

DRAFT

Blessed Sacrament CAC

September 5, 2006

DRAFT Notes

JPNC Zoning Meeting

CAC Members Present: Carmen Velazquez; Rafael Benzan; Jennifer Spencer; Silvia Villar; Ashley Cotton.

BRA: Inés Soto, Randi Lathrop, Richard Shaklik, Rep Sanchez: Anrew McCaud; ONS: Leslie Delaney-Hawkins;

JPZC: Marie Turley, Stephanie Ward, Jake, Jesus Gerena, Kevin Leary, Jim Greene, James Burke, Eric

Ines Soto (BRA) opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda. She explained the purpose of the meeting was to have a joint committee meeting with the CAC and JP Neighborhood Council Zoning and H&D Committee to discuss the zoning map amendment process. She distributed and referred to the tentative project calendar.

Zoning committee members were confused stating, "What are we expected to do tonight? Vote?" The BRA explained that the development team was asked to present their zoning analysis. The project is requesting a Map Amendment and needs to inform and will explain why they are requesting this versus board of appeal zoning relief.

Zoning Committee member asked why change the current zoning now when they just went through the Jackson Square re-zoning.

The BRA responded that at the time of map amendment for Jackson Square they were not aware of the status of the church. A Zoning Committee member replied that the BRA knew the Church was for sale.

Lance Campbell (BRA) discussed other zoning options for the project. The developer proposed the map amendment as one of four options. The others were zoning relief through Board of Appeal, PDA (not allowed in JP), and 121A (not eligible).

Rick Shaklik from the BRA stated that the tables are much more of an issue than the map itself. The tables were updated more recently than 1993. The map amendment will not change any of the tables.

There was a proposal to let the development team continue to work with the CAC and then come to the zoning committee.

The Zoning committee asked the BRA to explain why the developers chose the map amendment and if the BRA supports it. Ines stated that the development team would best explain this. They prepared a zoning analysis/slide presentation

See attached slide presentation.

The development team gave a quick update on project changes to date:

- There was an overall decrease from 129 units to 118 units. There was the addition of a unit to the Church building and the SRO.
- The plans have changed to include the relocated rectory and mixed-use building. The size and scale of the mixed-use building have been decreased. Three retail units have been eliminated, allowing for the relocation of residential units.
- The parking garage has decreased in size.

There was a question about the range of affordability and the number of units below 80% AMI.

There was a question about shifting the market rate and affordable units between the Church and Creighton Street Condos.

There was a question about the parking garage and strategies to keep the cost of the parking garage from increasing.

There were questions about the management entity.

There was a question about zoning and if the existing buildings would confirm to current zoning if converted to housing.

There was some confusion about overlay districts. Their purpose is to preserve the architectural design of an area.

Multi Family Residential (MFR) would allow the project to move forward with the exception of the Cheverus building, which is being considered as office space. Community space and ground floor retail is not an accepted use in MFR, but it is in Neighborhood Shopping (NS).

The economics of the project have allowed for the retail to be reduced and three residential units to be removed to the first floor

On the rectory, the Boston Landmarks Commission felt it was a historical building and stated that it added to the richness of the site.

There are trying to utilize the NS sub district so the sight is not over zoned.

After the community review process the BRA will petition the zoning commission which will then hold a hearing and if approved would go to the Mayor for signing. The Zoning Board of Appeal would only be involved if one of the uses were in violation, such as the Cheverus. Currently, there are no other violations in this project.

The amount of subsidy per unit does not vary regardless of the number of bedrooms. As a result it is less feasible to develop larger units.

What are the Building heights? Currently, the rectory is 45 feet. The convent is actually 55 feet high.

Creighton Street condos??

The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) across Creighton Street is 1.92.

The BS site FAR is 1.1?

A similar analysis was not done on the Sunnyside side of the site. What is the FAR?

The open space required by Single Family Residential (SFR) would be 80,000 square feet. The open space in this plan is 51,635 square feet. There are questions about green core access. There is deeded parking for the market rate housing.

What is being asked of the zoning committee? Why is the map amendment being proposed versus other options? The committee needs to be convinced that the map amendment is better for the community and there is an incompatibility of existing buildings on the site with the current zoning.

Explain how your project varies from existing zoning. All buildings do not conform to the existing zoning.

If the map amendment is approved, rather than board of appeal, the project would only need a variance for the Cheverus.

Floors would not affect MFR

FAR for those dedesignations would meet the FAR for NS and MFR
Spoke to ISD about building code.

There are 70 houses on Creighton/Sunnyside/Westerly Streets. This project will add 118 units of housing, with the school and proposed professional space in 2-8 acre of land (1 acre of land for green space).

One could look at individual acres and core with different analysis for different streets. There are 18.65 res. Acres in JP. A Map amendment does not give opportunity to

neighborhood to talk about the zoning. The ZBA would give opportunity to the neighborhood.

What do we think is the proper amount of density? Zoning committee listens very carefully to abutters and community groups in the neighborhood has a say.

- 1F-3000 doesn't make sense
- The issues are not with the project—rezoning is a larger process.
- Developer driven map amendment
- Sets precedent for spot zoning

The BRA stated that the project remains to be scrutinized by BCDC and Landmarks—and the again with the CAC. This is the beginning of the zoning discussion.

The zoning committee stated that if it was up to the zoning committee we would say you are not ready—why get bogged down w/ hundreds of variances when we can do a map amendment? The developers have more work to do on the project.

The developers are driving this project. I would like to use this time to ask why the rectory is being moved.

- Costs associated w/attaching buildings to it—inefficient use of space—
- Challenge a modern building to a historical building.
- Rectory is not being used for retail space due to above grade areas.

Rafael Benzan (CAC) stated that pushing us to look at the zoning does not preclude us from giving input on design.

We are not neglecting design by moving to zoning.

Edmund Cape asked how this project compares to the church redevelopment in Cambridge. Zoning Committee stated that JP is not compatible to Cambridge. He discussed why the zoning analysis was misleading. He stated that the developers omit the buildings and open space from the discussion. According to his (Sunnyside Neighborhood Association's) analysis, 26 units per acre would be more appropriate.

The zoning committee has many questions and will need to meet amongst themselves before hearing from the development team again. Ines asked that they send her their questions so she can keep the CAC informed. The CAC is meeting with the developers on design next and will debrief this meeting to discuss next steps.

An audience member asked as an abutter would I have more influence through the map amendment process or with variances.

The Zoning committee asked the developers to justify why they want a Map Amendment.

The meeting was adjourned.

CAC members stayed behind to discuss the DRAFT comment letter due Friday, September 8th.