

## 10.25 Notes/Comments

Black – AG or Public  
Red – BRA response

Regarding industrial uses p 44(Table B)

-Wilton Brook townhouses, streets too narrow for parking on either side

-Unit abuts M1 area (in a Local Industrial area) – short distance between unit and industrial property. Buffering requirements don't take industrial activities into account. There doesn't appear to be any regulations – local, city, state, etc.

-These activities have impact on those living next to them (emissions, chemicals, etc.)

\*Existing industrial uses grandfathered in, new potentially hazardous industrial uses not allowed in new code

-Children's health considerations?

-Take into account residential/industrial coexistence

-I think there should be open dialogue about this. We want to examine this a bit more.

-We all know you need jobs & small businesses, but not at the expense of peoples' health

-Residents should be protected – should we add additional lines to the code to regulate particulates, etc. moving forward? Appropriate restrictions should be written out.

-Quality of life is a vague term. Jobs are important, but there are costs associated with industrial to residents. Address the costs and benefits.

\*There are things in the zoning that we can incorporate in regard to screening and buffering between industrial and residential properties.

-Does zoning deal with emissions? No. EPA, etc. has existing regulations and enforces them.

-There is a de minimus. Small and local businesses are not regulated.

\*We can refer back to Article 2A “Definitions” (in the zoning code, already in the plan) to describe those undesirable uses

-Document doesn’t completely reflect newer types of businesses. Cleaning plant shouldn’t be an allowed use.

We can consider changing “Cleaning Plant” to a conditional use given the definition in Article 2A (“Cleaning Plant”, a laundry plant, dry-cleaning plant, or rug cleaning plant.)

-Can this list reflect the newer direction we’re discussing?

\*We want to do this citywide. The land use regulation tables that is seen in Article 69 (Tables A & B) is the standard land use regulations for each neighborhood in the city that has been recently rezoned. We would like to keep that as a template, but agree that newer and contemporary uses should be inserted. We are looking at this from a citywide perspective, so not only would Hyde Park benefit from this, but all neighborhoods in the City. It is a work in progress.

-Towing/tow lots mentioned anywhere? We have a lot of that. Noise issues.

\*If it’s not on the list it’s forbidden. See footnote #15 on Page 53 of Article 69.

-What about parking lots? How to define ‘disabled’ vehicle?

-During visioning process, we were talking about non-compatible uses. We haven’t created a place for these uses that might be expiring. I’m particularly concerned with gas stations.

-Should these go in LC districts?

-Gas stations in Hyde Park close to LC areas/residential areas – should be allowed.

We’ll look into this.

-Concern raised with Southie project at A – switch to all studios (in Sunday's paper). This will double residents added. Can this happen in Hyde Park?

Obviously there was/is a need for Studios in South Boston waterfront, but types of housing proposed would have to fit the needs of Hyde Park. A large amount of studio apts in Hyde Park would not be appropriate.

\*Waterfront zoning in Southie is different than Hyde Park. Zoning code restricts unit size, FAR, Article 80 triggered by any project > 15 units

-2009 Cleary/Logan Square Market Analysis – helpful reference in focusing on the overall rezoning. Most documentation is a fair appraisal of this process. Time and patience brings about progress. Documentation will serve Hyde Park in the long run. We're doing well.

-Owned industrial land for 30 years. Current changes will change rules for uses in an I-2 district. 150 uses originally allowed that have now been changed to C or F (ie, kindergarten A to C change). Approvals process is difficult, time consuming, discourages businesses from locating. Matched 1954 zoning with draft proposal.

-Steel mill converted to general industrial use. These new rules would have prevented 50% of our tenants over the last 30 years. We wouldn't have been able to improve the property.

-Drive-in bank now conditional. Ours is an isolated industrial district. Our property is single story.

-Currently have no height restriction in the old zoning. I suggested 50', you said 35'.

-Street wall continuity ordinarily a good idea, but my two blocks are long (4000'). Each has a different need.

\*Current setback – 5'. If two or more buildings violate that setback, new ones don't, giving property owners more options.

-Should there be flexibility to provide greater setback?

-Signage restrictions overly restrictive – 2'x2' for right angle signs. Free-standing signs important too.

\*Comprehensive sign review process allows for bypass on zoning review process.

-You should try to have as few conditional uses as possible. Review them and allow as many as are consistent with the neighborhood. If they're conditional, we lose them.

-Can we have a sub-meeting with industrial users?

Yes. We will set up a meeting at the BRA with key industrial property owners and managers to go over the land use table. We will show any changes as a result of that meeting to the community. We don't want to over-restrict industrial based uses that are appropriate.

-You're taking away 200 rights we currently have. We pay 3x in taxes. You're driving us out of the city. You'll end up with lawsuits. We want our properties to stay viable.

-Speak to concerns at the next community meeting.

-Can retail signs use the Comprehensive Sign Review program at the BRA?

Yes. This is a citywide policy (not in the zoning) – “comprehensive sign review”

-Staff should sit down with the list of changes in industrial uses.

-He runs one of the cleanest, nicest properties. Police dept, post office are tenants. Takes good care of the property. BRA agrees.

-Approval of change to narrative, adding “mixed use” is an improvement.

\*BRA will reach out to industrial property owners to meet with staff. Concerns will be addressed line by line.

\*Community-wide public meeting will take place in November. We will address issues, including new ones.

-St. Joseph's church parking. What are the regulations for parking? Can we increase that? These churches need to provide better parking.

\*Addressed on page 64, item F

-Webster St and River St, it's a mess. It needs to be increased for the safety of drivers and pedestrians.

\*We can't regulate use, but can regulate parking requirements.

-Is there a differentiation between freestanding and storefront churches in the zoning? No.

-0.1 space per seat (parking ratio) needs to be increased for churches.

We'll consider that.

-Maybe churches should have tandem parking. Everyone comes and goes at the same time.

Not a plausible suggestion.

-Crosscheck Nov meeting to avoid conflicts with neighborhood meetings.