



June 21, 2018

Boston Real Estate Collaborative, LLC  
Attn: Brent Berc  
1904 Washington Street  
Boston, MA 02118

Re: Request for Supplemental Information – 44 North Beacon Street Project

Dear Mr. Berc,

Please find enclosed a Request for Supplemental Information in association with the proposed 44 North Beacon Street Project in the Allston neighborhood of Boston. This Request for Supplemental Information describes information required by the Boston Redevelopment Authority d/b/a the Boston Planning & Development Agency in response to the Project Notification Form, which was submitted under Article 80B of the Boston Zoning Code on March 6, 2018. Additional information may be required during the course of review of this proposal.

If you have any questions regarding this Request for Supplemental Information or the review process, you may contact me at (617) 918 – 4457.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. Webster", written over a light blue horizontal line.

Gary J. Webster, Jr.  
Project Manager

CC: Jonathan Greeley, BPDA  
Michael Christopher, BPDA  
Lauren Shurtleff, BPDA  
Warren O'Reilly, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services  
Susan Tracy, The Strategy Group, Inc

**BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
D/B/A BOSTON PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT AGENCY**

**REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION  
44 NORTH BEACON STREET PROJECT**

**SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS  
FOR SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUEST**

**PROPOSED PROJECT:** 44 NORTH BEACON STREET PROJECT

**PROJECT SITE:** 44 NORTH BEACON STREET, ALLSTON, MA 02134

**PROPONENT:** BOSTON REAL ESTATE COLLABORATIVE, LLC  
c/o BRENT BERG  
1904 WASHINGTON STREET, BOSTON, MA 02118

**DATE:** JUNE 21, 2018

---

The Boston Redevelopment Authority (“BRA”) d/b/a The Boston Planning & Development Agency (“BPDA”) is issuing this Supplemental Information Request (“SIR”) in response to and based on the review of the Project Notification Form (“PNF”) submitted by Boston Real Estate Collaborative, LLC (the “Proponent”) for the 44 North Beacon Street Project.

This document is not a Scoping Determination as we are not requesting a Draft Project Impact Report. This document is only requesting that the Proponent provide more details around the information that was submitted in the PNF and respond to all comments and feedback received during the comment period. When the Proponent files a response to this request, a new fifteen (15)-day comment period will commence and the public review process shall continue.

On January 17, 2018, the Proponent filed a Letter of Intent in accordance with the Executive Order regarding Provision of Mitigation by Development Projects in Boston. On March 5, 2018 the Proponent filed a Project Notification Form (“PNF”) pursuant to Article 80 Large Project Review for a proposal which includes the construction of fifty-four (54) residential units, totaling approximately 53,884 gross square feet; including sixteen (16) home-ownership units and thirty-five (35) parking spaces (the “Proposed Project”). Notice of the receipt by the BPDA of the PNF was published in the Boston Herald on March 6, 2018 which initiated a public comment period set to end April 6, 2018, with an extension issued until April 13, 2018. Comments received since then have subsequently been added as well.

On March 29, 2018, the BPDA hosted a publicly-advertised community meeting regarding the PNF at the Boston Centers for Youth and Families Jackson-Mann Community Center (500 Cambridge Street, Allston, MA 02134). The BPDA hosted an Impact Advisory Group meeting on March 19, 2018 and on April 26, 2018, both at the Charlesview Community Center (123 Antwerp Street, Allston, MA 02134).

Written comments in response to the PNF received by the BPDA from the Impact Advisory Group members are included in **Appendix A** and must be answered in their entirety. Written comments in response to the PNF received by the BPDA from the public are included in **Appendix B** and must be answered in their entirety. Written comments in response to the PNF received by the BPDA from the city agencies are included in **Appendix C** and must be answered in their entirety.

## **PREAMBLE**

The Proposed Project is being reviewed pursuant to Article 80, Development Review and Approval, which sets forth a comprehensive procedure for project review of the following components: transportation, environmental protection, urban design, historic resources, infrastructure systems, site plan, tidelands, and Development Impact Project, if any. The Proponent is required to prepare and submit to the BPDA a filing with supplemental information that meets the requirements of this request by detailing the Proposed Project's impacts and proposed measures to mitigate, limit, or minimize such impacts. After submittal of the supplemental information filing, the BPDA shall distribute notice of such submittal. If the BPDA determines that the filing of supplemental information adequately describes the Proposed Project's impacts and, if appropriate, proposed measures to mitigate, limit, or minimize such impacts, the BPDA will announce such a determination and that the requirements of further review are waived pursuant to Section 80B-5.4(c) (iv). Section 80B-6 requires the Director of the BPDA to issue a Certification of Compliance indicating the successful completion of the Article 80 Development Review requirements before the Commissioner of Inspectional Services may issue any building permit for the Proposed Project.

## **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE**

The Request for Supplemental Information requests information that the BPDA requires for its review of the Proposed Project in connection with Article 80 of the Code, Development Review and Approval, and other applicable sections of the Code.

In addition to responding to the comments attached in the Appendix, the following points have been highlighted by BPDA staff:

### **I. Public Realm**

- Should address specific programming of courtyard

### **II. Urban Design**

- Shift ramp inside of building to maintain a continuous sidewalk and landscape.
- Continue to work on design of ground floor level garage entry, pick-up/drop-off configuration with BPDA, working towards maintaining an active use at ground floor level.
- Coordinate with BPDA and BTD to reduce drop off width to appropriate dimension.
- Building should begin to set back at 6th floor and/or datum line should be established/articulated at between 5th and 6th floor levels so as to diminish sense of height.
- Provide more specific information on proposed architectural materials and windows/door section details.

### III. Transportation, Circulation and Traffic

- Transportation solutions and mitigating impacts needs to be coordinated in conjunction with the proposed project across the street at 37 N. Beacon Street.
- Loading and pick up/drop off activity needs to continue to be refined with BPDA and BTD staff. The relocation of the parking access driveway from the east edge to the west edge of the site should be considered.
- A shared/public location for designated rideshare pick up/drop off should be explored with the City and abutting developments.
- The proponent needs to work with the City to design and implement intersection improvements at N. Beacon and Everett Street as part of the project's mitigation package. This will likely include signal equipment and operational upgrades, pedestrian improvements, accessibility improvements, pavement marking modifications for better lane management and the addition of a crosswalk on the westbound approach of the intersection.
- Additional considerations for off-site mitigation include improvements to nearby bus stops (shelters and other passenger amenities), contribution to the A/B Mobility study, and sponsoring of a Blue Bike Station

### **REVIEW/SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

Ten (10) copies of a bound booklet and an electronic copy (PDF format) containing all submission materials reduced to size 8-1/2" x 11", except where otherwise specified, are required. The electronic copy should be emailed to Gary J. Webster, Jr. at [Gary.J.Webster@Boston.gov](mailto:Gary.J.Webster@Boston.gov). The booklet should be printed on both sides of the page. In addition, an adequate number of copies must be available for community review. A copy of this request for supplemental information should be included in the booklet for reference.

**APPENDIX A**  
IMPACT ADVISORY GROUP COMMENTS

April 13, 2018

Gary Webster  
Boston Planning and Development Agency  
One City Hall Plaza  
Boston, MA 02201

RE: 44 N. Beacon Street Allston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

44 North Beacon is a pivotal project that will set a precedent for the future development of North Beacon and Everett Street. 44 North Beacon will be setting the standard for sidewalk appeal, setbacks, open space definition, FAR, height, parking, affordability, deed restriction and community benefits.

Given the number of community and IAG concerns on this project, the IAG cannot support the project as it is currently proposed. We hope our comments below help to better inform a project that better reflects the needs and interests of the Allston-Brighton community. We look forward to continued work with the developer and BPDA.

Below we have listed a number of concerns and suggestions related to the building itself, the impact on the immediate community, and the impact on the broader Allston-Brighton neighborhood.

### **1) Transportation**

With the explosive development in this area of Allston Brighton, the IAG is very concerned about the impact it will have on the existing neighborhood traffic. **We would like to see a the results of the BPD's transportation study and a more extensive traffic study that takes into account all proposed development for this area prior to project approval.**

**We also recommend that the proponent join the Allston Brighton TMA and support a publicly accessible shuttle in Allston Brighton.**

### **2) Massing/Density/Height**

The IAG and abutters have expressed concern about 7 story height overpowering 533 Cambridge Street (5 stories – 24 units) & 14/16 Gordon Street. **We recommend that the proponent lower the height of the rear building to better fit the context of its surrounding abutters.**

The FAR is 3.02 representing 3 times the zoning requirements.

### 3) Affordability & Homeownership

The median income of Allston/Brighton is \$52,362. Given the current market rate for housing, most neighbors in Allston/Brighton would be spending more than 50% of their annual income on this housing. As we experience one of the region's most expensive housing markets, **we recommend that the developers increase the percentage of their affordable units to 20% of the development.**

**We also recommend an increase in the number of ownership units.** This recommendation responds directly to Allston-Brighton's declining owner-occupancy rate. Allston has a very low 10 percent owner-occupancy rate, while Brighton's owner-occupancy rate has declined from 26.8 percent in 2010 to 22 percent in 2017. These owner-occupancy rates compare unfavorably to the city-wide average of 34 percent.

To ensure the goal of increasing owner-occupancy housing in Allston-Brighton, **we also recommend that the condominium units be deed restricted.** The developer has set 25% (4 units) as deed restricted. This leaves 12 condos open for investment/rentals. The provision for deed restricted condo units will make the building more attractive to individuals/families who want to live in Allston-Brighton for an extended period of time.

### 4) Setbacks/Open Space

The IAG has heard feedback on the current setbacks and open space along the building. Abutters, neighbors, and the IAG are concerned about the proposed 11' between the proposed project and their abutters. Building should be set back to allow for pull in area for Pick-up and Drop-off traffic and parking for deliveries, service vehicles and moving trucks.

Curbside trash barrels for 54 units will impede sidewalk – IAG wants developer to produce a better plan. Look at Boston's Complete Streets Guidelines to go for the ideal sidewalk scape, which is 11'-15', <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>.

Going from a commercial/industrial use to residential on North Beacon Street, the sidewalk experience should reflect residential - see 533 Cambridge Street. Proposed building is 11' from 14/16 Gordon Street barn building-too close. We recommend increasing set backs in order to create more space between the buildings.

### 5) Parking and Deliveries

15 parking spaces for 38 units (54 bedrooms) is not sufficient for this building. With 38 spaces planned, 16 go to condo units, 2 for handicap and 2 for visitors, 15 are left for 38 rentals. Although the parking ratio for this proposed development is in-keeping with the current demographic of car ownership amongst renters in Allston, this project seems to have no disincentive for its car-owning residents to obtain a free on-street permit from the City of Boston and park on city streets. Adding on-street parkers will create an undue burden along the neighboring streets, an area already strained for current residents who have no access to a private parking garage. If this is deemed to be the case, the developer should offer certain

parking amenities, such as space in their private parking garage, to the surrounding neighbors at a subsidized rate. **After the building attains full occupancy, we recommend that the developer track and share usage and occupancy rates for the onsite garage and work with the BPDA and BTD to offer available garage parking to the neighborhood residents.**

We also request more details and better plans for trash pick-up and barrel placement, pick-up and drop-off traffic and parking for deliveries, service vehicles and moving trucks.

## 6) Design

The IAG has heard considerable feedback on the architectural value of the building. It is our hope that in acknowledgement of its prominence as a precedent setting development on N. Beacon that the completed structure will feature more attractive architectural details that reflect a residential look throughout.

## 7) Community Benefits

**Considering the transformative nature of this project, we would recommend the proponent invest in the beautification of Union Square.** We suggest benefits to the Jackson Mann Community Center to increase community programming and beautification in Union Square. A renovation or rebuild of a new JM Community Center make it the core or Union Square activity. This should be a shared community benefit by all the developers on N. Beacon/Everett St.

We suggest a shuttle by joining the ABTMA organization spearheading this project.

Transportation improvements for bike & pedestrians in the Union Square area.

High percentages of deed- restricted home-ownership and increased affordable units.

Street trees, lighting, wide sidewalks, setbacks, curb landscaping, to beautify Union Square

Signed by 44 N. Beacon IAG Members,

Jane McHale  
Emma Walters  
Joanne LaPlant  
Jo-Ann Barbour  
Daniel Martinez

Daniel Daly  
Rosie Hanlon  
Peter Leis  
Galen Mook



May 17, 2018

Gary Webster  
Boston Planning and Development Agency  
One City Hall Plaza  
Boston, MA 02201

Dear Mr. Webster,

Here is the IAG response to 44 North Beacon, Allston, MA second proposal. Again, we strongly believe that this is a pivotal project that will set a precedent for the future development of North Beacon and Everett Street.

The IAG again cannot support this second project proposal. We have listed below our recommendations related to the second proposal and listed the issues stated in the IAG letter of 4/8/18 that were not addressed.

Signed by IAG members,

Jane McHale  
Joanne LaPlant  
Danny Daley  
Ben Tocci  
Peter Leis  
Galen Mook  
Rosie Hanlon  
JoAnn Barbour  
Emma Walters  
Daniel Martinez

**IGAG 2nd Comment Letter - 44 North Beacon St. Allston, MA 02134**  
**Alternative Proposal - May 17, 2018**

**Overriding Concern:** 44 North Beacon will be setting the standard for sidewalk appeal, setbacks, open space definition, FAR, height, parking, affordability, deed restriction and community benefits. It is a pivotal project that will drive the design of North Beacon and Everett Street development in the future.

The IAG has serious concerns that the four developers in this area are individually promoting building and site design before planning and traffic studies of the area been completed and vetted, which would allow for holistic planning.

**IGAG Responses to Alternative Plan:**

- Adhere to the Guest Street Planning Study recommendations
- Reorient to original plan of stepped building with 3-story condos on N. Beacon.
- Lower the back building to max 6 stories (Some IAG members want to see 5 max)
- Retain the newly proposed N. Beacon St. setbacks, green pick-up/drop-off area, trash area, green curb strip with trees/plantings, wider sidewalk.
- Garage entrance is much better on the east side of building

**Issues not addressed in Alternative Plan in regard to IAG Letter of 4/8/18:**

**Green/Open space**

- Rooftop open space with public access is only approx. 1200 sq ft.
- The use of the roof for public programming needs to be fully explained to IAG and inserted in cooperation agreement including hours public may access space, how they will access the building,

**Residential Program (Type of Units & Homeownership)**

With 90% rentals and only 10% ownership in Allston, this project should provide more homeownership with a deed restricted units will lead to neighborhood stabilization. Current plan is only 25% (4) units deed restricted

- The developer should decrease the number of rental units and increase the affordability of the rentals from 13% to 20%.

**Community Benefits**

Transforming North Beacon Street from a commercial/industrial area to a future of predominantly residential area, we need to look at the beautification of and revitalization of Union Square. We recommend that the proponent create a fund, along with the other developers around this intersection, that will be set aside for Union Square beautification, infrastructure improvements, and community programming.

**APPENDIX B**  
PUBLIC COMMENTS



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**RE:Allston -Brighton developments 44 & 37 N. Beacon st.p**

1 message

**Marie-Therese Metallidis** [REDACTED]

Thu, Mar 29, 2018 at 1:22 PM

To: Gary.J.Webster@boston.gov

Cc: ISD@boston.gov, publicwork@boston.gov

Hello,

We have been living in this Allston-Brighton neighborhood for more than 30 years.

We bought one of the trashiest home in the neighborhood and with our efforts we made it a better home for our family and by the same token bringing up the value of the neighborhood. Every steps of our improvements has been a painful process from the city of Boston because of regulations. We complied with the law and the city of Boston demands and we understood why.

Today, having lived 32 years in the neighborhood and looking around us we see buildings popping up left and right that indicates a lack of compliance by the builders.

The traffic and the parking has become horrendous and every little green or open space has turned into a construction disaster. Those buildings have been built with cheap looking materials without any concern for the beauty and convenience of the actual high taxpaying homeowners. The roads have become a disaster with potholes and damages which are even more obvious during inclement weather

Here we have some basing questions. What happened to the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), that supposedly cares for the beautification of the neighborhood and the shape of buiding.

Whatever happened to the environmentalist movement that ,you, the city of Bostom claim to be so concerned about?,

It is evident that those constructions are only for the benefit of the contractors and the city of Boston, (money, money, money,) without any consideration for the citizens who pay taxes to preserve the quality of life of the neighborhood. With these kind of construction you are allowing the CHOKING of the neighborhood and the lives of its residents.

Aris & Marie-Therese Metallidis

[51, Saunders St.](#)

[Allston, Ma 02134](#)

[REDACTED]

# *The Parents and Community Build Group, Inc.*

*Working To Build and Strengthen the Community Through Fundraising, Events and Education  
Advocacy - Stewardship - Education - Community Growth*



April 4, 2018

Re: Proposed Project – 44 North Beacon St., Allston

Dear Mr. Webster,

This correspondence serves as nonsupport for the presented 44 North Beacon Street Proposal Design for the following reason:

- \* The Project's massive size significantly impedes the quality of life of its abutting Cambridge St. and Gordon St. neighbors. The Project's size is too large.
- \* Re: Sidewalk Size and Use. A Complex of this size might be better served with wider sidewalks that can accommodate Trash Barrels versus crowding or blocking the pedestrian sidewalk on City of Boston trash disposal days, as planned. The planned sidewalk design is too narrow.
- \* No Loading/Delivery Area which will increase traffic congestion on North Beacon Street. North Beacon St. is designed for flow-through traffic. North Beacon St. cannot accommodate its daily amount of traffic, and parked vehicles. This is a safety issue.
- \* Re: Bike Use/Alternative Transportation: North Beacon St. and Everett St. Traffic is dangerous for bikes, the amount of traffic in that area is high and will increase as planned housing developments are completed, and dependency on the MBTA increasing service is unrealistic.
- \* Open Space: Residential Communal Use Open Green Space Areas versus proposed Rooftop Gardens. Tenants might be better served by transforming the rooftop areas into a seasonal lounge area with tree and flower plantings where tenants could socialize with their neighbors and family.
- \* Community Benefits: The North Beacon St./Union Square area is in need of revitalization, and would benefit from street tree plantings, attractive landscaping, wider sidewalks, better lighting, etc.
- \* Condo and Rental Pricing: Gentrification begins when community residents are priced out of their present neighborhoods because they can no longer afford to rent or purchase a home in their neighborhood/community. This is an important issue for Developers and the BPDA to address. Are the unit prices proposed affordable for the average/moderate-income renter, or home buyer?

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Joan Pasquale".

Joan Pasquale  
PCBG, Inc. and Resident

*1387 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 402 Allston, MA 02134*

*617-254-0632 [pcbginc@verizon.net](mailto:pcbginc@verizon.net)*

*[www.parentsandcommunitybuildgroup.org](http://www.parentsandcommunitybuildgroup.org)*



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition for 44 North Beacon Street Project

1 message

---

Zhang Liu [REDACTED]  
To: Gary.J.Webster@boston.gov

Thu, Apr 5, 2018 at 10:40 PM

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a property owner of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon Street](#).

I live in Allston for few years and really like this area. The back of building of [44 North Beacon Street](#) is right facing my apartment, so I'm interesting in this project, also attended the public meeting on March.29<sup>th</sup>. I learn some facts about this project, think this project is detrimental to the neighborhood because of the high density, low homeownership and doubling the allowable height of Article 51.

Here are a few of the reasons I am expressing my opposition:

- Height: The proposed project contains a 7 stories building with 70 feet height, which is more than double the height of Article 51 allowed. It will severely affect the lighting of other buildings around it. I know your department recently granted excessive variances exceed the city's own rules to large projects, but it's not lawful/reasonable and do hurt the current residents' rights.
- Homeownership: The proposed project only requests 16 unit ownership of total 54 residential units -- lower than 30% homeownership, which is too low even for Allston, an area already suffered enough with high turnover of tenants. My building has about 50% of homeownership but we, the owners, already think it's too low to manage a good living environment, and try to improve it during recent HOA meetings. As the Development Review Department, your team has the responsibility to urge developer enhance the homeownership, to maintain and improve the whole environment of local community.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project, it hurts me, my neighbors and many others in the community. Allston is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow your own Article 51 guidelines and proper urban planning that looks at the whole area in terms of economics diversity, properly planned business and residential areas, improved roads, upgraded mass transit, ungraded utilities, the improvements of safety issues, allow for family growth, and to consider the needs of people at all ages of life and economic standings. These are the consideration made by urban planners to benefit the whole community rather than the random parcel development as you have been allowing to be done.

Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Jo ZHANG



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street

1 message

---

kcrasco@rcn.com [REDACTED]

Thu, Apr 12, 2018 at 5:37 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, mark ciommo <mark.ciommo@cityofboston.gov>, william.brownsberger@masenate.gov, HomeownersUnionAB <homeownersunionab@gmail.com>

Development Review Department

Boston Planning and Development Authority

1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a Brighton property owner and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban

4/13/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street

planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Crasco

78 Fairbanks Street





Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street

1 message

**Crittendon, Rollin** [REDACTED]

Thu, Apr 12, 2018 at 9:04 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Cc: Mark Ciommo &lt;Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov&gt;, William Brown &lt;berger@massenate.gov&gt;, huab board@googlegroup.com

Dear Mr. Webster

I live and work near [44 North Beacon Street](#) and I oppose the current plans for it.

The density of the building proposal flouts the zoning rules, three times zoning.

The building is nearly double the 35 foot height allowed by zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor.

The traffic situation for this building exacerbates an already critical traffic area. When I commuted by car going down this street was an exercise in frustration for me and anyone backing out or turning in.

The variance request for setback removes any separation between the building and sidewalk.

In its current form this proposal hurts me and my neighbors. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Rollin Crittendon  
[2003 Commonwealth Avenue](#)  
#22  
Brighton



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**North Beacon Street**

1 message

**Annette Pechenick** [REDACTED]  
To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Thu, Apr 12, 2018 at 9:52 AM

[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)

Development Review Department

Boston Redevelopment Authority

[1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA](#)

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am property owner and resident of Brighton, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be

4/12/2018

City of Boston Mail - North Beacon Street

accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Respectfully,

Annette Pechenick

97 Colborne Road

Brighton MA 02135



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

1 message

Kirsten Ryan [REDACTED]

Thu, Apr 12, 2018 at 8:33 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, Mark Ciommo &lt;Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov&gt;, "Brownsberger, William (SEN)"

William Brown berger@ma.enate.gov

Cc: HomeownersUnionAB@gmail.com

[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)

Development Review Department

Boston Redevelopment Authority

1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a resident and owner occupant landlord living in Brighton Center and commuter to Cambridge for the past 18 years.

I am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it

4/13/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Kirsten Ryan  
9 Oakland Street  
Brighton



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

1 message

Joe Zina

Thu, Apr 12, 2018 at 10:40 AM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov,  
Lance.Campbell@boston.gov

[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)

Development Review Department

Boston Redevelopment Authority

1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a homeowner and resident of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the

4/12/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Joseph Zina  
45 Hano Street, Allston

--

*Joe Zina*



MERRILL & McGEARY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

100 STATE STREET

SUITE 200

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109

MICHAEL W. MERRILL  
MMERRILL@MERRILLMCGEARY.COM

RITA M. McGEARY  
RMCGEARY@MERRILLMCGEARY.COM

CAMERON S. MERRILL  
CMERRILL@MERRILLMCGEARY.COM

RYAN R. SEVERANCE  
RSEVERANCE@MERRILLMCGEARY.COM

(617) 523-1760

FAX (617) 523-4893

WWW.MERRILLMCGEARY.COM

Of Counsel

PAUL J. McCARTHY

April 12, 2018

Mayor Martin Walsh  
1 City Hall Square, Suite 500  
Boston, MA 02201-2013

Re: Proposed Development By  
Boston Real Estate Collaborative, LLC  
44 North Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts

Dear Mayor Walsh:

I represent the Board of Trustees of 533 Cambridge Street Condominium Trust, a residential Condominium located at 533 Cambridge Street, Boston, Massachusetts (the "Condominium"). The Trustees on behalf of the residents of the Condominium, a majority of which are owner occupants, oppose the proposed development by Boston Real Estate Collaborative, LLC as currently described in the Expanded Project Notification Form ("EPNF") dated March 5, 2018 (the "Development").

The Condominium is a direct abutter to the rear of the Development. The Development has focused a majority of the project density on the rear of the property. As shown in the EPNF, the Development requires variances for FAR, Height and Setbacks.

Specifically, the Development seeks a variance to build more than triple the allowable FAR. The neighborhood is already extremely congested and will be further congested due to several other approved and pending developments. Aside from the excessive density, the rear of the Development will be 69 feet tall (a figure which likely does not include mechanicals, head houses and utilities) in a district which allows a height of 35 feet. The Development is double the allowable height which is further compounded by the requested variance for a smaller than required rear setback. The required setback at the rear is 20 feet, however the Development will be only 15 feet from the lot line. The final requested variance is a reduction of more than half of the



MERRILL & McGEARY

Mayor Martin Walsh  
April 12, 2018  
Page Two

required parking spaces. The neighborhood is already plagued with a lack of on street parking, by providing approximately 30% of the required parking the Development will serve to only make matters worse.

The size and density of the Development is out of character of the neighborhood. Not only will the construction have a major negative impact on the neighborhood for years, but if constructed, the proposal as planned is too dense and will place a significant burden on an already congested area. Each variance requested only serves to compound the negative impact of the other variances. The excessive density will have greater impact on the Condominium due to the excessive height and insufficient setback.

The addition of 54 units, of which 38 are rental will have a profound impact on the quality of life of the local residents. When you add frequent moving trucks for transient residents, deliveries, curbside loading and trash removal this is a potential disaster for the neighborhood, pedestrians and vehicles. The proponent claims move in and move out will be during "off peak" hours, however this is not realistic as shown each year on common move dates.

The Development is not appropriately designed or planned in relation to the lot and neighborhood. The Proponent should go back to the "drawing board" to reconsider mitigating the impacts not only on the Condominium, but on the neighborhood.

The Trustees have been excited to be part of the revitalization of the area. The Development, however, is not in keeping with the other positive developments. The Trustees request your closest attention to the details of the Development as the planning process continues. The Trustees intend to participate at every step, because as planned and designed this Development does not work for the neighborhood. Furthermore, the planned development does not meet the criteria for the issuance of a variance and the development will be opposed on this basis in the future as well. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

  
Michael W. Merrill

MWM/dmd

cc: Gary J. Webster, City of Boston BPDA  
Mark Ciommo, City Councilor  
Sal N. DiDomenico, State Senator  
Kevin Honan, State Representative  
Board of Trustees, 533 Cambridge Street Condominium Trust



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

1 message

**dustina bennett** [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 9:56 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Cc: Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov, Annissa Essaibi George &lt;A.E.George@boston.gov&gt;, Ayanna Pressley &lt;Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov&gt;, Michelle Wu &lt;Michelle.Wu@boston.gov&gt;, Michael.Flaherty@boston.gov, Kevin Honan &lt;kevin.honan@mahouse.gov&gt;, Michael Moran &lt;michael.moran@mahouse.gov&gt;, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov, warren.oreilly@boston.gov, Homeowners Union of A-B &lt;homeownersunionab@gmail.com&gt;

Dear Mr. Webster,

I have been a resident of Brighton for over 13 years, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

*Dustina M. Bennett*

Dustina M. Bennett

4/18/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

Hobson Street, Brighton





Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street

1 message

Sharon Daley

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 11:12 AM

To: "gary.j.webster@boston.gov" <gary.j.webster@boston.gov>, Mark Ciommo <mark.ciommo@boston.gov>, Will Brown berger william brown berger@ma enate gov , Homeowner Union of A B homeowner unionab@gmail com

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a property owner of Brighton and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who does business and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be better for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownerhip, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setback** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portion of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street. 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Sharon Daley

4/18/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street

22 Saybrook Street  
Brighton, MA 02135



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## 44 North Beacon Street Comments

1 message

---

Mike [REDACTED] Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 10:31 PM  
Reply-To: Mike [REDACTED]  
To: "gary.j.webster@boston.gov" <gary.j.webster@boston.gov>, Mark Ciommo <mark.ciommo@cityofboston.gov>, "michelle.wu@boston.gov" <michelle.wu@boston.gov>  
Cc: "william.conroy@cityofboston.gov" <william.conroy@cityofboston.gov>

Mr. Gary Webster  
Senior Project Manager  
Boston Planning & Development Agency  
One City Hall Square  
Boston, MA. 02201  
[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)  
617.918.4457

**Subject:**  
44 North Beacon Street Comments

Mr. Gary Webster;

I have cc Boston's Senior Transportation Planner, Bill Conroy as a courtesy because I reference him in my comments.

I am a resident of Portsmouth St, Brighton, MA. I am often in the area of 44 N. Beacon St, including attending events at the Jackson/Mann Center.

### Parking

Parking should be at least one per bedroom. However this project is unwilling to attempt this goal. The proponent has stated anyone who needs a parking space and is unable to have one, will find someplace else to live.

Therefore the proponent will have no issues with a condition for approval that the **BTD commits not to issue street parking permits** to anyone living in the buildings. The precedent has already been set by BTM doing the same for other areas within Boston. Boston's Senior Transportation Planner, Bill Conroy, is my reference.

### Traffic

Traffic is always an issue, however some areas have suffered long before the rapid development within Austin/Brighton. This project already has over burden traffic. It is near the intersection with one of the few streets that crosses I-90.

Additional, traffic from all projects need to be considered together, not just individually. This includes demolition, construction and built. Traffic issues and possible solutions needs to be transparent with community input. The projected growth rate for increase in traffic needs to be updated to a realistic number.

There should be a moratorium on building projects should the BPDA be unable to do this in the

timely matter.

**Additional Comments**

Because of all of the above plus the FAR is 3 times of what is allowed by zoning, Height is double what is allowed by zoning, and limited open space among other issues, this project should not be approve as it now stands.

Please do not combine my comments with anyone else, each person should have their voice heard individually.

Thank you for your time and consideration,  
Michael Dzedzic  
14 Portsmouth St

Brighton, MA



**44NBeaconComments.docx**

15K



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposed to current 44 North Beacon St.Proposal

1 me age

Eileen Houben [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 12:43 AM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Cc: Mark Ciommo@boston.gov, A E George@boston.gov, Ayanna Preley@boston.gov, Michelle Wu@boston.gov, Michael.Flaherty@boston.gov, kevin.honan@mahouse.gov, michael.moran@mahouse.gov, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov, Warren O'Reilly &lt;warren.oreilly@boston.gov&gt;, Homeowners Union of A-B &lt;homeownersunionab@gmail.com&gt;

Gary J Webster

Development Review Department

Boston Redevelopment Authority

1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am opposed to this project for many reasons including density(~3x allowed 1.0) , height (~2x allowed),

and traffic that the infrastructure and T already can't handle even *before* the many nearby approved

& constructed projects come online. I'm lucky that my frequent visits & travel through this neighborhood

are usually not during rush hour, and the traffic is still difficult now.

We have article 51 zoning that friends & neighbors worked on with predecessors & colleagues of

yours for 100s of hours. We have the 2012 Guest Street Area Plan which neighbors, BRA staff, and urban planning

experts worked on & was supposed to be an agreement with Allston Brighton citizens. When will the city and the BPDA

stand up for its citizens and make developers respect its rules??!! The risk is supposed to be on the developer, not us,

and variances are supposed to be given **only** when there is both real community need and active strong support from neighbors &

community. The only part of the GSA plan that anyone has paid attention to is the maximum density that was supposed to be

allowed just bordering the Pike- and only with spacing plus height variation vs wall effect; the T station (tho' its use is limited);



and possible new street links. The integral green necklace and green street setbacks have been ignored &/or built over.

And maximums in height & density have been proposed for all the projects in the area with no real stepdown to the street,

and these assumptions have been carried across the street where the zoning height is 35', not the more generous 40'

of the N.Beacon street side of GSA.

44 N Beacon has CC1 zoning (see attached files.) All residential uses are conditional (requiring board of appeals),

but appealing to allow a residential use should be separate from appealing to override the zoning.

I am adamantly opposed to zoning variances here. (Possibly a variance of +/-10% might work on a plan if it increased

affordable homeownership. That's what we need.)

I would accept a residential use ONLY with a 35'or shorter height, designed in a way that does not block the

light & view from longtime neighbors on Cambridge st. whose windows overlook the site. Some were not aware of the project through

proper procedure from the developer, but only when local civic group members leafleted or talked to them. These suggestions

would fit the neighborhood, but they are not in the developer's proposal, and that project I oppose.

Sincerely,

Eileen Houben

Corey Rd Brighton

ps. Please note that you will also see my signature as clerk on the Homeowners Union of AB letter,


but this is my personal letter and contains some topics and some stronger views that probably won't be in the group letter.

---

## 2 attachments

 zoning table for res. use of CC1 and NS1 .xls  
11K

 businesszoningdimensions.TableE.ods  
16K



# Homeowners Union of Allston- Brighton



[HomeownersUnionAB@gmail.com](mailto:HomeownersUnionAB@gmail.com)

April 13, 2018

By electronic mail

Mr. Gary Webster  
Project Manager  
Boston Planning and Development Agency  
Boston City Hall, Boston, Mass.

Re. Opposition to development proposal for 44 North Beacon Street

Dear Mr. Webster:

Our organization is strongly opposed to the above referenced development plan in its current form. We offer the following comments:

**BUILDING MASSING, HEIGHT & DENSITY:**

While we applaud that the part of the building facing North Beacon Street is limited to 3 stories (it is indeed the appropriate scale for this location), we are opposed to the current plan in which the rest of the building becomes significantly higher (5 stories in the middle, and 7 stories in the back).

The current height and massing are harmful to residential abutters in the rear (many long-term owner-occupants), and create excessive density that would have a strong negative impact on North Beacon Street traffic (due to the parcel's inability to accommodate needed parking, as well as on-site space for moving and delivery trucks, and pick-ups and drop-offs).

**NUMBER OF UNITS:**

The proposed 54 housing units on a 17,640 SF parcel, right on a very busy, but narrow arterial road, is simply too many in number.

For comparison, a successful condominium project at 533 Cambridge Street (directly behind 44 No. Beacon St.) has 44 units on a parcel of 26,377 SF (data from the Boston Assessing website), which amounts to 600 SF of land per each unit. By that measure, the 44 No. Beacon St. parcel, which has 17,640 SF, should have 30 units (17,640 divided by 600).

In another relevant example, 31 No. Beacon St. (currently under construction) has 20 units on a parcel of 9,895 SF (data from the BPDA website), which amounts to 495 SF of land per unit. By that measure, the 44 No. Beacon St. parcel of 17,640 SF, should have no more than 36 units (17,640 divided by 495).

Both 533 Cambridge St. and 31 No. Beacon St. are dense enough to be economically viable and profitable projects, but their plans also incorporated room for driveways and loading areas, which ensure that the projects have little impact on traffic.

Based on those observations, we conclude that traffic impacts of the 44 No. Beacon St. proposal can only be mitigated by removing about 18 units from the project. Lower density would decrease the number of needed parking spaces, and with proper redesign, allow room for service vehicles and pick-ups and drop-offs on site.

#### **SETBACKS & OPEN/GREEN SPACE:**

Both the proposed setbacks and amount of street-level open space are grossly insufficient in the current proposal. Additionally, the minimal setbacks in combination with proposed excessive height, are harmful to the abutters.

We object to the concept that roof decks can be counted as open space (by that logic, even balconies could be considered open space). This approach violates the spirit of Article 51, and any other zoning article that logically prescribes retention of certain amounts of open space in residential areas.

Additionally, since this project proposes to excavate the entire site for parking, it severely limits the parcel's ability to sustain trees or any other substantial greenery that could be seen and enjoyed by neighbors and passers-by.

#### **RESIDENTIAL PROGRAM (TYPE OF UNITS & HOMEOWNERSHIP):**

We do not believe that it is prudent, practical, or sustainable to have a project with 38 units of transient rental housing and 16 condo units conjoined within the same building, and in the configuration that is being proposed.

For reasons stated many times before, we think that new housing construction in Allston-Brighton should be adding quality, owner-occupied housing – to address the persistent problem of low and still dropping owner-occupancy rates, both in Allston and Brighton – even as the neighborhood is growing in popularity.

Of the thousands of housing units that are getting built and will be built in the near future in Allston-Brighton, only a small percentage are homeownership units. This imbalance has to be corrected.

We ask that this project be built for homeownership, and that the condominium documents be structured to ensure that the building is going to be primarily owner-occupied.

#### **PARKING FOR RESIDENTS OF THE BUILDING:**

A residential building in this location should have at a minimum 1:1 unit to parking ratio (in addition to some visitor/service parking, which is also needed). This is necessary to minimize impact on on-street parking in the neighborhood, and to ensure that the building has stable occupancy (residents

without a parking space are often forced to move if their employment or other circumstances require that they have a car).

**PARKING FOR DELIVERIES, SERVICE VEHICLES, and MOVING TRUCKS/VANS:**

This development parcel is “landlocked” on three sides, and the only access for vehicular (as well as pedestrian) traffic is from North Beacon Street. The lot is very close to the intersection with Everett Street, which is already congested and very difficult for all users, and will become critically important to local traffic when the very large Stop & Shop project is built.

In a public meeting about traffic issues in North Brighton, which took place at WGBH earlier this year, a BTD representative stated that large developments are required to provide loading areas for delivery and other service vehicles, as well as passenger pick-ups and drop-offs. And yet, 44 North Beacon Street, a project located in an extremely sensitive area from the traffic standpoint -- does not address this issue.

If this problem is not remedied, this project must not be approved (ditto for any future dense proposals in the immediate vicinity). To allow North Beacon Street to become overwhelmed with hundreds of moving trucks and service and delivery trucks, due to excessively dense transient rental housing, would be unconscionable.

CONCLUSION:

In a nutshell, the 44 North Beacon Street project as proposed has severe impacts that would be impossible to mitigate. We ask for a significant reduction in density and height and other necessary changes as indicated above.

Please ensure that our comments are thoughtfully considered in the BPDA internal project review process.

Thank you.

Eileen Houben  
HUAB Board Member & Clerk

Eva Webster  
Chairperson of the HUAB Board

CC.: Councilor Mark Ciommo, Representative Kevin Honan, Senator Sal DiDomenico

[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)  
Development Review Department  
Boston Redevelopment Authority  
[1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA](#)

Dear Mr. Webster,

I have been a resident of Brighton for over fifty years, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

- **Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.
- **Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.
- **Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.
- **Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

*Lauren McGrath*

Lauren Minihane-McGrath

Ranelegh Road, Brighton, MA.



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Concerns about the proposed developer at 44 North Beacon St.

1 message

Eric Porter [REDACTED]  
Reply-To: Eric Porter [REDACTED]  
To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 6:05 PM

[gary.j.webster@boston.gov](mailto:gary.j.webster@boston.gov)  
Development Review Department  
Boston Redevelopment Authority  
1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I attended the 1st IAG meeting for the proposal for 44 North Beacon St. At this meeting, the developer stated the he/they had contacted the neighbors and "had their support". However this seemed to not be true. Two abutting neighbors attended this meeting and confronted him about this falsehood. As you may remember, when asked again, "who did he have support from?" he could not point to more than 1 neighbor and even that seemed dubious. At the next meeting he boldly made this same claim and again two neighbors were there to invalidate this. I do not think it is in BPDA's or our community's interest in chasing the truth out of a developer. If a developer cannot be honest and do their due diligence at the begging of the process, I would imagine it would only get worse as time passed.

The agreement plan with any developer has so many areas in which they could short cut their obligations or hide aspects of the construction. Also, it seems reasonable to believe that the TAPA agreement is something that is not read in a stringent manner after the fact, and many obligations within this agreement could go unnoted once the building has been approved for construction. I have seen developers make grandiose obligations to the public and the city during the proposal phase, but after reviewing the TAPA Plan once the project has been approved, it could be seen that promises such as "will provide T passes to residents" became "will provide T passes to residents only the first month they move in". My concern is that this developer could act in such a manner.

With specifics to the building plan itself here are the problems I see.

Density: The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning.

Height: The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.

Traffic and trash: The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently. We need to consider that September 1st move ins and outs will require many large dumpsters and a location for them to be placed for 3-4 days.

Setbacks: The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. That specific area of Allston Village has a number of owner occupants and could be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute

4/18/2018

City of Boston Mail - Concerns about the proposed developer at 44 North Beacon St.

to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Eric Porter  
80 Linden St.



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon Street proposal

1 message

**Sarah Rodrigo** [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 10:38 AM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov

Cc: Mark Ciommo &lt;Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov&gt;, A E George@boston.gov, Ayanna Pressley@boston.gov, Michelle.Wu@boston.gov, Michael.Flaherty@boston.gov, kevin.honan@mahouse.gov, michael.moran@mahouse.gov, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov, Warren O'Reilly &lt;warren.oreilly@boston.gov&gt;

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am writing to express my opposition to the development at [44 North Beacon Street](#) as currently designed.

Allston Village and North Brighton are great neighborhoods that could be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines, the 2012 BRA Guest Street Planning Study and basic principles of good urban planning.

This project does NOT follow those guidelines.

Development and increased density in A-B is somewhat inevitable. But the key to increasing density through responsible development is preserving or improving the quality of life for all residents and visitors. In order to achieve that goal the community must look at its needs and determine the parameters under which development should occur.

Well, the community did that. When will the City start enforcing those parameters? Perhaps now is a good time.

Sincerely,

Sarah Rodrigo  
[6 Duval Street](#)  
[Brighton MA 02135](#)







Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**Opposition to 44 North Beacon St. Project**

1 message

**Susan Rufo** [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 5:09 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov, william.brownsberger@masenate.gov

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am writing you this letter in opposition for the proposed development at [44 North Beacon Street](#). As a property owner in Brighton, as well as someone who was born and brought up in Brighton, and who continues to work in

our family business established over 50 years ago the ongoing permitting of projects that have become excessive in scope, height and density and the proposed project at [44 North Beacon Street](#) is just an example of that.

Zoning is being trampled on and exploited to such extents that it compromises the quality of life for the residents of

Brighton and Allston. This proposed building is almost three times as large as what the zoning code allows. Where building heights are allowed at 35 feet this project calls for more than twice the allowed height. This type of development is one sided allowing developers the luxury of excessive development to the detriment of the abutting neighbors and neighborhood.

It becomes a travesty to those residents and homeowners who invested in their homes and properties with the

belief there was a level playing field and that everyone would have to abide by the same rules and zoning codes.

Unfortunately, our government agencies and representatives are letting us down, and the voices that seem to count most are those with the deepest pockets.

There has been an on slot of development in Brighton/Allston without the benefit of a master plan of what our

neighborhood/community goals are in achieving thoughtful and beneficial development that allows responsible

growth. The traffic becomes worse, the public transportation system over burdened, and our fire and police stretched

to limits beyond what is reasonable. Public safety is being compromised.

With so many projects already approved or in the construction phase, all well beyond the Article 51 guidelines which

was established to protect and advance development in Brighton and Allston it is time for a reality check.

Please look at this project with consideration of its impact on the quality of life for its neighbors, the neighborhood and

community. I appreciate your time in reading my letter of opposition for the project at [44 North Beacon Street](#).

Many thanks,

Susan Rufo

[465 Washington Street](#)

[Brighton, MA 02135](#)



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.**

1 me age

**Wetterstrom, Wilma E** [REDACTED]

Fri, Apr 13, 2018 at 10:05 AM

To: "gary.j.webster@boston.gov" &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

Cc: "Mark Ciommo@bo ton gov" Mark Ciommo@bo ton gov , "William Brown berger@ma enate gov" &lt;William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov&gt;, lizbreadon via Homeowners Union of Allston-Brighton &lt;homeowners-union-of-allston-brighton@googlegroups.com&gt;

Dear Mr.Webster,

I'm a long-term resident of Brighton and so am concerned about the proliferation of new developments overrunning Allston Brighton. This one, 44 North Beacon Street, like the others, poses many threats to the quality of life in this community and should be rejected in its current configuration.

The density and height are major concerns. How can such an enormous structure be plopped onto a tiny parcel less than half an acre? The floor area ratio is three times the size that is allowed by zoning. And the height is twice as high as zoned for this area. The height, moreover, violates the terms spelled out in the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study, which was an agreement with the Allston Community.

This tall structure combined with the project proposed for the site across the street (37 North Beacon Street) will create an oppressive corridor with walls looming high on either side, close to the sidewalks (due to meager setbacks) and towering way over neighboring homes. The developer tries to divert attention from the fact that this will be a corridor of hardscape with his perspective drawing (page 1 of the plans) awash with green, a green strip between sidewalk and street as well as a plethora of trees surrounding the building. But there is not enough space for the green strip, nor is it likely that the paltry open space around the building could support many large trees.

Another concern is traffic and congestion. North Beacon and Everett Streets already carry more traffic than ever intended. Backups at the North Beacon-Everett and Union Square intersections are already unbearably long and waits at the traffic lights interminable. Adding more traffic to this mix from the proposed development will only increase the frustration and delays for drivers as well as pump yet more CO2 in the atmosphere as cars sit idling in the gridlock.

Finally, the building, like other projects marching across Allston Brighton, is a big generic box, but even worse, pug-ugly. In the rush to add housing, mostly rental unfortunately, aesthetic considerations seem to have been abandoned in Allston Brighton. Why? I fear that my community will become a mishmash of tall boxes with nothing to distinguish the streets from many newly developed cities (such as Houston). In today's Boston Globe, director Brad Anderson explained why he loves to film in Boston:

> It's such a great city, visually. You can't get that kind of look in Canada that you can get in Boston: the old-brick historical buildings, the winding streets, the old but funky neighborhoods like Southie and Somerville. You can't get that elsewhere. It's a very unique place in that way.

He might have added that in Brighton we see old commercial red brick buildings festooned with interesting architectural details (such as the "tower" on the corner of the Roark's Building at Market Street and Chestnut Hill Avenue); and we see residential streets with charming wood frame homes also festooned with eye-catching detail. How long will our city offer a unique look with the onslaught of generic boxes?

I would add too that those charming houses and commercial districts have been home to many long-term residents who care about and fight for this community. But those residents, like the buildings, are in decline too. This proposed development will further tip the scales in the direction of renters, crashing here briefly on their way elsewhere.

Please consider how the 44 Beacon St project will diminish the quality of life in Allston Brighton, and reject it as currently proposed.

Sincerely yours,

Wilma Wetterstrom  
9 Glenley Ter

4/13/2018

City of Boston Mail - Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

Brighton, MA 02135



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**44 North Beacon**

1 message

**Erica Furtado** 

Sat, Apr 14, 2018 at 12:35 PM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, mark.ciommo@boston.gov

To whom it may concern :

I am a resident of Allston living at [8 Harvard Terrace](#) in Allston. I am writing in support of the project at 44 North Beacon Street. Although the project may have some minor impacts on a few people, the greater good of Allston would be best served by building more housing for both owners and renters alike. Allston is a largely renters neighborhood - to try and change that overnight by insisting all future housing be majority home ownership is elitist - many people living in Allston cannot afford to purchase homes and does that mean we don't belong?

Perhaps if the developer moved the main massing to North Beacon Street the height and setback concerns of the abutters could be alleviated and the neighborhood could still get the additional housing units we need and deserve. There are too many benefits from projects like [44 North Beacon](#) - affordable housing, new housing in general, community benefits - to let the voice of a few opposers control the fate of future generations to come. Allston is changing and growing and that is difficult for some people to grasp but this project should be approved. Were this a strictly 2 and 3 family block already I might feel differently about the scale but it is a mostly commercial block and an opportune location for density to serve the growing population and demand to be in Allston. Please do not allow a few people to control the fate of so many by scaling this project back to the point where nothing happens and the site remains underutilized and ugly.

Thank you ,  
Erica Furtado



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.**

1 me age

**Diana Arsenault** [REDACTED]

Sun, Apr 15, 2018 at 11:19 AM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov,  
Homeowner UnionAB@gmail.com

Development Review Department  
Boston Redevelopment Authority  
[1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA](#)

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a property owner of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

**Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rentals.

**Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.

**Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic times. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.

**Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as much and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Diana Arsenault  
[11 Reedsdale Street](#)  
[Allston, MA 02134](#)



Gary Webster <gary.j.webster@boston.gov>

## Opposition to 44 North Beacon St.

1 message

Kevin Arsenault [REDACTED]

Sun, Apr 15, 2018 at 10:59 AM

To: gary.j.webster@boston.gov, Mark.Ciommo@boston.gov, William.Brownsberger@masenate.gov,  
Homeowner UnionAB@gmail.com

Development Review Department  
Boston Redevelopment Authority  
1 City Hall Plaza Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Webster,

I am a property owner of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at [44 North Beacon street](#). As someone who lives, does business, and commutes in this neighborhood, I think this project will be detrimental to the neighborhood for the following reasons:

**Density:** The FAR of this building is 3 times that of what is allowed by zoning. The majority of units will be rentals, and the few condos that the building includes will be too small and crowded to attract long-term homeowners. It would be best for the neighborhood if this entire project was much smaller and built for homeownership, since the vast majority of new projects proposed and being built in the neighborhood are rental.

**Height:** The proposed building is double the 35 foot height allowed by the zoning. This will wall off immediate neighbors and diminish their quality of life and set a precedent that will encourage further building of tall buildings along this corridor. Since it is next to the 2012 Guest Street Planning Study which was an agreement with the Allston Community, this project should also abide by similar guidelines because the 2012 agreement took urban planning into consideration.

**Traffic:** The proposed building sits upon a major intersection of Allston, where one of the few streets that crosses the highway connects to the rest of the neighborhood. As it is, this intersection is regularly backed-up in all three directions during peak traffic time. The current traffic infrastructure cannot support the number of vehicles that this development would attract, especially in light of the numerous other development projects just down the street. Additionally, any multi-unit development on this corridor absolutely needs ample space for deliveries, taxis, and trash pickup to pull off since there is very little room to maneuver around stopped vehicles currently.

**Setbacks:** The developer is requesting a variance for a reduced setback in the rear and portions of the project push very close to the sidewalk in front. A variance is also required to allow less than one parking space per unit, which implies that the developer feels this location will attract pedestrian residents who rely on the nearby train station to commute. If this is to be a pedestrian-friendly project then the design should reflect as such and have a generous front setback for decent landscaping to improve the pedestrian environment and provide room for snow storage in winter.

In conclusion, I am opposed to this project. It hurts me, my neighbors, and many others in the community. Allston Village is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow the Article 51 guidelines. The residents and businesses of Allston welcome the interest in our neighborhood, but only if it improves the lives of those already here and encourages new residents to join the community and contribute to it. This can only be done through holistic urban planning that looks at economic diversity, residential and business zoning, mass transit, utilities, and the overall health, safety, and happiness of the people who live in the neighborhood. This cannot be accomplished by letting developers squeeze as much profit as possible out of the individual parcels they acquire. Please do not combine my opposition view/vote with anyone else in my household or on my street – 1 person should be 1 vote.

Sincerely,

Kevin Arsenault  
604 Cambridge Street  
Allston, MA 02134

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
3/8/2018	Robert	Chapman	None	Support	Build it!
3/9/2018	Pawel	Latawiec		Support	I am writing in enthusiastic support of the proposal for 44 North Beacon St. in Allston. The mixture of rental and ownership opportunities will help to engage the residents in Allston's broader community and provide opportunities for new neighbors to settle. The number of units, number of affordable units, and size and scale of the building perfectly match the neighborhood context and should not be revised. This project brings magnitudes of improvement to the public sphere by replacing a single-story commercial building and parking lot with green space, attractive architecture, and new neighbors. The developers have intelligently chosen to go with a low parking/unit ratio, keeping in line with the site's proximity to the new Boston Landing station and other transportation modalities, including Hubway stations, bike paths, and bus lines. As the notification form demonstrates, the development will have minimal impact on current traffic patterns and extend public transit access to new families. In conclusion, the project demonstrates a clear understanding of its surroundings, provides much-needed housing in a transit-oriented location, and enhances the neighborhood with a forward-looking architectural and community vision. The project should be built without change from the notification form.
3/15/2018	JENNIFER	ENGEL	Ms	Oppose	please please please! Can you have at least as many parking spaces as there are units!?!?!
3/19/2018	Gerard	Teichman		Neutral	I generally like the idea of a courtyard, low density side on N. Beacon. I am aware of heavy traffic entering Union Square on N. Beacon. So cars leaving the site may have trouble exiting if their is a backup. What about access to Cambridge St? If a access to Cambridge St is created, exit to Cambridge St will take traffic away from N. Beacon.
3/28/2018	lily	lee		Oppose	I strongly oppose - against the 44 N.Beacon Street Project. If the building is more than 35 feet high, my unit will be directly affected. Which means there will be no sunshine coming to the unit. It is also not following the article 51, which says it is to improve the life, and promote welfare of the people of Boston. In this area, it is already crowded with so many cars and people on the street. Also the building right now is an ambulance service which is a good blend of residential area and commercial service. Please do not allow this to happen. Please keep this ambulance company building or keep the same height of the building so we can receive proper sunshine. It is important to human life. Thank you!
3/29/2018	Gerard	Teichman		Neutral	I have a concern about the 7 story building. That seems dense for this area. Why not continue the same home ownership density across the entire project? I can see a lower building at the back with a nicer facade.
3/29/2018	Cyrus	Tehrani		Support	I would like to express my full support for the project as proposed. This project provides a huge community benefit in adding much needed housing, including 7 income-restricted affordable units. The project site currently contains no housing would would be a net addition of 54 homes. Allston's housing costs are driven up by an abundance of students and a scarcity of housing. This project is a step in the right direction to help satisfy the demand in the neighborhood. There should not be any additional parking added to the project other than what's been proposed, since additional parking will just drive up the prices of the homes making them less affordable. Please approve this project as proposed.
3/31/2018	Bruce	Kline	BAIA,RNA	Oppose	This project is too dense.It tries to show open space that is actually on the rooftops. Parking space is totally inadequate for residents. There is no provision for delivery which will cause even more congestion on North Beacon street. The height is twice that allowed by current zoning and setbacks are totally inadequate.



44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/5/2018	Gavin	McCarthy		Neutral	N. Beacon St is nearly a parking lot already. I fear continued development at and around Everett St is going to make matters much worse. During AND after construction. Yikes! Gavin McCarthy
4/5/2018	Jo	Zhang		Oppose	Dear Mr. Webster, I am a property owner of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at 44 North Beacon Street. I live in Allston for few years and really like this area. The back of building of 44 North Beacon Street is right facing my apartment, so I'm interesting in this project, also attended the public meeting on March.29th. I learn some facts about this project, think this project is detrimental to the neighborhood because of the high density, low homeownership and doubling the allowable height of Article 51. Here are a few of the reasons I am expressing my opposition: ? > Height: The proposed project contains a 7 stories building with 70 feet height, which is more than double the height of Article 51 allowed. It will severely affect the lighting of other buildings around it. I know your department recently granted excessive variances exceed the city's own rules to large projects, but it?s not lawful/reasonable and do hurt the current residents? rights. ? > Homeownership: The proposed project only requests 16 unit ownership of total 54 residential units -- lower than 30% homeownership, which is too low even for Allston, an area already suffered enough with high turnover of tenants. My building has about 50% of homeownership but we, the owners, already think it?s too low to manage a good living environment, and try to improve it during recent HOA meetings. As the Development Review Department, your team has the responsibility to urge developer enhance the homeownership, to maintain and improve the whole environment of local community. In conclusion, I am opposed to this project, it hurts me, my neighbors and many others in the community. Allston is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow your own Article 51 guidelines and proper urban planning that looks at the whole area in terms of economics diversity, properly planned business and residential areas, improved roads, upgraded mass transit, ungraded utilities, the improvements of safety issues, allow for family growth, and to consider the needs of people at all ages of life and economic standings. These are the consideration made by urban planners to benefit the whole community rather than the random parcel development as you have been allowing to be done. Thanks for your time. Sincerely, Jo ZHANG
4/8/2018	Marian	McLane		Oppose	Dear Mr. Webster My name is Marian McLane and my family has been residing at 14/16 Gordon Street in Allston since 1921. As a registered voter, landowner, Boston tax-payer and long-time Allston resident, I have deep concerns regarding the development proposal at 44 North Beacon Street in Allston. · To begin, I was never formally notified by the developer, neither by mail, nor by phone, nor by email of this project. These concerns were only brought to my attention by an informed member of the community. Based on this information I attended both the Impact Advisory Group (IAG) meeting at Charlesview Community Center on March 19th and at the 44 North Beacon Street Public Meeting on March 29, 2018 at Jackson Mann School. · My property is less than nine feet from the proposed building. Nine feet. As an abutter, this seven story 54 unit building is unacceptable. This proposed seven story building will impact the neighborhood dramatically by walling off the immediate neighbors and diminish our quality of life. · 100 percent home ownership is best for this neighborhood. Traffic on North Beacon Street is already congested and this proposal will exacerbate parking and deliveries. · The environmental issues will be impacted. Noise, air and garbage pollution will soar with the excessive density that this construction proposes. I am open to new development and innovations within the neighborhood but I strongly oppose this current proposal. Sincerely, Marian McLane marianmclane@verizon.net

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/9/2018	Lily	Lee		Oppose	I oppose the 44 North Beacon Street Project for reasons below: The building higher than that of current ambulance company will block my view and light from northwest since my unit is at the northwest corner. Also a tall building so close to the backend will endanger the safety of the neighborhood. North Beacon -Brighton Ave -Cambridge street is already jammed during busy hours. Pouring more residents into a condensed small area is bringing more harm than good to the community. Current home owners rights to view and light should be also protected by law and regulations and zoning standards. No one should strip these rights from the American citizens. Also, I am shocked that the development plan is not getting the residents informed. How can decision be made before abutted residents are noticed and fully have their voices heard.
4/9/2018	Rachel	Oppenheimer		Oppose	I strongly oppose this building. The added congestion and traffic poses a SERIOUS safety concern for all residents in our neighborhood. The added vehicle traffic will add more blocked sidewalks and driveways, making them impassable by pedestrians, especially people with physical handicaps! Additionally, there are not enough parking spots designated for a building of the size which will cause more illegal parking and make our neighborhood sidewalks unsafe to pass. Similar buildings were built on Brainerd Road in Allston over the past few years. Since then, there has been an increase in traffic accidents, no street parking options for guests, and safety concerns for all pedestrians. We don't want this in our neighborhood. It's a deterrent for visitors and consumers which will hurt our local restaurants and businesses. Cambridge street is already unbearable with traffic during commute times. Adding even more residents and vehicles will create more traffic on North Beacon and Cambridge street heading to and from the pike and Storrow Drive. The increased traffic causes more aggressive, angry drivers, road rage, and car accidents already... We don't need to add even more! We don't want to fear our commute routes. Let's keep our neighborhood safe for everyone and our local businesses thriving.
4/10/2018	Harvard	Pan		Oppose	Insufficient parking will make an already dangerous traffic area worse.
4/10/2018	Tina	Chen		Oppose	As a resident living in the neighborhood of the proposed project at 44 North Beacon St Allston, I strongly opposed the proposed project for the following reasons: 1. The proposed project contains three buildings - 3 stories(32 ft height), 5 stories(51 ft) and 7 stories (70 ft, which is more than double the height of Article 51 allowed). With these heights, the proposed buildings will severely affect the lighting of the neighboring buildings. Furthermore, the current sunlight survey has overlooked this issue, it has no disclosure of how the buildings close-by will be affected. 2. The proposed project contains 54 residential units with only 35 parking lots (including 2 visitors? parking), this is clearly not a well-planned parking solution. The insufficient parking spots will foreseeably cause a lot of problems with parking and congestion. 3. The extra traffic and congestion will pose a serious safety concern for all of us living in the neighborhood. Our sidewalks are already blocked, it will be more impossible for everyone to get around - especially people with handicaps!
4/11/2018	yujia	peng		Oppose	I am the resident of 533 Cambridge St. This project will negatively affect the sunlight, the traffic, the environment and the street parking around. It is already very crowded here. It will cause a lot of problems.

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/11/2018	michele	cloutier		Oppose	I live at 533 Cambridge St. unit 207. I?m a HOA trustee in the position of president. I GREATLY OPPOSE the development of 44 North Beacon St. It will greatly affect the quality of all our lives here at 533 Cambridge St. I became a trustee because I planned on living here until retirement and wanted our building to remain as beautiful as it was when I moved in 10 years ago when it was brand new. I care deeply for this building and the neighborhood. Now, because of this development, I see the possibility that I may end up being so unhappy that I would need to move. I?ve spent so much timing making my unit a home and it would break my heart to have to move. It's a well-known fact that the more transient a neighborhood is the more crime there is. By adding 38 rental units, right in our backyard, it will certainly contribute to the unlawfulness in Allston. Because of its proximity to several colleges it will attract students and where there are students there are more drugs, drinking, loud music, vandalism, parties, delinquent behavior and rubbish. Allston already has a high population of students. We need families and homeowners to turn Allston into a great community - not rentals and more cars trying to park on already crowded streets. The height of 44 North Beacon St, being 7 stories, will definitely impact the whole back of our building. It will be close enough to our building that it will completely put the entire backside of our building in complete shadow. Lack of sunlight is often a contributing factor to depression. Sunlight profoundly affects peoples? lives and more than half our units will be in darkness. Please don?t develop 44 North Beacon St. It?s not good for the neighborhood and not good for those residents that call Allston their home.
4/11/2018	Joan	Beaton		Oppose	Good morning, ? I am opposed to the proposed construction on 44 North Beacon Street, Allston, MA. ? I live in the house at 14-16 Gordon Street that abuts 44 North Beacon Street. ? This proposed development is too big overall. ? This development is too tall. ? This development does not have enough parking spaces. ? This neighborhood is too dense for this proposed building. ? This development will negatively impact this already high traffic area. Sincerely, Joan M. Beaton
4/11/2018	Gu-Yeon	Wei		Oppose	I do not support this construction. It will significantly degrade the area in many ways. This proposal has too many units and will overly tax the surrounding infrastructure.
4/11/2018	chifung	Li		Oppose	The traffic in Cambridge street is worst than ever. And the building is not enough parking spot of all the owner of the building, which mean there will be more and more car parking on the street and the traffic in Cambridge st getting worst. And the public transportation near us is not enough to support the huge community. Plus, if the building is renting out for the college student, than it will cause all kind of noise and drunk people walking on the street during the night. And the building is going to higher than 5 stories than the backside of the building will not have any sun come in. And condo and parking lot in the back is completely in drakness forever!
4/11/2018	Steven	Pugh		Oppose	Hello I am an owner at the abutting property located at 533 Cambridge Street. I am also a trustee for our condo association. I strongly oppose this development located at 44 North Beacon Street in the currently presented form. The zoning variances (twice the allowed height! roughly 1/3 of required parking spots! 15 feet from our property line!) alone are a disgusting attempt to cram this building into a space where it will have severe, permanent detrimental impacts on our building and my unit. I am not opposed to development at this site, despite the temporary negative impacts construction will have on my life. Boston desperately needs more housing, but this plan impacts people who have already have lived and paid taxes at 533 Cambridge for coming on ten years this August (I?ve lived in Allston since 1991). We are the literal bird in the hand, versus the two in this planned monstrosity. If we feel our collected voices are not being listened to, we will take all necessary and appropriate action to ensure our voices are heard. Personally, I am a regular voter and I will make my voice heard through the ballot box as well. Thank you for your time. Steven Pugh

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/11/2018	Nikhil	Naik		Oppose	This building adds 54 new units to the area with just 35 parking spots. This will lead to a lot of congestion on Beacon Street. As a bus commuter who walks on this street, the traffic is already very bad for pedestrians (especially children attending the nearby school). There are already a number of new construction projects underway in this area (including the large Boston Landing project), and the added congestion from this project will be a serious safety concern for existing residents. Finally, the proposed project is on the site of an ambulance company, which provides an essential service to the community
4/12/2018	Qi	Zhang	N/A	Oppose	Dear Mr. Webster, I am a property owner of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at 44 North Beacon Street. My family live in Allston for few years and really like this area. The back of building of 44 North Beacon Street is right facing my apartment, so I'm interesting in this project, also attended the public meeting on March.29th. I learn some facts about this project, think this project is detrimental to the neighborhood because of the high density, low homeownership and doubling the allowable height of Article 51. Here are a few of the reasons I am expressing my opposition: > Height: The proposed project contains a 7 stories building with 70 feet height, which is more than double the height of Article 51 allowed. It will severely affect the lighting of other buildings around it. I know your department recently granted excessive variances exceed the city's own rules to large projects, but it's not lawful/reasonable and do hurt the current residents' rights. > Homeownership: The proposed project only requests 16 unit ownership of total 54 residential units -- lower than 30% homeownership, which is too low even for Allston, an area already suffered enough with high turnover of tenants. My building has about 50% of homeownership but we, the owners, already think it's too low to manage a good living environment, and try to improve it during recent HOA meetings. As the Development Review Department, your team has the responsibility to urge developer enhance the homeownership, to maintain and improve the whole environment of local community. In conclusion, I am opposed to this project, it hurts me, my neighbors and many others in the community. Allston is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow your own Article 51 guidelines and proper urban planning that looks at the whole area in terms of economics diversity, properly planned business and residential areas, improved roads, upgraded mass transit, ungraded utilities, the improvements of safety issues, allow for family growth, and to consider the needs of people at all ages of life and economic standings. These are the consideration made by urban planners to benefit the whole community rather than the random parcel development as you have been allowing to be done. Thanks for your time. Sincerely, Qi ZHANG
4/12/2018	Rebecca	Ward		Support	hi, I have been hearing negative chatter from the Homeowner's Union of Allston-Brighton on this project but personally I think it's an interesting use of the space. I'm particularly intrigued by the rooftop farm idea. -- Rebecca Ward

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/12/2018	YiFen	Chen	N/A	Oppose	<p>Dear Mr. Webster, I am resident of Allston, and am writing to express my opposition for the planned development at 44 North Beacon Street. My family live in Allston for few years and really like this area. The back of building of 44 North Beacon Street is right facing my apartment, so I start to get to know this project, think this project is detrimental to the neighborhood because of the high density, low homeownership and doubling the allowable height of Article 51. Here are a few of the reasons I am expressing my opposition: &gt; Height: The proposed project contains a 7 stories building with 70 feet height, which is more than double the height of Article 51 allowed. It will severely affect the lighting of other buildings around it. I know your department recently granted excessive variances exceed the city's own rules to large projects, but it's not lawful/reasonable and do hurt the current residents' rights. &gt; Homeownership: The proposed project only requests 16 unit ownership of total 54 residential units -- lower than 30% homeownership, which is too low even for Allston, an area already suffered enough with high turnover of tenants. As the Development Review Department, your team has the responsibility to urge developer enhance the homeownership, to maintain and improve the whole environment of local community. In conclusion, I am opposed to this project, it hurts me, my neighbors and many others in the community. Allston is a great neighborhood that would be made even better through proper improvements that follow your own Article 51 guidelines and proper urban planning that looks at the whole area in terms of economics diversity, properly planned business and residential areas, improved roads, upgraded mass transit, ungraded utilities, the improvements of safety issues, allow for family growth, and to consider the needs of people at all ages of life and economic standings. These are the consideration made by urban planners to benefit the whole community rather than the random parcel development as you have been allowing to be done. Thanks for your time. Sincerely, YiFen CHEN</p>
-----------	-------	------	-----	--------	--

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/13/2018	Clare	Bouzan	Resident of North Beacon Street	Oppose	<p>Dear Gary Webster and Planning Board, I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development at 44 North Beacon Street. As a resident of North Beacon Street, I feel I am able to offer an informed perspective on how the project in its current form would impact the neighborhood. There are many issues which I could address in this letter, including the fact that the proposed height and width of the building do not seem to abide by the current neighborhood zoning regulations and/or be too intrusive to surrounding residents and businesses, parking spaces for residents and guests etc., but I have decided to only focus on one issue in order to be able to expand upon it freely. That issue is traffic. Traffic - The area where Everett St meets North Beacon is a highly congested intersection during rush hour, both ways, as it is a main thoroughfare for traffic entering and exiting Union Square and a flow point for vehicles coming off of Storrow Drive. It is also well traveled route for fire trucks coming from Union Square and ambulances heading to St Elizabeth's Hospital in Brighton. Having such a huge development in this area would naturally incur a significant additional traffic burden. Even if you don't consider cars owned by the residents, the amount of activity by ride apps like Uber and Lyft and delivery services such as Grubhub, Ubereats, UPS etc. would increase the traffic problems tremendously. From studies I have seen Uber, has done more harm than good when it comes to traffic. Just in my casual observation, I have seen traffic increase along Braintree Street in Allston with the recent developments that have happened there over the past few years. What once was a fairly quiet area, now has buildings which often feature 3 or 4 cars lined up outside with blinkers on as drop offs are happening and deliveries are being made. Now take that same scenario and projected it onto 44 North Beacon Street and one can easily imagine the stress placed upon traffic in the area. Therefore, it is imperative that the company which desires to build upon 44 North Beacon Street go back to the drawing board and ask their architect to redesign the project to include a pull in delivery area - ideally one that could be accessed on one end of the development and exiting on another, utilizing both North Beacon and Cambridge Streets. Or, at the very least, implement some kind of horseshoe design which takes cars out of the street while transactions are taking place. As we all know, society is changing at a rapid pace, brick and mortar stores are disappearing everyday and online shopping has become commonplace, people are spending more and more leisure time in their homes - having food brought to them instead of going out to eat (even if the restaurant is in walkable distance ) and ride apps like Uber are taking business away from public transportation. As a result, urban buildings with many tenants bring more vehicles to their doorstep. As this is a relatively new phenomenon, many cities have been faced with having to come up with ways to handle these challenges with buildings that are already established; it seems to me that the developers and planners involved with 44 North Beacon St have an opportunity to be proactive and incorporate a low traffic impact design within their plans, while at the same time setting a standard for future developments within the city. Thanks for reading, Clare</p>
-----------	-------	--------	---------------------------------	--------	--

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/13/2018	Richard	Sharp		Oppose	<p>I am a home owner and resident of Allston, having lived at 51-D North Beacon Street (directly across the street from the proposed 44 North Beacon Street project) for the past 30 years. I attended the public meeting presentation of the proposed project on 29 March 2018. The proposed project is too large. According to the numbers provided in the developer's proposal, it asks for variances of all kinds that are extreme: triple the maximum FAR (3.05 rather than the required 1.0), double the maximum height (69 feet rather than the required 35 feet), a five foot reduction in minimum rear setback (15 feet rather than the required 20 feet), and slashing of required parking spaces to only a third of what's required (35 spaces rather than the required 98.9 spaces). It adds too many people with too little parking, and insufficient space for pick-up/drop-off, deliveries, and moving vans. It will add to the already extremely congested traffic on North Beacon Street. Developers always point to the new train station nearby as the solution to the problem, but that station is not a panacea. Far more people use the streets and buses for transportation, and no improvement to either is planned. Indeed, personal experience indicates that traffic has increased and become more congested in the past year. And bicycling in winter months is greatly reduced. The proposed project is completely out of character with the house next to it, the building on the other side of that, and the house and townhouses across the street. Importantly, it does not address the crucial need to build a more stable community in Allston by failing to meet the need for more home ownership rather than transient rentals. In the end, the proposed home ownership requirements come down to only two units. The proposed project would displace a beneficial service to the community: an ambulance service. In lieu of that real benefit (especially important to the older members of the community who have lived here for many years), what is proposed as a replacement community benefit is an occasional invitation to the roof for an explanation of how plants are grown on the roof. It's hardly an equal traded-off. If it is to move forward at all, the proposal needs to be reduced in size to keep it within current zoning laws and to include a much higher percentage of units that require home ownership and owner occupancy. I am therefore opposed to the proposal in its current form. Both I and my wife are submitting letters. Please be sure to count each of our votes separately. Thank you. Richard Sharp 51-D North Beacon Street Allston, MA</p>
-----------	---------	-------	--	--------	---

44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/13/2018	Chu-Mei	Cheng		Oppose	<p>My husband and I are home owners and residents of Allston, having lived at 51-D North Beacon Street (directly across the street from the proposed 44 North Beacon Street project) for the past 30 years. We both attended the public meeting presentation of the proposed project on 29 March 2018. The proposed project is too large. According to the numbers provided in the developer's proposal, it asks for variances of all kinds that are extreme: triple the maximum FAR (3.05 rather than the required 1.0), double the maximum height (69 feet rather than the required 35 feet), a five foot reduction in minimum rear setback (15 feet rather than the required 20 feet), and slashing of required parking spaces to only a third of what's required (35 spaces rather than the required 98.9 spaces). It adds too many people with too little parking, and insufficient space for pick-up/drop-off, deliveries, and moving vans. It will add to the already extremely congested traffic on North Beacon Street. Developers always point to the new train station nearby as the solution to the problem, but that station is not a panacea. Far more people use the streets and buses for transportation, and no improvement to either is planned. Indeed, personal experience indicates that traffic has increased and become more congested in the past year. And bicycling in winter months is greatly reduced. The proposed project is completely out of character with the house next to it, the building on the other side of that, and the house and townhouses across the street. Importantly, it does not address the crucial need to build a more stable community in Allston by failing to meet the need for more home ownership rather than transient rentals. In the end, the proposed home ownership requirements come down to only two units. The proposed project would displace a beneficial service to the community: an ambulance service. In lieu of that real benefit (especially important to the older members of the community who have lived here for many years), what is proposed as a replacement community benefit is an occasional invitation to the roof for an explanation of how plants are grown on the roof. It's hardly an equal traded-off. If it is to move forward at all, the proposal needs to be reduced in size to keep it within current zoning laws and to include a much higher percentage of units that require home ownership and owner occupancy. I am therefore opposed to the proposal in its current form. Both I and my husband are submitting letters. Please be sure to count each of our votes separately. Thank you. Chu-Mei Cheng 51-D North Beacon Street Allston, MA</p>
-----------	---------	-------	--	--------	--



44 North Beacon Street Public Comments via website form

4/13/2018	Meghan	Beaton		Oppose	<p>I oppose the proposed development at 44 North Beacon Street, Allston, MA. For almost 100 years, since it was purchased in 1921, there has been a member of my family living at 14-16 Gordon Street Allston, MA; a home that directly abuts the property of 44 North Beacon Street. My name is Meghan Beaton and I am the 4th generation of family members who now reside in the house. This family home along with a beautiful carriage house was built in the 1880's and was the only home on Gordon Street between Cambridge Street and North Beacon Street until the 1940's. Below are my concerns about this project. ? The developer's proposal at 44 North Beacon Street Allston, MA is a seven- story building complex, comprised of 54 residential units and 35 parking spaces, is much too big for the neighborhood and for the lot that it will be built upon. This development is nine feet from a historic carriage house. Nine feet. This is much too close for any project to be built never mind a 7-story housing complex. ? Not only is the architecture of the building an eye-sore and does not fit the character of the neighborhood (it reminds me of the low income buildings from the 1970's that Harvard just demolished at Barry's Corner), the space available on North Beacon street simply cannot accommodate the traffic pattern of the construction trucks that will be needed to implement this project. ? There are development projects currently happening in Brighton Landing, two blocks away, and the vehicles encompassing North Beacon Street just from that is at an all-time high and is causing major congestion. ? The negative environmental impact that this project will have on the neighborhood is immense. There is little greenery now in this area of the city, and now with this structure, there will be even less. The already poor air quality will then be filled with fumes from the trucks, dust and dirt from the digging and will cause health concerns down the line to the home owners and residents who currently reside next to this lot as well as causing much noise pollution. As an Allston resident, tax-payer and registered voter, I whole-heartedly oppose this development being proposed for 44 North Beacon Street.</p>
4/13/2018	John	Quatrala	Unbound Visual Arts	Neutral	<p>Dear Gary, Thanks for the opportunity to submit comments. Unbound Visual Arts, is the only 501c)(3) community-based visual arts organization in Allston-Brighton. As such, we'd like to strongly suggest, that one of the major needs for the Allston neighborhood is a dedicated and secure art exhibition space for the visual arts. Though we don't expect the developer to build and outfit an exhibition space, we'd like to propose that this development is a good location where an experienced non-profit could raise money and build it out. This exhibition space should be approx. 1,000 s.f. This formal space, managed by an experienced non-profit, would eventually have limited or no outdoor sunlight from windows or doors, four full floor to ceiling walls, painted a neutral white, approximately equal linear length walls; heights of at least 9 feet or 10 feet, and professional moveable and dimmable ceiling track lighting for all the walls and the center space. There are other elements that can also be discussed with the developer once the non-profit gallery manager is selected. There has very limited dedicated, secure exhibition space in Allston-Brighton and this development, located in such a key location, would be a great location for such an art exhibition space. This space should be for educational exhibits featuring art from artists from throughout Allston-Brighton. Best regards, John Quatrala Unbound Visual Arts 320 Washington St. Suite 200 Brighton, MA 02135</p>

**APPENDIX C**  
CITY AGENCY/STAFF COMMENTS

**Boston Water and  
Sewer Commission**



980 Harrison Avenue  
Boston, MA 02119-2540  
617-989-7000

March 29, 2018

Mr. Gary Webster  
Boston Planning & Development Agency  
One City Hall Square  
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 44 North Beacon Street, Expanded Project Notification Form

Dear Mr. Webster:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (the "Commission") has reviewed the Expanded Project Notification Form ("EPNF") for the proposed 44 North Beacon Street Project (the "Project"). The Project site is located on North Beacon Street, in Boston's Allston neighborhood.

Currently on the Project site is an approximately 7,750 square foot (sf) single-story commercial building with 14 parking spaces. The existing building will be demolished to support the Project. The Project will consist of the development of approximately 54,000 gross square feet (sf) of residential space with an open courtyard and below-grade parking. The Project will include 54 total residential units. The unit mix consists of two studio units, 13 one-bedroom units, 11 one-plus bedroom units, 16 two and two-plus bedroom units and 12 three-bedroom units. It is intended that 16 units will be reserved for home-ownership and 38 will be available for rent. The Project will provide seven on-site, affordable units. The building will feature 35 parking spaces, 750 sf of bicycle storage and maintenance space, 1,500 sf of indoor amenity space and another 9,761 sf of residential amenity and open space.

Approximately 20 percent of the Project site will remain as open space to maximize permeability and green space. The Project will include rooftop landscapes that will employ both intensive and extensive plantings in conjunction with hardscaped occupiable areas. Much of the unoccupied roofs will feature green roofs, which will provide stormwater management and thermal benefits to the building and Project. The occupiable roof decks will feature an array of intensive green roofs, ranging from native and drought resistant grasses and shrubs to trees in large planter boxes.

Water, sewer, and storm drain service for the site is provided by the Boston Water and Sewer Commission. It is anticipated that the Project will require new water, sewer and drain service connections to the Commission's respective systems. For water service the Project site is currently served on North Beacon Street by a 12-inch ductile iron cement lined main that was installed in 2006. There is no existing fire protection system. Domestic water demand for the Project is estimated at 10,406 gallons per day (gpd), based on the estimated sewer flow with a 10 percent factor for consumption, system losses and other miscellaneous uses. It is anticipated that the Project domestic and fire protection services will be four-inch ductile iron cement lined pipe.

For sanitary sewer service the Project site is served on North Beacon Street by an existing 12-inch sanitary sewer main. The existing sewer service is a six-inch cast iron pipe running from the foundation wall to the 12-inch sewer main on North Beacon Street. Total sewage generation for the Project is estimated at approximately 9,460 gpd, based on 310 CMR 15.203.

The Project site is currently approximately 88-percent impervious. For drainage the Project site is served by two 10-inch storm drains located within the sidewalks located on each side of North Beacon Street. Drainage from the Project site ultimately discharges to the Charles River.

The Commission has the following comments regarding the proposed Project:

**General**

1. The Proponent must submit a site plan and General Service Application to the Commission for the proposed Project. Prior to the initial phase of the site plan development, the Proponent should meet with the Commission's Design and Engineering Customer Services to review water main, sewer and storm drainage system availability and potential upgrades that could impact the Project's development.
2. The site plan must show the location of the water mains, sewers and drains serving the Project site, as well as the locations of existing and proposed service connections.
3. Any new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at the Proponent's expense. They must be designed and constructed in conformance with the Commission's design standards, Water Distribution System and Sewer Use Regulations, and Requirements for Site Plans.
4. With the site plan the Proponent must provide detailed estimates for water demand (including water required for landscape irrigation), wastewater generation, and stormwater runoff for the Project. The Proponent should provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, commercial, irrigation and air-conditioning make-up water for the Project.
5. The Project is expected to include vegetative/green roofs. The Proponent should review these plans with the Commission prior to preparing the site plan for the Project. All plans for these green roofs must be shown on the site plan(s) provided to the Commission for review and approval.
6. It is the Proponent's responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the water and sewer system serving the Project site to determine if the systems are adequate to meet future Project demands. With the site plan, the Proponent must include a detailed capacity analysis for the water and sewer systems serving the Project site, as well as an analysis of the impact the Project will have on the Commission's systems and the MWRA's systems overall. The analysis should identify specific measures that will be implemented to offset the impacts of the anticipated flows on the Commission and MWRA sewer systems.
7. Developers of projects involving disturbances of land of one acre or more are required to obtain an NPDES General Permit for Construction from the Environmental Protection Agency. The Proponent is responsible for determining if such a permit is required and for obtaining the permit. If such a permit is required for the proposed Project, a copy of the Notice of Intent and any pollution prevention plan submitted to EPA pursuant to the permit must be provided to the Commission's Engineering Services Department prior to the commencement of construction.

8. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Nutrients has been established for the Lower Charles River Watershed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). In order to achieve the reductions in phosphorus loadings required by the TMDL phosphorus concentrations in stormwater discharges to the lower Charles River from Boston must be reduced by 64%. To accomplish the necessary reductions in phosphorus the Commission requires developers of projects in the lower Charles River watershed to infiltrate stormwater discharging from impervious areas in accordance with DEP requirements. With the site plan the Proponent must submit a phosphorus reduction plan for the Project.
9. The design of the project must comply with the City of Boston's Complete Streets Initiative, which requires incorporation of "green infrastructure" into street designs. Green infrastructure includes greenscapes, such as trees, shrubs, grasses and other landscape plantings, as well as rain gardens and vegetative swales, infiltration basins, and paving materials and permeable surfaces. The proponent must develop a maintenance plan for the proposed green infrastructure. For more information on the Complete Streets Initiative see the City's website at <http://bostoncompletestreets.org/>
10. Before the Proponent demolishes the existing structure existing water and drain connections that won't be re-used must be cut and capped in accordance with Commission standards. The Proponent must complete a Termination Verification Approval Form for a Demolition Permit, available from the Commission. The completed form must be submitted to the City of Boston's Inspectional Services Department before a Demolition Permit will be issued.

#### Sewage/Drainage

11. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in cooperation with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) and its member communities are implementing a coordinated approach to flow control in the MWRA regional wastewater system, particularly the removal of extraneous clean water (e.g., infiltration/ inflow ("I/I")) in the system. Pursuant to the policy new developments with design flow exceeding 15,000 gpd of wastewater are subject to the Department of Environmental Protection's regulation 314 CMR 12.00, section 12.04(2)(d). This regulation requires all new sewer connections with design flows exceeding 15,000 gpd to mitigate the impacts of the development by removing four gallons of infiltration and inflow (I/I) for each new gallon of wastewater flow added. The Commission will require the Proponent to develop an inflow reduction plan consistent with the regulation. The 4:1 reduction should be addressed at least 90 days prior to activation of water service, and will be based on the estimated sewage generation provided with the Project site plan.
12. Oil traps are required on drainage systems discharging from enclosed parking garages. Discharges from the oil traps must be directed to a building sewer and must not be mixed with roof or other surface runoff. The requirements for oil traps are provided in the Commission's Requirements for Site Plans.
13. Grease traps will be required in any food service facility in the new development in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. The proponent is advised to consult with the Commission before preparing plans for food service facilities.


14. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission and the MWRA. The discharge of any dewatering drainage to the storm drainage system requires a Drainage Discharge Permit from the Commission. If the dewatering drainage is contaminated with petroleum products for example, the Proponent will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the EPA for the discharge.
15. The proponent must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's drainage system.
16. The site plan must show in detail how drainage from the building's roof top and from other impervious areas will be managed. Roof runoff and other stormwater runoff must be conveyed separately from sanitary waste at all times.
17. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) has established Performance Standards for Stormwater Management. The Standards address stormwater quality, quantity and recharge. In addition to Commission standards, the proposed Project will be required to meet MassDEP's Stormwater Management Standards.
18. In conjunction with the site plan and General Service Application the Proponent will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:
  - Specifically identify how the Project will comply with the Department of Environmental Protection's Performance Standards for Stormwater Management both during construction and after construction is complete.
  - Identify specific best management measures for controlling erosion and preventing the discharge of sediment, contaminated stormwater or construction debris to the Commission's drainage system when construction is underway.
  - Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control or treatment structures to be utilized during construction.
19. The Commission requests that the Proponent install a permanent casting stating: "Don't Dump: Drains to Charles River" next to any new catch basin installed as part of the Project. The Proponent may contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.
20. The Commission encourages the Proponent to explore additional opportunities for protecting stormwater quality by minimizing sanding and the use of deicing chemicals, pesticides and fertilizers.

### Water

21. The Proponent is required to obtain a Hydrant Permit for use of any hydrant during construction of the Project. The water used from the hydrant must be metered. The Proponent should contact the Commission's Operations Department for information on obtaining a Hydrant Permit.
22. The Commission utilizes a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. Where a new water meter is needed, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, the Proponent should contact the Commission's Meter Installation Department.

23. The Proponent should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular the Proponent should consider indoor and outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If the Proponent plans to install in-ground sprinkler systems, the Commission recommends that timers, soil moisture indicators and rainfall sensors be installed. The use of sensor-operated faucets and toilets in common areas of buildings should also be considered.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this Project.

Yours truly,  
John P. Sullivan, P.E.  
Chief Engineer and Operations Officer

JPS/as

cc: Brent Berc, Boston Real Estate Collaborative, LLC  
Katherine Ronan, Mass. Water Resources Authority  
Maura Zlody, Boston Environment Department  
Mike Nelson, Boston Water and Sewer Commission  
Phil Larocque, Boston Water and Sewer Commission



Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

---

**Comment Period Extended: 44 North Beacon Street, Allston**

---

**Carrie Marsh** <carrie.marsh@boston.gov>

Tue, Apr 24, 2018 at 11:36 AM

To: Gary Webster &lt;gary.j.webster@boston.gov&gt;

Hello Gary - I thought that I had previously sent comments for this project, but do not see them. If it is not too late, I would be grateful if you would accept these now. The development at 44 North Beacon will provide units for 54 households, but virtually no open space. The residents of this building will therefore rely on the existing open spaces in the neighborhood for their active recreational uses. BPRD respectfully requests that impact mitigation commensurate with the scale of the development be provided to the Fund for Parks and Recreation, to be used on the improvement of parks and playgrounds in the Allston neighborhood. Further, if dogs are to be allowed in the building, there should be a pet recreation space provided onsite, to eliminate impacts to public open spaces. Thank you for this consideration.

**CARRIE MARSH**

Executive Secretary

Boston Parks and Recreation Commission

1010 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor

Boston, Massachusetts 02118

617-961-3074 (direct) 617-635-4505 (main)

[Quoted text hidden]





Martin J. Walsh  
Mayor

## Article 37 Interagency Green Building Committee

June 21, 2018

44 North Beacon, LLC  
c/o Boston Real Estate Collaborative LLC  
1904 Washington Street  
Boston, MA 02118

Re: 44 North Beacon Street – IGBC Project Notification Form Response Letter

Dear Brent Berc,

The Boston Interagency Green Building Committee (IGBC) has reviewed the Project Notification Form (PNF) submitted in conjunction with this project for compliance with Boston Zoning Article 37 Green Buildings.

The PNF indicates that the project will use the LEED v4 Homes and Multifamily Midrise rating system. Additionally, the project team has committed to:

1. Achieving a minimum green building outcome of LEED Silver, with 53 points.
2. Reducing carbon impacts by improving the performance of the building 10% beyond code.

The IGBC accepts the rating system selection and green building commitments.

Given the imperative to reduce environmental impacts related to the built environment, the IGBC requests the project team pursue LEED Gold and identify any obstacles to earning the necessary credits. Our recommendations for achieving an exemplary green building include:

- Pursue the 2 “Maybe” points for the Advanced Utility Tracking credit.
- Pursue the 2 “Maybe” points for the Environmentally Preferable Products credit.

The IGBC requests that your project make full use of utility and state-funded energy efficiency and clean/renewable energy programs to minimize energy use and adverse environmental impacts. Please engage the utilities as soon as possible and provide information on any energy efficiency assistance and support afforded to the project.

In support of Boston's Carbon Neutral 2050 GHG goal, please include the following strategies for reducing GHG emissions:

- Prioritize passive strategies such as improved building envelope performance by increasing building envelope air tightness and insulation.

- Ensure active building systems are appropriately sized for improved passive performance and cost savings are fully captured.
- Include solar PV and provide system(s) location, size, and output information along with any related analysis.

Please check the [Article 37 Green Building and Climate Resiliency Guidelines](#) page for updated information. Projects must demonstrate compliance with Zoning Article 37 prior to obtaining building permits. The following documents must be submitted to your BPDA Project Manager and the IGBC for review and approval:

- Design / Building Permit Green Building Report, including an update LEED Checklist, the updated and building energy model, and supporting information as need to demonstrate how each prerequisite and credit will be achieved.
- An Excel (.xls) version of the updated LEED Checklist.
- Updated Climate Resiliency Checklist (please populate the online Climate Resiliency Report).
- Signed Design Affidavit.

The Climate Resiliency Report and Checklist contains several “TBD” entries. Please complete the Checklist and Report online with all required fields included and filled.

Please respond to IGBC comments within three weeks including timing for the provision of the requested information and items. This information and items should include:

- Updated LEED Checklist including additional credits being actively pursued as well as the points of all credits not being pursued.
- Updated Climate Resiliency Report and Checklist with all “to be determined” sections completed and filled out.
- Solar system scoping analysis for project site.

Please include the IGBC official email account [igbc@boston.gov](mailto:igbc@boston.gov) in future communications. Let me know if you have any questions or if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,  
Benjamin Silverman, LEED Green Associate  
On behalf of the Interagency Green Building Committee

Cc: Gary Webster, BPDA Project Manager