Feedback from West End Area Planning Group, as of **3/10/03** meeting

General Comments

1. Positive feedback on the overall tone of the document.
2. Document does a good job reporting community concerns.
3. There is a need to correct typos, misspellings, incorrect labels and captions for some figures, and incorrect names. (Example: wrong name given for St. Joseph's Church.)
4. Maps and diagrams should show more of the surrounding areas—these should include a broader context.
5. Diagrams could be a little more "future-oriented." (Example: Pedestrian Circulation diagram.)

Comments on Open Space Principles

While the topic of Open Space is touched upon in many of the comments we've received, there have been no specific comments on these principles.

Comments on Community Character Principles

1. Some mentioned the need to create appropriate connections and a good transition to and from the North Station area, which is likely to have more tall buildings in the future.
2. Some feel that one way to create such a transition is through the implementation of good urban design principles, such as "stepping down gradually" in height as you move from an area with taller buildings toward an area with shorter buildings. This would help "create a bridge" between such areas.
3. Mention that there are currently a variety of heights and building types in the residential community.

Comments on Transportation Principles

1. Cardinal O'Connell Way is very dangerous—enforcement needs to be enhanced, and additional means for improving safety should be explored. It is used as a "cut-through"; this goes against the desire to keep local and regional traffic separate.
2. Make more mention of safer street crossings, in general.
3. Rename "Transportation Principles" to "Transportation and Pedestrian Circulation Principles."
4. Mention Science Park Station and Leverett Circle as a means of pedestrian access (specifically relating to access to the new parks on the river).

5. Facilitate at-grade, open-air pedestrian access to and through MGH campus.
6. Mention bicycles and bicycle paths.
7. Mention that the area is dominated by transportation facilities.
8. More emphasis and discussion of Blossom Street.
9. What about the streetscapes when the elevated Green Line comes down?
10. Mention that the community feels strongly that the MBTA station at Science Park should be prioritized for an upgrade.
11. Mention the change in character of the area during day and night—commuters and residents; what is impact of institutional traffic on residential streets?
12. Mention other options for replacing surface parking in addition to underground garages; suggest other ways to deal with parking issues.
13. Mention need for traffic enforcement.
14. Mention trucks and limousine issues at the Fleet Center.

Comments on Land Use Principles

1. There is a desire for hospitals to include other (more community-friendly) uses in their campus, and to be a more blended part of the overall area.
2. Be a little more normative regarding what types of development should happen around the West End Area (on adjacent blocks).

3. Remove apparent contradictions—for example, whether the Lindemann Center plaza should be returned to open space or whether it should be developed.
4. There should be mention of the need for more affordable housing.
5. There should be mention of desire for mixed (commercial, retail, residential) use.
6. Recognize that first-floor retail makes sense in some locations but may not be appropriate in every location.

Comments on Community Facilities Principles

1. Mention need for specific additional services (such as a school) if more residents are attracted to the area.
2. Better define " community facilities."
3. The continuing need for good law-enforcement needs to be stated.

Other comments

1. Some feel the legal implications of the *West End Land Assembly and Redevelopment Plan are* not fully analyzed on certain issues.
2. Present the demographic information in a way that is easier to understand.
3. Include an updated version of the timeline (used earlier in the process); state which projects (public

and private) are likely to be impacted by these principles.

4. How specific should the language in this plan be? (One example was an exception taken to the terms "low- and mid-rise.")

5. Recognize explicitly that "some of what we want"— as expressed in these principles—is "in conflict"; there will have to be trade-offs and compromises down the road.

6. There was comment about the names "Charles River Park" and "Charles River Plaza"—some people would like to see these removed from general usage within the Planning Principles, as they are associated with specific development entities. Others felt these names are common usage.