on home ownership. However, with this being a largely publicly funded development -- correct me if I am wrong -- I think the broader community should weigh in. Very low income people may not qualify for a mortgage, much as we would like to enable this option of homeownership. I live on Cotton and it is a mix of owned and rented, which has worked very well.
- Affordable homeownership projects are not really a vehicle for wealth accumulation because resales are restricted. That's what keeps it affordable for future residents as well. So while homeownership may be preferred for various reasons I don't think it's really going to result in wealth accumulation. Rental actually provides more mobility for residents because it is easier to move out. And mixed homeownership/rental would create landlord-tenant relationships which create their own issues. All else being equal, I think rental has its advantages
- Thanks for all this great effort to make affordable housing and green space in Rozzie!
- In one of the earlier Zoom meetings we were asked what, "in an ideal world", we would like to see happen with the development of 104-108 Walter St. So the idea I had was that

it would be great for a housing unit to be created for someone who was specifically qualified and willing to act as a steward for the wetlands. Being on site might make it possible to be the eyes and ears of the community, handling any problems that come up and helping to direct the efforts of the many people willing to volunteer their time to maintain trails and provide a human link between the neighborhood and the City's broader interests. I don't have a practical suggestion for how to structure a contract with such a person, whether it should be a volunteer or paid position, etc. But I would hope there would be a way for these two projects - affordable housing and wild land access - to both be served.

- I realize that the proposal that came out of the community process specified home ownership. However, someone at the meeting suggested that Roslindale is increasingly lacking rental opportunities as more and more 2- and 3-family houses are converted to condominiums. Please allow the RFP to permit proposals that consider affordable rental opportunities.
- If home ownership, how will the property be managed - a single condo association? Two condo associations? What control will the owners have related to how the project is being built (e.g. materials, landscaping choices, paint colors)? Again, this is probably standard, and just wasn't discussed at the meeting.

*Treatment of the existing house:*

- I'm happy to hear that there's an investigation about whether it will be possible to save the existing house.
- Thank you for this meeting and for all of your work and for working with LANA to acquire the property. We're excited for the opportunity to create homeownership opportunities. We're looking forward to enhancing equity and climate resiliency. This has been a collaboration and we want to continue collaborating. We developed a preferred neighborhood site plan with community input, including input from the direct abutters. While you include some of the features from that plan, we really looked at some of the issues raised in this discussion like traffic, the challenge of backing out onto Walter, and the need for pedestrian access. I think it's important to provide flexibility to any developer, and we have been asked by City officials to be flexible. And so I think that requiring retention of the blue house needs to be discretionary and not a mandate. This does need to be affordable, family housing. Families move to Roslindale for some green space, and there needs to be attention to the needs of abutters for site setbacks. A key point from previous community meetings was setbacks from the rear property line. I also think it's important to have community representatives as part of the selection process. We are thrilled to see your timeline for designation in the summer. With some finetuning, this could be a really strong RFP.
- (*referring to the comment above*) We support Kathleen's proposals! Great comments!! Thank you.
- Thank you for this presentation. It is clear that you have clearly listened to the community's concerns and incorporated them into the RFP, and I'm delighted that preserving the existing house is part of the plan.

- I'm really glad that the existing house is going to stay and will be incorporated into whatever gets added to 104, good to know that it will not end up in a landfill.
- Thank you everyone for your hard work! I agree with Kathleen McCabe regarding the front house. Conserving and remodeling it could be way more costly than demolishing and rebuilding. Its situation on the lot could also impede freedom of site design.
- I wasn't able to attend the meeting but I see that the existing building will remain on the site, which was my main concern. It seems counterproductive to demolish a whole building, sending all of that great material to a landfill, in the name of environmental conservation. So with the house incorporated into the plan, I'm excited to see this move forward.
- I'm still unclear on the actual condition of the existing building at 104 Walter St. Requiring that it be preserved could hamstring the development proposals. Please allow the flexibility to remove the building and build the 4 units from scratch, even if the RFP requires justification for removal. Maybe replace "will be expected to retain" with "the BPDA has a preference for retaining"?
- We had originally wanted to retain the existing house as well, but several arguments were made that brought us on board with the earlier proposal. If the idea is to create four units in two structures, it did not seem feasible to have two full size units in the existing house, or if there were, they would be smaller units. This would require the rear structure to be larger, and consume more of the rear lot. This in turn would make it difficult to maintain adequate setbacks from the Wetlands and our property (proposed at 22 feet), and potentially make parking problematic (not enough room for cars to turn around and exit to Walter St). It was also suggested that it would be difficult to retrofit the existing structure to adhere to current standards at a reasonable price point. That said, if it is feasible to retain the existing building and make it into two units we are ok with that option.

*Proposed fence:*

- Screening off the access to the Urban Wild visually goes against the idea of defensible space. Residents of the affordable housing are going to want to keep an eye on who goes in and who goes out.
- Near the Arboretum, low stone walls are sufficient to separate public open space from private lots, rather than a fence. The trees and fence reduce sight lines. You just need a symbolic divider to represent the property line. I would hate for this to look like a gated community.
- I agree to look at alternatives to a chain link fence and to keep line of sight between the two properties.
- I agree with all of this comment about the low stone wall being enough.
- Totally agree about the comments questioning the use of a chain link fence and have a strong preference for natural materials as a border (low wooden fence? stone wall?). I also worry about wildlife and fences, which is a real concern for animal paths. I have in the past called the managers of Allendale because their wire fence at a major entrance

had a stuck rabbit who died while caught in the fence (it was alive when we found it but too injured to live)

- Agree wholeheartedly about the preference for a stone wall over a fence
- I was the person who asked the odd question last night about how high the planned evergreens planted along the narrow strip to the Roslindale Urban Wild might grow. I'm contemplating having solar panels installed on my roof once the Norway Maples are removed (my other question). The previous owners failed to maintain their trees and I've had a number of large branches fall into my yard over the years. Further, I've had to have the maples cut back several times as they encroached upon on house. I love trees, but I really wish whatever is planted won't be a repeat of my past experiences. Hopefully, this explains my sensitivity to this issue. Second, I realize that a number of my neighbors liked the idea of a low stone wall instead of the black vinyl fence the city was planning on putting in. However, I'm not crazy about the idea. I view the strip running from Walter Street to the main body of the Urban Wild as a pathway, not a gathering place. The thought of people "sitting on the wall and having a conversation" isn't especially appealing as it'd be right next to my house (not behind it, like those arboretum neighbors). The Urban Wild is not the arboretum and doesn't have Harvard University managing it. Further, having grown up in a home where my father was often not present, I think it might be a good idea to consult with my new neighbors about what they want. People who may be moving there from areas with more significant crime issues, may not like others "hanging out" on a wall right by their homes, either. Thanks for taking the time to read and consider my thoughts, and thanks for hosting the meeting last night. I am truly grateful that the city has bought 104/108 Walter Street and I not only look forward to a revitalized urban wild space, but to welcoming my new neighbors, too.
- Thank you so much for hosting this meeting. I found it very informative. I walk in the wetlands regularly this time of year and appreciated hearing about the plans and the input from neighbors. I would like to echo the feedback from the neighbor who advocated for a stone wall as an alternative to a large metal fence. His experience as an abutter to the Arboretum was very persuasive, given the large amount of Arboretum foot-traffic (far more than would be seen at the wetlands.) A large fence will disrupt the visual beauty of the wetlands and disrupt wildlife paths. I urge that a stone wall be considered as an alternative. Otherwise I support the path forward and look forward to hearing more as things develop. As a side note: in the spirit of inclusion, it might be helpful to encourage commenters at community meetings to avoid acronyms (such as "DND.") Some of us are not well versed in all of the various offices related to development! Thank you again for all of your work on this project.
- I had one follow up regarding the black back fence of the property. I support the idea of a wall, but should that prove costly my thought was to intersperse wall and holly, or some other native bush. I agree that the sight line would be improved with a wall vs trees and a fence, but a smaller plant like holly might provide a nice compromise. Also holly makes for an uncomfortable entry for errant trespassers on the private property. And birds love it.

- There was a lot of discussion of the chain link fence, and a preference for a low stone wall, which is more in character with the other parkland in the neighborhood. If the issue is that a stone wall would add too much expense to the development project, how about having the parks department / conservation commission build the stone wall?

*Community process:*

- I'd like to fill folks in on the community process that has informed tonight's presentation. In the fall, the Wetlands Working Group held two community workshops virtually to look at different ideas and options, talk about what might be done, what people wanted to see, what the possibilities were. So the preferred site plan that Morgan is talking about came out of those workshops which were attended by more than 40 people each. It was great community participation and something we worked really hard on to get the word out and bring people together. There was a lot of interest in affordable homeownership on this site to bring some housing equity and economic integration in a neighborhood that needs it badly. So the preferred site plan that we came up with was looking at four units of affordable homeownership in two structures. I want to thank the BPDA for hosting tonight's meeting and for a chance to continue the community process.
- Please require that the designated developer make a presentation to the community during design review after designation.
- The community developed an abutter- and community-supported site plan and project attributes, including 2 very well attended public workshops. That site plan should be included in the RFP.
- This presentation properly reflects the output of the community process organized through LANA in which more than 40 people participated. In particular (1) it expands and enhances the wetlands, (2) it provides 4 units of much needed affordable housing and (3) the design guidelines reflect the existing conditions of the neighborhood and the perspective of the neighborhood. I also want to stress the need to provide appropriately sized family units and as deep affordability as possible.
- Thanks to the many people who have worked many years to make this a reality; also appreciate this very informative meeting with City and Councilor staff on hand. Glad that this will be recorded to share with other neighbors. Also commend you on having Spanish translation!
- A huge amount of effort was put in by a group, many of whose members have relevant professional planning and development experience. At least one seat on the review group should be allocated to someone from LANA and/or the Roslindale Wetlands Task Force.
- We moved here four years ago and have enjoyed the Wetlands and neighborhood overall. We learned of the earlier development proposals after being here for a short while and were dismayed at the prospect of building within the Wetlands. We were approached by the Wetlands group to formulate alternatives in hopes, primarily, of saving the wetlands. After many discussions with the community regarding the best use of the land, and working with architects on design proposals, we landed on the proposal presented to you. This involves far more development on the 104 site than we would

originally have liked (1-2 units only), but we understand the need to find a suitable option for all, and hope this set-up will provide benefit to the community in the form of wetlands preservation, climate resiliency, and increased affordable homeownership. We look forward to working with you as the project progresses and reviewing the RFP before it is issued. This has been our first foray into community development, and we are impressed with the way the community and city have come together.

*Site Design and landscaping:*

- I'm excited about the wetlands. I'm concerned about the logistics of fitting four units and parking for four cars on 104 Walter while still having green space on the property.
- In previous meetings, we discussed designing parking so that cars could turn around on the lot. This is a safety issue.
- The 15 foot buffer between 104 and 108 with dense tall evergreens seems wider than it needs to be and reduces the already limited open space on the property.
- During the community process it was agreed that it is important that the parking be set up so that it is not necessary for residents to back out into Walter Street traffic - in other words that there be sufficient opportunity to turn around within the property. This should be required in the RFP.
- There was mention of "loam and seed". Does this mean it will have a lawn rather than beds or other planting or gardening opportunities? Lawns are high maintenance monocultures and this shouldn't be a requirement. Of course sufficient quality soil should be provided.
- The slides you presented and discussion covered the green barrier between 104/108 and 112 Walter Street, but did not address the barrier / separation with 100 Walter Street. The community proposed plans reflected: a) a setback from the property (~20 feet away from 100 Walter property line); b) borders between properties; and c) green barrier in the form of shrubs or trees.
- If the space between the front and back buildings are to contain four side by side parking spaces, that would mean that cars (and headlights) would be facing into our yard. To mitigate disruption, the original community plan contained: a) a solid privacy fence to block the car noise, headlights, and be at least 6 feet tall (not the black vinyl fencing discussed on the 112 Walter side); b) a green barrier (bushes/trees).
- I also like the idea of strongly encouraging tree planting in the proposals
- Please note that any outside machinery or equipment that belongs to the house such as air conditioning, laundry exhaust vents, HVAC units or similar will create noise that is disruptive both to abutters and to the wildlife in the Wetlands. We appreciate any and all measures that can be taken to minimize this disruption.
- In the presentation you mentioned putting trash barrels in the back of the property. This would place trash cans of up to four families right up against the Wetlands. If this is going to be the case it is critical wildlife proof trash barrels are used at all times to keep critters, rats and other animals away.

*Roslindale Urban Wild:*

- Regarding parking for the wetlands, no one expects a lot of traffic. There's a lot of on-street parking right across the street from 108. It is on a severe bend in the road at the bottom of a hill, and there are some serious safety issues on the road here. Our car was totaled a year and a half ago, as have our neighbors. It may be a serious safety hazard for visitors to the Urban Wild to park and then cross the street.
- And also perhaps an enhanced/safe walking path between Arboretum and Wetland.
- I am a neighbor on Coniston Rd and I fully support this plan. You've done a wonderful amount of work and I support the balance between affordable housing and protecting the wetland. My concerns are how to ensure safety for pedestrians on Walter St (parking, crosswalks), control of invasive species - how will that be ensured/encouraged on the property, and keeping the boundary something more natural (stone wall) rather than chain link). Thank you. I look forward to the next meeting!
- Traffic/speed control for the park entrance should be very important for planning, I agree with the Blairs
- I support the call for bike parking at all five entrances to the wetlands (Selwyn, Coniston, Walter, Weld and Hazelmere).

*Traffic:*

- I left comments during the session about this, but I wanted to reiterate the traffic problem on the bend of Walter St directly across from the proposed entrance to the urban wilds, especially because visitors who park will likely have to cross the street to get to the other side of Walter, as will any foot traffic coming from the east side of Walter. I live a block up from the proposed entrance, on the east side of the street, and have been here for 10 years. Immediately across the street from the proposed entrance, I've seen parked cars get totalled three times by drivers as they've sped down that bend on Walter. Four houses up from the proposed entrance, my parked truck has been hit twice by people coming out of the bend, my neighbor's parked car was hit once, the fire hydrant closer to the entrance has been smashed off and sent flying (luckily no one was hit by it), my next door neighbor on the corner of Cotton and Walter has had his retaining wall driven into, another car drove over the sidewalk and up my lawn (which is a slope), and a neighbor 2 doors down from the proposed entrance had their dog killed by a car. These are just the things I've seen happen over the last 10 years, and I'm sure there is more I didn't hear about. It is a really difficult turn and, because of the hill, people fly down it. Sometimes I cross at that point in the street because it's the only place you can see oncoming traffic from both sides, but everyone is flying and I always run to get across. It's marked as 15 miles/h on the turn, but no one obeys that speed limit. I agree with other neighbors who said at the meeting that traffic speed at the bend is a real problem. Hopefully something can go into the planning for the proposed Walter St entrance to slow it down for pedestrians, bikers, and people parking cars.
- As mentioned in the call, 104/108 Walter sits at a difficult section of Walter St to enter and exit. It is effectively a blind spot, that will pose a danger to pedestrians and oncoming traffic for decades to come. This danger becomes more apparent when we consider that the number of inhabitants at 104 Walter are now likely to increase from 3

individuals to potentially 12-16 people. The existing traffic measures in place today are insufficient to curb this danger, and will require more significant traffic calming measures (flashing light, speed enforcement, stop sign etc.) instituted at that point.

*Flooding:*

- We have heard about issues from flooding farther down the hill.
- Flooding has been on Eldon Street, and not on Walter. Portions of the Roslindale Wetlands are at a low elevation than the 104 Walter. 104 Walter Street is an upland parcel.
- When we did the original site plan, it was envisioned no basements to minimize topographic disruption and potential impacts on flooding.



*Roslindale Wetlands Task Force:*

On behalf of the Roslindale Wetlands Task Force, many thanks for hosting the 2/23 community meeting regarding 104 Walter St. As a longtime advocate of the project, I was thrilled to see such a great turnout.

Following are the RWTF's recommendations:

- **Proposals are for 4 units of affordable home ownership.**
- **Preservation of existing structure on 104 Walter St. is *optional*** rather than required. Given the building's limitations -- outdated infrastructure, restrictive footprint -- we recommend making its retention optional. While we encourage developers to be creative, we're concerned required retention will limit response. Its removal offers prospective developers greater flexibility in siting, design and use of modern, sustainable materials.
- **Make landscaping an integral part of the proposal,** to maintain prospective homeowners' privacy and to minimize disruption to abutters.
- **Discourage low walls/public seating around the planned Walter St. Wetlands entrance.**
- **Make a copy of the RFP available for community review and comment** prior to issuance.
- **Seat community members on the RFP review committee.**
- **Require prospective developers who file an RFP to present their plans to the community.**



Longfellow  
Area  
Neighborhood  
Association, Inc.

P. O. Box 222, Roslindale, MA 02131

longfellowarea@gmail.com

---

March 9, 2021

Ms. Morgan McDaniel, Project Manager  
Boston Planning & Development Agency  
Boston City Hall, 9<sup>th</sup> floor  
Boston, MA 02101

RE: Comments re: Disposition of 104 Walter Street, Roslindale

Dear Ms. McDaniel:

The Longfellow Area Neighborhood Association (LANA) first wishes to express its thanks and appreciation to you and everyone at the Boston Planning & Development Agency for acquiring 104-108 Walter Street. We appreciate BPDA's and the City's quick response to this threatened parcel and look forward to the development of four units of affordable home ownership at an enlarged 104 Walter Street parcel. Thank you!

We are heartened to see that BPDA and DND are moving forward to solicit proposals for developer designation for four units of affordable homeownership at 104 Walter. LANA is submitting these comments based on the presentation you and your colleagues made on February 23, 2021 at a virtual community meeting regarding 104 Walter.

LANA urges BPDA and the City of Boston to:

1. Use the neighborhood-preferred site plan and key attributes as a guide to inform future development at 104 Walter, and to providing appropriate public access to the Roslindale Wetlands from Walter Street through 108 Walter. A copy of which is included with this comment letter.
2. Enable review of the RFP language for redevelopment of 104 Walter by LANA and the Wetlands Working Group, a committee of LANA, before issuance.
3. Host a community meeting where qualified developers responding to the City's RFP present their proposed plans to the neighborhood, and answer questions prior to designation.
4. Involve neighborhood representatives in the RFP review and developer selection process.
5. Designate the preferred developer for four units of affordable home ownership by Labor Day 2021
6. Require a landscape plan to be part of the developer's designation application. In lieu of a highly prescriptive landscape plan, we are suggesting that the landscape plan reflect the following values and concerns:
  - a. Visitors to the Roslindale Wetlands and walkers on the perimeter trail should experience a sense of escape from the built environment. Thus, it is important for the landscape and development be appropriately sited and screened from the view of the perimeter trail and the Roslindale Wetlands.
  - b. An aesthetically pleasing barrier fence between 100 and 104 Walter should be erected that provides appropriate shielding 100 Walter from headlights from the parking and movement of vehicles at 104 Walter.
  - c. Native plant species should be used. Newly planted trees should be sufficiently sized (3-inch caliper or larger). Existing invasive species should be removed.
  - d. The service/trash area be appropriately screened from view from the street as well as from the Roslindale Wetlands.

Ms. Morgan McDaniel, BPDA  
Comment Letter RE: Disposition of 104 Walter, Roslindale  
March 9, 2021  
Page 2 of 2

- e. The rear boundary between 104 Walter and the Roslindale Wetlands should be clearly demarcated in an aesthetically pleasing manner.
- f. The Coniston Road viewshed should be considered. The vista from the back yards on the northerly side of Coniston Road should be predominantly vegetative consistent with the Roslindale Wetlands.

Thank you for considering these comments, and incorporating them into the development of the RFP for developer designation for the creation of four units of affordable homeownership at 104 Walter, Roslindale.

LANA looks forward to continued collaboration with you, BPDA and city agencies to advance this project so a beneficial development is created in keeping with the character of the LANA area and the adjacent Roslindale Wetlands.

Sincerely yours,

LONGFELLOW AREA NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION



By: Kathleen McCabe, President

Enclosures (2)

cc: City Councilor Arroyo  
City Councilor Essaibi-George  
City Councilor Flaherty  
City Councilor Mejia  
City Councilor O'Malley  
City Councilor Wu  
Chief Chris Cook  
Chief Sheila Dillion  
John Feuerbach  
Aldo Ghirin  
Nick Moreno  
Paul Sutton  
Kirsten Studlien

**- 2 STRUCTURES WITH  
A TOTAL OF 4 UNITS  
- 4 PARKING SPACES (1 PER UNIT)**



# Key Features of Preferred Site Plan for 104-108 Walter Street, Roslindale

## ALLOCATION OF LAND USES

- **Open Space largely at 108 Walter.** The entire “Rear” of 108 Walter to be permanently part of the Roslindale Wetlands along with the “Stem” of 108 Walter that includes the existing BWSC easement and the strip to the north, to be owned by the City Parks Department or Conservation Commission and to be part of the Roslindale Wetlands Urban Wild.
- **Affordable Home Ownership largely at 104 Walter.** The 104 Walter parcel would be expanded approximately 11 feet northeast to match with the BWSC easement line to contain 4 units of affordable home ownership housing (2 units in 2 buildings each) and 4 parking spaces.

## MAJOR ELEMENTS

- **Pedestrian Public Access Path** to the Roslindale Wetlands be created from Walter Street through the stem of 108 Walter to connect with the Loop Trail.
- **Protection of Roslindale Wetlands Urban Wild** by acquisition of the largest privately owned parcel in the designated urban wild area and permanently protecting it through ownership by an Article 97-protected entity (Boston Parks or Boston Conservation Commission), preferably along with a Conservation Restriction held by Mass Audubon.
- **Creation of 4 units of Affordable Home Ownership** on the expanded 104 Walter parcel in two separate, differently-sized two-family/townhouse style units, with a smaller-footprint dwelling in the rear to minimize impact on the Wetlands and visibility from Coniston Road and the rear yard of 100 Walter.
- **Maintenance of Existing Boston Water & Sewer Commission easement** that will serve as the driveway for the housing on 104 Walter and also serve in part as access for occasional Boston Parks Department vehicles for maintenance to the Wetlands.

## LANDSCAPE ELEMENT FEATURES

- **Landscape & Privacy Fencing Buffer** along the northeasterly boundary of 108 Walter should be maintained (adjacent to 112 Walter). Invasive species, specifically the Norway maple trees, should be removed and replaced with non-invasive appropriate tree/shrubbery species that provide a full green buffer.
- **Landscape & Privacy Fencing Buffer** along the southerly boundary of 104 Walter (adjacent to 100 Walter), including the planting of additional vegetation and trees (3 to 4) as part of the buffer, with specific efforts to screen headlight glare from the parking area on abutters.
- **Green Fence should be erected at the rear of 104 Walter** to clearly demarcate the boundary between 104 Walter and the “Rear” of 108 Walter

(which will become a permanent part of the Roslindale Wetlands). The fencing should be incorporated with the landscaping, either as part of the fence or adjacent. The view from the Roslindale Wetlands of the fence should be green and vegetated.

- **Ample Yard Space** between the two 2-family structures should be provided for future residents.
- **Landscape edge** should be designed and planted between the BWSC easement/driveway and the pedestrian path.
- **Grading:** The structures should be built and the site should be graded to protect the abutting properties from storm water runoff.

### **PARKING & PAVEMENT**

- **Four off-street parking spaces** will be provided for the residents of the affordable home ownership units – one space per housing unit – on the expanded 104 Walter parcel.
- **No off-street parking** for Wetlands visitors. Pedestrian, bicycle and transit access is encouraged.
- **Bicycle parking** for residents and visitors is encouraged.
- **Permeable pavement** to enhance climate resiliency is strongly encouraged throughout the site.

### **DEMOLITION**

- **All existing structures should be demolished** that are currently on the two parcels. This includes the two sheds on the rear of 108 Walter; the dilapidated old barn that straddles the current 104-108 Walter property line, and the existing blue house.
- **Recycle and re-use materials** from the demolished structures as much as possible, either as part of the new affordable housing at 104 Walter or elsewhere.
- **Current tenants** should be supported in relocation by the eventual ownership entity and developer with as generous a timeline and as much assistance as possible.

### **HOUSING FEATURES**

- **Net Zero Design** should be integrated in the design, construction and operation of the new affordable home ownership units.
- **Variety of Unit Sizes** contained among the 4 units of affordable home ownership offered on the site.
- **Context-sensitive design** so that the homes look and feel like they are part of the LANA neighborhood and Walter Street, so that a similar scale, type of materials and style is incorporated.
- **Configuration of the design** of the housing should focus intensity of the uses away from abutters and the Wetlands. This includes entrances in the 2-family closest to Walter Street likely should face Walter Street.

### **CLIMATE RESILIENCY WILL BE ADVANCED BY THIS SITE PLAN & VISION BY:**

- **Protecting the Roslindale Wetlands** which provides for storm water runoff storage, wildlife habitat, and tree cover for heat island mitigation.
- **Adding additional trees and landscape features** to both 104 and 108 Walter that provide buffers, but also enhance heat island mitigation, absorption of carbon, and facilitate absorption of storm water.
- **Net Zero Housing** with four units of affordable home ownership.
- **Invasive Species Removal** with the extraction of invasive Norway maples and other invasive species on the site.

### **EQUITY WILL BE ADVANCED BY THIS SITE PLAN & VISION BY:**

- **Creating 4 units of Affordable Home Ownership** in the LANA neighborhood which is facing rising home prices and gentrification.
- **Net Zero Design** with new energy-efficient construction enabling lower long-term operating costs.

### **WHY DEMOLITION?**

The two community workshops discussed the legal, financial, and material / structural maintenance concerns with affordable condo developments as well as the importance of energy-efficient construction and net-zero goals. The extensive interior reconfiguration gut rehab required to create 2 side-by-side units would likely negate most “embodied carbon” benefits of retaining the house. Additionally, the two community workshops as well as the immediate abutters discussed the importance of a site plan which has adequate side and rear lot line setbacks, that is consistent with the “street wall” along Walter Street, and that allows for a comfortable amount of useable yard area for the residents of the new housing. Considering all these factors, the community’s recommended vision is to remove the existing house and deteriorated outbuildings, re-use and re-cycle as much of the material as possible, and create two new structures of two side-by-side condo units each in a traditional and contextual design which blends in with the neighborhood.

The existing circa-1890s house has not been inventoried by the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the City of Boston has not determined it to be historically significant. Within the past 10-15 years it was abandoned for at least a year over an entire winter season and its condition is not known.



**CITY OF BOSTON  
IN CITY COUNCIL**

March 9, 2021

Morgan McDaniel  
Boston Planning & Development Agency  
1 City Hall Square, Ninth Floor  
Boston, MA 02201

Dear Morgan,

I am writing to express my support for an environmentally sustainable and affordable housing development at 104 Walter Street. Over the past year, I have worked closely with the Department of Neighborhood Development and the Longfellow Area Neighborhood Association (LANA) to help support the City of Boston's land acquisition for 104-108 Walter Street.

As the Chair of the Boston City Council's Committee on Environment, Resiliency, and Parks, I recommend that the developers of this project apply net zero carbon building standards. I also support the creation of at least four units of affordable homeownership. As per the request of the community, please make a copy of the RFP available for public review and comment prior to issuance and seat community members on the RFP review committee. I also recommend a presentation to the community when prospective developers file an RFP.

Thank you and please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

**City Councilor Matt O'Malley**  
*Boston City Council District 6*





OFFICE OF  
**RICARDO ARROYO**  
BOSTON CITY COUNCILOR  
DISTRICT 5

Morgan McDaniel  
Boston Planning & Development Agency  
1 City Hall Square  
Boston, MA 02201

Subject: Request for Proposals for 104 Walter Street, Roslindale

March 8, 2021

Dear Morgan,

I write in support of the recommendations put forward by the Longfellow Area Neighborhood Association (LANA) and the Roslindale Wetlands Task Force (RWTF) regarding the development of a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the affordable housing project located at 104 Walter Street in Roslindale.

I was proud to support the acquisition of the 104-108 Walter Street parcels last year, which was due in large part to the advocacy efforts by LANA, RWTF, and other community members. Since the fall of 2020, LANA and RWTF have hosted neighborhood discussions and community workshops, working with residents to develop a site plan for the 104 Walter Street affordable housing project. They engaged in a thoughtful community process resulting in a consensus plan that describes how to fit four units of affordable housing on the parcel. In light of the work by these neighborhood groups on this parcel, I would like to support the recommendations that they have put forward regarding the RFP process for 104 Walter Street, including the following:

- The proposal should be for four (4) units of affordable home ownership
- Preservation of the existing structure on 104 Walter St. should be **optional**
- A copy of the RFP should be available for community review and comment prior to issuance
- Community members should be selected as part of the RFP Review Committee
- Prospective developers who file an RFP should be required to present their plans to the community

An essential part of ensuring that our City continues to develop in a prosperous, resilient manner is the inclusion of community members' input and participation throughout the process. I

thank you for your continued work in the planning and development of the City of Boston, and for your commitment to working with local communities.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ra', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Ricardo Arroyo  
Boston City Councilor  
District 5