

**Forest Hills Improvement Initiative**  
*A Partnership for Building a Better Community*

**Meeting Notes - Ninth Community Meeting**  
**August 13, 2008**

Following are meeting notes and community comments from the August 13<sup>th</sup> Community Meeting that focused on the responding to community questions and concerns regarding the Use & Design Guideline Recommendations for the Forest Hills Improvement Initiative. *Italic text* has been added by staff to clarify statements.

**Public Safety**

Boston Police announced efforts were underway to redraw area district boundaries so that the Forest Hills area is not split into several different police districts.

- Boston police will announce several community meetings to discuss the district changes and Optimization of police response times and continuity of command leadership will be addressed.

**Transportation**

Boston Transportation Department provided updates on recent and soon to be completed area improvements. Community comments:

- Explore the provision audio signals for the visually impaired.
- Review sign location at base of Weld Hill St.
- Review signal timing at Tower St. & Hyde Park Ave relative to bus movements.
- Enforcement is needed in the area in general and especially at the Tower, Woodlawn, and Weld Hill at Hyde Park Ave. where illegally parked cars block sight lines for cars turning onto Hyde Park Ave.

**Parcel S Use & Height Alternatives**

	<b>Residential over Retail</b>	<b>Blend Office &amp; Residential over Retail</b>	<b>Office over Retail</b>
<b>6 / 5 Stories</b>	29 dots	12 dots	2 dots
Financial Feasibility			
Financial <i>Infeasibility</i>			
<b>5 / 4 Stories</b>	0	3 dots	0
<b>4 / 3 Stories</b>	0	1 dot	0
<b>Zero</b>		1 dot	

Note: a community member informed the meeting that he found the format objectionable and that he preferred not to participate further in the meeting and encourage others to do so too.

**Parcel S - Height Comments**

- I support a 5 or 6 story building on Parcel S
- Please listen to the residents of the Forest Hills area. There is too much building planned. Density invites crime, pollution and can turn a good place to live into a bad environment. Bad environments trigger health problems. Please NO DEVELOPMENT on Parcel S.

- Height GOOD, Density GOOD.
- Zero development
- Many people attending this forum & voting for no development are boycotting the post-it process. They wanted their voice heard. They were silenced & manipulated by this process post-it exercise. I would like to suggest a measure: give me the number of people here (that voted on a preference) that were part of CDC's or other related organizations.
- Please NO development at all. It is already too dense, too much traffic, noise, air pollution, and trash on main & side streets, etc. We need the green space.
- Good TOD opportunity; must be affordable, density will support many uses. Density can be livable; *6 stories ✓*.
- Dense development at the station will bring in more people to invigorate businesses, reduce crime, and make the area more vibrant.
- I do not want a six story building on this site. Alternatives?
- I do want 6 stories!
- 5-6 stories is OK given the grade.
- I think 5/6 stories is a positive in the location.
- A little less parking and more office & residential to support the retail; this is a TOD project!
- I think 6 stories is fine! Fits in nicely!
- No development of a building higher than that which exists.
- No development at all!
- I support 6 stories or whatever is required to make the Parcel S viable.
  
- Please consider establishing a max. height of 70 ft. above Hyde Park Ave. verses 6 stories because 6 stories of retail and office could exceed 70 ft. while 7 stories of housing could be below 70 ft. and no development will exceed 70 ft. because it then becomes a high rise and cost go up significantly.

### **Parcel S – Use Comments**

- How feasible is the “one institutional office tenant” scenario? Wouldn't that make the space difficult to lease if that one tenant leaves? Why not smaller medial offices, given the *area* hospitals & labs?
- Parcel S needs a better range of uses (something in between the two studies that were done). We need a daytime & a night time crowd to support the retail.
- Nice mix of Office / Residential (*Residential over Retail / Some Office Option*). Encourage office users to use the T. Emphasize healthcare & support services.
- No Office Space; too much traffic.
- The well-to-do will most probably not want to live in the noisy congested places you seem to be planning. Traffic will be a problem no matter what.
- *I am* For Housing if affordable (*50/50 market/affordable*). *I am* For Office if housing is market.
- I am very excited about this plan; Hyde Park Ave needs some life! Housing increases safety *by providing more eyes on the street*.

### **Affordable Housing Comments** (*should these be specific to Parcel S, in General or both?*)

- Any Housing 50% affordable, AMI to = JP AMI.
- No less than 50% affordable housing! I've been a JP home-owner for over 15 years. My friends & co-workers cannot afford to live in JP. We don't need more unaffordable housing! 50% affordable please!
- My concern is that none of the "for profit" developers will be interested in bidding & we'll have too high a % of affordability.
- I support 50% affordable housing; it will do the most to preserve the existing neighborhood.
- I support finding a developer who can make the 50% affordable housing work; someone with experience with this financing.
- Affordable 30%-80% AMI, 50/50 affordable / market *housing*.
- Ditto – *to the above*.
- Definitely want 50% affordable, especially as housing unit numbers are getting reduced. Elderly for some *of the housing* might reduce traffic / care uses.
- 50% affordability for current JP residents is essential!
- I have lived in JP 20 yrs., 15 yrs as a home-owner. I am also a nurse who works with homeless people. I totally support 50% affordable housing!
- Housing 50/50 NO! 80 / 20 (market / affordable) MAYBE!
- Please think affordable housing; if we lose the socioeconomic diversity of JP we will never be able to get it back.

### **Other Comments**

- Please consider public financing for public plaza thru from Hyde Park Ave to Washington St. It will be very expensive (15 ft + grade change, over parking structure, ADA requirements). And the "connection" to Washington St does not seem very useful.
- The goal is to develop Parcel S – whatever it takes to unburden Parcel S of the transportation & infrastructure requirements.
  
- Improve the crime rate in the T Station; improve pedestrian safety, and traffic first. Then come to the community with development proposals.
- Just get going!!
  
- Can greater parking requirement for office use be reduced because of proximity to "major transportation hub"?

**END**