

## Sullivan Square Disposition Study

### Public Meeting: 10-10-13

#### Meeting Notes

- Public comment: 5feet between the tree and building seems too tight.
  - **Consultant Response:** will talk to Dennine
- Public comment: Will there be wind protection from the trees? It doesn't seem like it here.
  - **Consultant Response:** The trees don't solve that problem; the way to do that is through building design and typology to minimize wind tunnels etc. Our final report will recommend issues that need further investigation/solutions and we can include wind impacts there.
- Disagree with giving up open space the early on in the process. I'm not sure if we agreed on this.
  - **Consultant Response:** During the July meeting there were breakout groups and what is being presented tonight is the result of those discussions, and discussions in the September meeting when this version of an open space plan was presented.
- Public comment: This is pushing the agenda of development and undervaluing the open space.
- Public comment: I disagree, I think that the appeal to have activity in the open space is very real. I'm open to having a building on a portion of the parcel.
- Public comment: It's great to have businesses activity near the open space but why can't we have more open space on another parcel?
- Public comment: In favor of publicly accessible land but owned and maintained by private entities.
  - **Consultant Response:** Yes, that scenario will show up later in the presentation.
- Public comment: Half building and half park parcel won't work very well and the property owner should be made to pay to maintain and develop park.
- Public comment: The park will inevitably be part of the private building owner and will no longer be part of the public realm.
- Public comment: There are many different kinds of open spaces - plazas; pedestrian through ways; destinations and parks. We are talking about both kinds of park and we want both. A Healthy mix.
- Public comment: How is the concern from the last meeting about how high the buildings are against the highway being addressed?
  - **BRA Response:** We still need to provide dimensional information about the highway to the consultants.
  - **Consultant Response:** The question is about establishing the view point and who can see it from which vantage points. We need to still do those eye level views to understand what it will look like on the ground level.
- Public comment: How wide is revised building at the MBTA station parcel?
  - **Consultant Response:** 65'.
- Public comment: So there is room for more step back.
- Public comment: Regarding the Charlestown/Somerville line - what happens in that area? It's vague.
  - **Consultant Response:** The curb line differs from the current line. The new configuration gives you a wider sidewalk.
  - **BRA Response:** That is not something that's part of this process but we can add it as a suggestion for further study in a future process.
- Public comment: Would it be possible to make the Somerville intersection happen sooner?
  - **BRA Response:** That is a BTD policy issue.
- Public comment: Has there been thought about incorporating elevated pathways?
  - **Consultant Response:** No, that is not something we are considering.

- **BRA Response:** One of the goals of the BTD process is to make the streets walk-able and to improve pedestrian access on the street level.