



**BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY  
d/b/a Boston Planning and Development Agency (“BPDA”)**

**SCOPING DETERMINATION FOR  
45 TOWNSEND STREET (“THE PROJECT”)  
ROXBURY**

**PROPOSED PROJECT:** 45 TOWNSEND STREET

**PROJECT SITE:** 45 TOWNSEND STREET  
ROXBURY, MASSACHUSETTS

**PROPONENT:** KENSINGTON INVESTMENT COMPANY  
 (“KIC”) ROXBURY LLC  
347 CONGRESS STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110

**DATE:** July 23, 2018

---

The Boston Planning and Development Agency (“BPDA”) is issuing this Scoping Determination in response to the following documentation submitted by KIC Roxbury LLC (“the Proponent”) and as follow-up to discussions and review conducted with members of the KIC Team by BRA and other City of Boston agency staff.

Items submitted to the BRA include:

- Expanded Project Notification Form (“EPNF”) which KIC Roxbury LLC filed for the 45 Townsend Street Project on July 12, 2017

Pursuant to Section 80B-5.3 of the Code, a scoping session was held on August 7, 2017 with the City’s public agencies where the project was reviewed and discussed.

## **REGULATORY REVIEW/CITY OF BOSTON AGENCY COMMENTS**

Comments provided herein reflect considerations and review by departments within the BRA and other City of Boston agencies.

Specifically, they are:

- BPDA Transportation/Infrastructure Planning
- BPDA Urban Design
- BRA Environmental Review
- Boston Transportation Department

Additional comments have been solicited and will be received from:

- Boston Parks Department
- Mayor's Commission for Persons with Disabilities
- Boston Environment Department
- Boston Water and Sewer Commission

## **STAKEHOLDER REVIEW/PUBLIC COMMENTS**

- Public comments received by the BPDA during the comment period will be provided and will require response by the development team
- An Impact Advisory Group ("IAG") has been formed as part of the review process. Comments received by the BPDA during the comment period(s) from the IAG and from stakeholders will be provided and will also require full response by the development team.
- BPDA-sponsored public meetings are held to elicit feedback and comments on aspects of the project following submission of documents required for the review process and/or related to revisions in project scope/magnitude

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **Original Proposal – July 12, 2017**

The Project proposes the redevelopment of the approximately 4.85-acre site bound by Townsend Street to the north, Academy Homes II to the west and Haley Street to the south. The Project includes up to approximately 380,000 square feet which contains up to approximately 322 rental units, approximately 4,500 square feet of new ground floor retail/commercial space, as well as community gathering space, and up to approximately 220 parking spaces. The development team proposes to have the project comply with the Inclusionary Development Policy through the creation of an off-site income restricted homeownership project within walking distance of the Project.

At this time the BPDA has not approved the Proposed Project

### ***I. REVIEW / SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS***

Draft Project Impact Report (“DPIR”): In addition to full-size scale drawings, 10 copies of a bound booklet containing all submission materials reduced to size 8-1/2” x 11”, except where otherwise specified, are required. The electronic copy should be submitted to the BRA via the following website: <https://attachments.bostonplans.org/>. 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 Additional Materials should be included in the booklet for review.

#### **A. General Information**

1. Applicant/Proponent Information
  - a. Development team
    - (1) Names
      - (a) Developer (including description of development entity and principals)
      - (b) Attorney
      - (c) Project consultants and architects
      - (d) Evidence of current status of existing partnership and ownership interest
    - (2) Business address, telephone number, FAX number and e-mail, where available for each
    - (3) Designated contact for each
  - b. Legal Information
    - (1) Legal judgments or actions pending concerning the Proposed Project

- (2) History of tax arrears on property owned in Boston by Applicant or affiliates
- (3) Nature and extent of any and all public easements into, through or surrounding the site.

**B. Regulatory Controls and Permits**

An updated listing of all anticipated permits or approvals required from other municipal, state or federal agencies, including a proposed application schedule shall be included in the Additional Materials.

**C. Public Comments**

The Supplemental Materials should include responses to any public comment and/or letters submitted to the BPDA.

**D. IAG/Project Review Committee Comments**

The Supplemental Materials must include responses to the IAG/Project Review Committee comment and/or letters submitted to the BPDA

**II. OBSERVATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS**

**A. OVERALL PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS**

The following represent areas of programmatic consideration for the project which the proponent is required to address.

- **Inclusionary Development Policy (“IDP”) Compliance:** The Project should meet its IDP requirement through the onsite creation of affordable housing units.
- **Economic Development:** The Project program includes elements that are described as promoting economic benefit – specifically the retail/restaurant and co-working spaces. These elements in a predominantly housing focused project may be seen as adding additional and unnecessary traffic.

Consideration might be made by the Proponent as to whether these proposed elements are necessary or even desired by stakeholders and whether the financial resources needed to create the retail might be utilized for additional housing or some other more desired programmatic use.

- Acknowledgment is given to the Proponent's stated mission to create economic opportunity through homeownership. Consideration might be given to analysis of ways in which this can be done closer to the Project site (abutting properties) or onsite in response to stakeholder concerns.

## ***B. BPDA URBAN DESIGN***

The comments of BPDA Urban Design are incorporated herein by reference and made a part hereof. The Proponent is required to address the following comments.

- In response to the observations regarding the Project's overall massing and scope, the Proponent is encouraged to look at a reduction in the size of the project that reflects:
  - Utilizing the existing footprint of the site (e.g. existing buildings, layout, etc.) as the basis for considering alternative size for proposed program.
  - Given the site's geographic challenges (e.g. ledge, etc.), the utilization of existing layout will inform the placement of housing units as well as provide a basis for reviewing the number of housing units proposed thereby making a case for more or less density as appropriate.
- Focus on neighborhood context and creating a balance and complementarity between vehicular and pedestrian experience will be a key component to enabling the project to achieve a more successful design. Related considerations and suggestions include:
  - The Proponent will want to design the pedestrian and vehicular circulation to enhance the overall connectivity with the surrounding neighborhood and residential district
  - Any vehicular circulation should ensure a safe pedestrian environment, providing proper sidewalk and crosswalk design.
  - Development should recognize its visibility impacts
  - Redesign of the Project will want to reflect greater sensitivity to neighborhood context
- The response to the Scoping Determination will need to provide a sense of the Project's proposed sequencing or phasing strategy – with related time lines and milestones – based on any revisions.

**C. BOSTON TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT AND BPDA  
TRANSPORTATION/INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING**

The comments of the Boston Transportation Department (“BTD”) and BPDA Transportation/Infrastructure Planning are included. The Proponent is required to address all the following questions/comments:

- The development team’s analysis for purposes of creating the EPNF, while adequate, might be enhanced by taking into consideration an expanded (at least additional quarter mile radius). It may prove useful to consider intersections and/or roads suggested by the Impact Advisory Group as basis for further analysis. Examples of streets/intersections to be considered may include but need not be limited to portions of: Walnut Avenue, Marcella Street, Dimock Street, Seaver Street, Washington Street, Westminster Street and Crawford Street
- Relatedly a reduction in scope will mitigate the need to create additional vehicular access points. For example the secondary access proposed for Harishof Street in its current iteration is problematic and might not be necessary with a project of reduced size.
- The Proponent proposed traffic calming measures – regardless of size and scope – will prove beneficial. Inclusion of such mitigation within the response to this scope is requested.

**D. BPDA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The comments of the BRA Environmental Review Team are included. The Proponent is required to address all the following questions/comments:

- The project should pursue LEED Platinum or Gold for all buildings and commit to a minimum of LEED Silver Certification for all buildings.
- Additional Requirements for the current iteration of the proposal:
  - Sustainability Narrative and LEED Checklist - one specific for each building. ;
  - Climate Change Checklist - one for the whole project is fine for now.
  - The project should include on-site clean and or renewable energy systems to the greatest extent possible and specifically plan for building

mounted solar photovoltaic systems and natural gas fueled Combined Heat and Power Systems size to meet domestic hot water.

- The project should assess utility and state energy efficiency program opportunities and engage utility representatives to determine how to maximize building performance.
- If it has not done so already, the development team should see the [Boston Article 37 Green Building and Climate Resiliency Guidelines](#) web site for more detailed information and related documents and submit requested materials accordingly.

#### ***E. MAYOR'S COMMISSION FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES***

The comments of the Mayor's Commission for Persons with Disabilities are included. The Proponent is required to address all the following questions/comments:

- It is requirement of the City of Boston as of August 2014 that all development projects provide an Accessibility Checklist as part of the Article 80 process. If one has not been prepared, the development team should complete the documents provided in the Accessibility Guidelines <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/planning/planning-initiatives/accessibility-guidelines-and-checklist> and submit for review by the Commission for additional comments