Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
10/25/2018	Sandra	Jordan		Oppose	I oppose the project at 50 Stedman street until the developers address all concerns by the SNA and certainly from the abutting neighbors
10/25/2018	Josh	Hanye		Oppose	I am writing to request that the BPDA stop the review process until the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association and a direct abutter have had an opportunity to fully consider the ramifications of this significant proposal and to engage the developer in negotiations. This request for review was filed prematurely as the abutter and SNA had not yet reached a decision on whether to support, oppose, or negotiate. In order to uphold the critical value of neighborhood input, the review process should be paused until the neighborhood has had a full opportunity to weigh in.
10/29/2018	William	Decaneas		Neutral	I would like to see the project approval delayed until the developer has met with an abutter. At the most recent SNA mtg it was mentioned that the developer did not contact a direct abutter despite having stated that they had done so. I think it's important that the direct abutter has a chance to provide feedback and input on these plans.

10/29/2018	Michael	Babcock	Stonybrook Neighborhood Association	Neutral	I'm disappointed that this project has moved to this stage prematurely. The individuals who co-chair the 50 Stedman SNA sub-committee both appear to have conflicts of interest, and have acted in bad faith to push this project through regardless of established SNA procedures. Most troubling has been the opacity of communications, the filtering of discussion by one of the co-chairs, the deliberate lack of minutes being taken at meetings for public review, and the majority of communications taking place via email, rather than in-person meetings. This malfeasance deserves closer examination, particularly as one of the direct abutters of this project was deliberately passed over when the co-chairs made an incomplete canvas of the neighborhood to inform concerned residents of the project, and public meetings. I urge the BPDA to put the brakes on the review process around this project. Michael Babcock SNA resident Former co-chair of the SNA Steering Committee
10/30/2018	Rosetta	Martini	Member SNA	Oppose	This is an Industrial site. Developer is planning a 21 unit residential site. The plans shown last night at the community meeting at Doyle's showed the plan using the industrial code of 1.6---Yet, the building will be residential building and calls for 1.0. The building is too, too, dense and covered almost the complete lot. It needs to be reduced following the residential code NOT the INDUSTRIAL code. They are using this to circumvent the law and only asking for a variance to remedy this. This is wrong. I strongly oppose this project. On another note: They are driving our long time Jamaica Plain trusted mechanic from his site and not helping him to find a new shop. This is wrong. Rosetta R. Martini

11/6/2018	Jonathan	McCurdy	Stonybrook Neighborhood Association	Oppose	[illegible] that fair process is not being followed. The developers prematurely filed with the BPDA, before getting to a good point in their negotiations with the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association. The SNA has not completed discussions with the developer and has not voted on this yet because the project still needs some significant resolutions regarding neighbors concerns - including setbacks roof/height issues, design, environmental concerns, etc. It is not ready to go through the larger city review process. In addition, the developers neglected to inform a direct abutter about this project and so she has missed out on these negotiations. The developers separately negotiated larger setbacks to her next door neighbor's property but not for hers. The developers need to take the time to incorporate this and other concerns into an updated plan and continue to work with the full SNA on the project to come to an agreement that all can live with. The BPDA project manager Aisling Kerr who ran the meeting did not take any notes; I find it extremely disturbing that a city public meeting is not being documented by the BPDA which is supposed to take public comment in order to make a decision on the project. Kerr did say she would extend this comment period until after the SNA votes; please honor that promise. Kerr also said the BPDA would hold off on voting on this project until after the SNA vote; again please honor that promise. The local process

11/7/2018	Jennifer	Uhrhane	Stonybrook Neighborhood Association	Oppose	[illegible] that fair process is not being followed. The developers prematurely filed with the BPDA, before getting to a good point in their negotiations with the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association. The SNA has not completed discussions with the developer and has not voted on this yet because the project still needs some significant resolutions regarding neighbors concerns - including setbacks roof/height issues, design, environmental concerns, etc. It is not ready to go through the larger city review process. In addition, the developers neglected to inform a key abutter about this project and so she has missed out on these negotiations. The developers separately negotiated larger setbacks to her next door neighbor's property but not for hers. The developers need to take the time to incorporate this and other concerns into an updated plan and continue to work with the full SNA on the project to come to an agreement that all can live with. The BPDA project manager Aisling Kerr who ran the meeting did not take any notes; I find it extremely disturbing that a city public meeting is not being documented by the BPDA which is supposed to take public comment in order to make a decision on the project. I asked about the notes and Kerr responded that she "had a good memory." She also said that the BPDA was already comfortable with the current plans, despite an abutter having serious concerns about the building's setbacks to her property. I
11/7/2018	Stephanie	Lowitt		Oppose	I oppose the construction of such a large building in this space. It will disrupt the area traffic and parking. It will encourage air BnB-type rentals in such small units. (While the developer insists the condo documents will not allow this, we know condo documents can be changed at any time.) And I am fully opposed to the developer?s concession that the only way to make the building smaller is to remove the accessible/affordable units. That will only increase the gentrification and economic inequality of the area.

11/7/2018	Mason	Weintraub		Oppose	At minimum, please do not continue evaluating this proposal until all abutters have had a chance to review and weigh in. I live around the corner from this address and am concerned about the size of the proposed building. 21 units will bring a considerable amount of traffic and congestion to the neighborhood which is already suffering from too much morning/evening commute traffic for people traveling between Washington street and Forest Hills Street. I'd like to see a smaller footprint with fewer units. Thank you for your consideration.
11/8/2018	Suman	Mukherjee		Neutral	I think for all of us who live very close to this complex have been annoyed by the noise and industrial activities in this area, as well as early morning truck traffic. So, at some point it is nice to have a residential complex on 50 Stedman. But we have to think about our community. We have to think about public opinion. We need to listen to our leaders and committee people who are dealing with this kind of projects for long. There is a reason we have SNA meeting, there is a reason we have SNA steering committee. So, we need to think about the consequences of this project and how it effects our neighborhood in the long run. Lets talk more. Lets think about how green it would be after the project done. How will be the parking situation when constantly visitor come. All things considered, it is a good project but for valid reason if the project is delayed, let it be.
11/9/2018	Craig	Panzer	Resident	Oppose	I cannot support this project as it displaces a Jamaica Plain business (Wentworth Service Station) that thus far has been given NO support on how or where to relocate his business. Boston is building housing - what it's not building is an inclusive economy.

11/13/2018	Myra	Michail		Support	I strongly support this project. A small but vocal group of residents have opposed this project since its inception based on an inaccurate assumption that some last minute changes to the JP/Rox plan designating this area as suggested rezoning to 3-family was somehow binding. 3-family or smaller residential housing is economically unfeasible in this area which is currently burdened by environmental contamination, pollution, and noise, and it is highly unlikely that the zoning board would rezone this tiny patch of industrial land to 3-family with all the relevant information in front of them. The vast majority of the community members want this area to be developed. After repeatedly attempting to have their voices heard by the initial group of opposing neighbors, a supermajority of the abutters pushed to have the SNA reconstitute the working group addressing the development such that their voices would be heard. While the developers should have known to require a formal vote from the SNA in support of their project before submission of the small review process, they had a clear indication of support from the subcommittee addressing this development and had made the vast majority of the changes requested by the subcommittee.
11/16/2018	Stephanie	Kreutz		Support	I live on the corner of Brookley Road and Forest Hills Street, and would be very happy for this project to move forward. Right now, the area is just empty and unattractive, and it would look so much nicer and feel so much more neighborly for it to be used for housing.

11/18/2018	Zack	DeClerck		Support	I am in strong support of this project. I live down the road and would love the industrial lots along the Washington St corridor to provide much needed housing stock to our communities. I rather see a less car centric parking ratio, but I hope this project moves forward and doesn?t get downsized (which tends to result in pricier units) Best, Zack
11/19/2018	Ian	Pylvainen		Support	Hi, As a resident of the area, I'm in support of this project - JP is a neighborhood that needs more housing desperately. If any change needs to be made, I think reducing the parking from 21 parking spaces would be good - Boston needs less cars in general and this development is an easy walk to Forest Hills Station and the Southwest Corridor for cyclists. Still, the development in question will be a great addition to the neighborhood. Thanks, Ian Pylvainen
12/10/2018	Rosetta	Martini	SNA	Oppose	This project is too dense for that small area. Developers are raping Jamaica Plain. They are squeezing us out of every open space/lot in JP. I am opposed to this project. I would support 3 Three-deckers in this location as it would fit better into the community and not be as dense. People could at least have a back yard or some green space. JP is turning into one big housing project. It's disgusting.
12/10/2018	Marc	Waterfall		Support	I favor this project this is exactly the type of housing JP should be bringing to this under utilized area.
12/10/2018	Max	Glikman		Support	I am very supportive of the 50 Stedman Street project. I believe that it creates much-needed and demanded apartments in Jamaica Plain. The fact that it has 19% (or 4 units) of affordable housing on site is tremendous. I wish all developers were as helpful as the developers of 50 Stedman. As a homeowner in Jamaica Plain, I welcome the types of projects that 50 Stedman are. Thank you.

12/10/2018	Eric	Herot		Support	Please allow me to express my support for this important project. Although I would have preferred less parking and a less sprawling, suburban-style layout (with taller buildings and smaller setbacks), this project is a reasonably good compromise between the aesthetic desires of the immediate abutters and the needs of the broader community. I am eager to see it go forward.
12/10/2018	Mary	Rigo	Abuttter	Oppose	Neighborhood Association has voted to oppose this project with a very clear message that the project is not in the best interest of the neighborhood in its current form. Please help the neighborhood in getting the developers to amend plans to make them acceptable. As a direct abutter who has only recently become aware of this project I strongly oppose this project. Only 5 residential parcels directly abutt this proposal, my property is one and has been ignored until recently and developer used the opportunity of my ignorance of the project to build as close to the property line as they felt they could get away with (8ft). This is where current plans stand while neighboring property enjoys a 12ft set back since they were involved early. Setback requirements for Multi Family Construction are not met on 3 out of 4 sides. Ignoring setbacks allows Helm investments to build an overly dense apartment building which exceeds FAR ratio by 60%. A 3 foot set back on any new construction plans provides not opportunity for yards and sets a terrible precedent. There is no reason why Zoning set backs for Multi Family cannot be met on this property other than greed. Plans indicate area is mostly commercial/industrial. This is very far from the truth. 3 sides of the proposed structure are bordered by residential structures/property. Same developer has been granted a variance to build multi family at 76

12/10/2018	Megan	McManaman		Support	I am in full support of this project in that it 1. increases the housing stock in a community with a desperate need for housing and 2. is a constructive use of what is now an under-utilized eyesore that benefits the larger community not in the least.
12/10/2018	Marat	Ryndin		Support	As someone who lives directly next to the sight of the proposed project, I'm very much in favor of it. I bought the condo apartment about 5 years ago and while I really like the location and the apartment itself, the sights out of my windows aren't exactly inspiring. Mostly industrial stuff that makes a lot of noise and creates so much dust that it's hard to use the deck in the warm months. The particular location of the proposed project contains a parking for oil trucks and is full of chemical waste. I have reviewed the project and it's a very reasonable solution to turning that location into a residential building. The developers have even gone agreed to compromise greatly on the number of units by agreeing to lower the height of the building so that it doesn't rise above all the triple deckers surrounding it. I see absolutely no reason to delay the project further and do not understand the opposition to it by people who will mostly not even be affected by it. All of the direct abutters are wholeheartedly in support of the project and I urge you to take our opinion into consideration.
12/10/2018	Daniel	Verinder		Oppose	Sounds like the developers did not get agreement from all abutters and then lied about it. They also have not clarified what they will be doing for community benefits. Until these issues are addressed, this project should be denied and its Article 80 review process should be suspended.
12/10/2018	Clayton	Martin	JPYIMBY	Support	Much needed housing.

12/10/2018	sarah	buermann		Oppose	Opposing for the moment. Article 80 process needs to be suspended until adequate and appropriate info. has been provided to abutters and neighbors, and adequate and appropriate adjustments have been made and agreed upon. It is important for the health of our basic neighborhoods that evolution be carefully and considerately produced, that full information be provided to all and that fairness prevail.
12/10/2018	Catharine	Seiler		Support	I fully support this project as a nearby resident.
12/10/2018	Carolyn	Kelley		Oppose	I can not support the 50 Stedman Street project moving forward. Having followed the progress of negotiations between the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association and the developer of 50 Stedman Street, I am very concerned that there has not been enough time to adequately address the concerns of the abutter who was notified of the project late in the stage, or to draw up a detailed plan for relocating Wentworth Service Station, which I believe the developer has agreed to help with (though it is unclear in what capacity). Until those issues are resolved I do not think it is fair to either of those parties to proceed, and I feel it would undermine the community review process to allow the project to continue. I would hate to see this precedent set in our neighborhood.

12/10/2018	Bill	Reyelt	SNA property owner & member	Support	As a Kenton Rd property owner, I strongly support this project. Given the allowance for off-street parking, I think the townhouse design with below-grade parking is a far better design solution for this site than detached 3-family structures or a line of townhouses with street-level garage doors comprising the public realm. The project will provide desperately needed housing, including income-restricted units, proximate to significant public transit investments / infrastructure. I am disappointed that it has taken so long to move forward and urge the BPDA to approve. My only design suggestion is that perhaps some additional windows be incorporated into the shorter facades / ends of the building to add some visual interest to those portions of the building. Also urge the city to leverage any opportunities to put any adjacent telephone lines below grade where feasible.
10/9/2018	Donna	Coyle	Gilman, McLaughlin & Hanrahan	Neutral	I live at Arborway Gardens and would like to see this area beautified a bit. The busway and other very old industrial buildings which are part of the area where this project is proposed to be are an eyesore. Hopefully the developer won't have to go through long due diligence and environmental testing and clean up of hazardous waste/materials for too long before anything gets built.

10/9/2018	Michael	Littman	Resident	Support	I think this is a fantastic location for new housing and this fits so nicely into the context of the neighborhood. 4 units out of 21 designated as affordable will also serve as a great addition to the neighborhood to keep provide much needed affordable housing. The developer should be sure to build at least 21 secure covered indoor bike parking spaces. I think providing 21 parking spaces is a bit too much but I understand that it will add value to each unit. In return for allowing the developer to forgo our precious zoning codes, are there any community benefits being provided. I feel that infrastructure upgrades along Washington Street? I feel this neighborhood could benefit from a blue bikes station being installed near Doyle's cafe, or as identified in the blue bikes expansion project.
10/13/2018	Rosetta	Martini	SNA	Oppose	Too Close to the house and empty lot at Brookley Road. Plus, I voted for 3 Three Deckers on that site not a Three Story 21 Unit Building. Developers are suffocating us here in JP. Pretty soon there won't be a tree or patch of grass anywhere. Developers are fleecing our land/neighborhood.
10/14/2018	Mike	Wasserman		Support	I have been trying to submit comments, but they haven't been going through. So, my longer explanation of our support was deleted. However, please know that, as an abutter to the property, we are strongly in favor of this proposal. We believe that a small number (as few as 1 or 2) residents in the area make a disproportionately large obstacle to almost all new development, but they don't represent the views of the neighborhood or the majority of abutters.

10/12/2018	Nate	Deshmukh Towery	Neighbor	Support	I live nearby and my kids have attended the preschool around the corner for the past 3 years. I think this project is an excellent addition to the neighborhood - along with the other development nearby, it will provide affordable housing as well as replace a parking lot full of semi-broken vehicles. A win for all.
10/17/2018	Sarah	Sterritt		Support	As an abutter to this project, I support this moving forward. Thanks
10/18/2018	Sean	Camp		Support	I am a direct abutter and would like to see this project be built. The developers have done a good job of engaging the community and I think the end product will be very beneficial.
10/19/2018	Peter	Conti		Support	I support the current plan. Though I understand it deviates from Plan JP/Rox, and the deviation is obvious, I don't believe the deviation is negatively impactful. Higher density has a real purpose in a city with a housing problem, and having that higher density start one street over from the Plan (and current ongoing construction) is not a game-changer for me. I also understand that not all abutters feel properly considered in this process. I do not believe the process has been unaccommodating. All abutters (and the rest of the community) have had ample time involve themselves in the multi-year-long discussions on this project. If you have a stake in the outcome of a project, the onus is on you to stay involved. It is a reasonable to consider a lack of involvement as indicative of apathy or indifference to the outcome, or as approval to it's ongoing state. Nothing is perfect. This is acceptable.

10/20/2018	Christopher	Luongo-Zink		Support	I am one of the most direct abutters to this project and I am in full support of it. The developers have been extremely accommodating to our building and the neighborhood as a whole. They have kept us notified of changes along the way for the past 2 years. My husband and I own the first unit of our triple decker and the other two units are also in full support of the building (5 abutters alone in our building all supportive).
10/16/2018	Gerald	Dudley		Support	I am especially in support of this project if it includes more than the required amount of affordable housing units. What is currently occupying the space is an eyesore and wasted space, a housing development with affordable rental options would be a boon to the community.
10/16/2018	Perry	Paolantonio		Support	Fully support this - it's a great addition to the neighborhood and a huge improvement over what's there now!
10/16/2018	Jason	Welcker		Support	I am a direct abutter of this property and I support moving forward with this project as is. My opinion is that the design from the builders has taken into account all of the key asks from the abutters living around the property to be developed. I would like to see this land developed immediately as it will be an immediate improvement in the neighborhood overall.
10/16/2018	Sarah	Feeney		Support	In Support.
10/16/2018	Scott	Schreiber		Support	I am in favor of the proposed project. I live two blocks away and would like to see this project built. Further, I am in favor of a variance being granted to retain the currently proposed quantity of Off-Street Parking (21 parking spots), to promote alternative means of transportation among community members.

10/16/2018	Jana	Ryndin	Jana Ryndin	Support	I absolutely love this project from the first time the developers came to us. I have experienced living at the end of Plainfield Street for over 4 years and the current situation is absolutely a nightmare - one can not sit on own porch for many industrial reasons. 3 story building from modern materials is the common middle ground in my opinion. Developers respect other buildings hights in the closest area and this is what most of the neighbors should only care about.

Boston Water and Sewer Commission

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

November 13, 2018

Ms. Aisling Kerr
Assistant Project Manager
Boston Planning and Development Agency
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 50 Stedman Street, Jamaica Plain
Small Project Review Application

Dear Ms. Kerr:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (Commission) has reviewed the Small Project Review Application (SPRA) for the proposed residential development located at 50 Stedman Street in Jamaica Plain. This letter provides the Commission's comments on the SPRA.

The proposed project site consists of an existing 14,344 square foot parcel containing a vacant commercial structure. The project proponent, Helm Investment LLC, proposes to demolish the existing structure and construct a three story, approximately 24,000 square foot building that will include twenty-one residential rental units and twenty-one garage parking spaces.

The Commission water distribution system has an 8-inch Southern High PCI water main installed in 1921 and lined in 1995 in Stedman Street.

For sanitary sewer and storm drain service, there is a 10-inch sanitary sewer and a 15-inch storm drain in Brookley Road. There is no sanitary sewer or storm drain in Stedman Street.

Water usage and sewage generation estimates were not provided in the SPRA.

The Commission has the following comments regarding the SPRA:

General

1. Prior to the initial phase of the site plan development, Helm Investment LLC 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 development.

2. Prior to demolition of any buildings, all water, sewer and storm drain connections to the buildings must be cut and capped at the main pipe in accordance with the Commission's requirements. The proponent must then complete a Termination Verification Approval Form for a Demolition Permit, available from the Commission and submit the completed form to the City of Boston's Inspectional Services Department before a demolition permit will be issued.

3. All new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at Helm Investment LLC'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. The site plan should include the locations of new, relocated and existing water mains, sewers and drains which serve the site, proposed service connections, water meter locations, as well as back flow prevention devices in the facilities that will require inspection. A General Service Application must also be submitted to the Commission with the site plan.

4. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in cooperation with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority and its member communities, is 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. In April of 2014, the Massachusetts DEP promulgated new regulations regarding wastewater. The Commission has a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for its combined sewer overflows and is subject to these new regulations [314 CMR 12.00, section 12.04(2)(d)]. This section 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. In this regard, any new connection or expansion of an existing connection that exceeds 15,000 gallons per day of wastewater shall assist in the I/I reduction effort to ensure that the additional wastewater flows are offset by the removal of I/I. Currently, a minimum ratio of 4:1 for I/I removal to new wastewater flow added is used. The Commission supports the policy, and will require proponent to develop a consistent inflow reduction plan. The 4:1 requirement should be addressed at least 90 days prior to activation of water service and will be based on the estimated sewage generation provided on the project site plan.

5. The design of the project should 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/

6. The water use and sewage generation estimates were not included in the SPRA. The Commission requires that these values be calculated and submitted with the Site Plan. Helm Investment LLC should provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, irrigation and air-conditioning make-up water for the project. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. Helm Investment LLC should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.

7. Helm Investment LLC should be aware that the US Environmental Protection Agency issued the Remediation General Permit (RGP) for Groundwater Remediation, Contaminated Construction Dewatering, and Miscellaneous Surface Water Discharges. If groundwater contaminated with petroleum products, for example, is encountered, Helm Investment LLC will be required to apply for a RGP to cover these discharges.

8. It is Helm Investment LLC's responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site to determine if the systems are adequate to meet future project demands. With the site plan, Helm Investment LLC must include a detailed capacity analysis for the water, sewer and storm drain systems serving the project site, as well as an analysis of the impacts the proposed project will have on the Commission's water, sewer and storm drainage systems.

Water

1. Helm Investment LLC must provide separate estimates of peak and continuous maximum water demand for residential, commercial, industrial, irrigation of landscaped areas, and air-conditioning make-up water for the project with the site plan. Estimates should be based on full-site build-out of the proposed project. Helm Investment LLC should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.

2. Helm Investment LLC should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular, Helm Investment LLC should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If Helm Investment LLC 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 be considered.

3. Helm Investment LLC is required to obtain a Hydrant Permit for use of any hydrant during the construction phase of this project. The water used from the hydrant must be metered. Helm Investment LLC should contact the Commission's Meter Department for information on and to obtain a Hydrant Permit.

4. The Commission is utilizing a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. For new water meters, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, Helm Investment LLC should contact the Commission's Meter Department.

Sewage / Drainage

1. A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Nutrients has been established for the Lower Charles River Watershed by the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). In order to achieve the reductions in Phosphorus loading required by the TMDL, phosphorus concentrations in the lower Charles River from Boston must be reduced by 64%. To accomplish the necessary reductions in phosphorus, the Commission is requiring developers in the lower Charles River watershed to infiltrate stormwater discharging from impervious areas in compliance with MassDEP. Helm Investment LLC will be required to submit with the site plan a phosphorus reduction plan for the proposed development. Helm Investment LLC must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.

   In conjunction with the Site Plan and the General Service Application Helm Investment LLC will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:

   - Identify best management practices for controlling erosion and for preventing the discharge of sediment and contaminated groundwater or stormwater runoff to the Commission's drainage system when the 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.

   - Provide a stormwater management plan in compliance with the DEP standards mentioned above. The plan should include a description of the measures to control pollutants after construction is completed.

2. Developers of projects involving disturbances of land of one acre or more will be required to obtain an NPDES General Permit for Construction from the Environmental Protection Agency and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. Helm Investment LLC is responsible for determining if such a permit is required and for

obtaining the permit. If such a permit is required, it is required that a copy of the permit and any pollution prevention plan prepared pursuant to the permit be provided to the Commission's Engineering Services Department, prior to the commencement of construction. The pollution prevention plan submitted pursuant to a NPDES Permit may be submitted in place of the pollution prevention plan required by the Commission provided the Plan addresses the same components identified in item 1 above.

3. The Commission encourages Helm Investment LLC to explore additional opportunities for protecting stormwater quality on site by minimizing sanding and the use of deicing chemicals, pesticides, and fertilizers.

4. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission. Helm Investment LLC is advised that 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, Helm Investment LLC will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the discharge.

5. Helm Investment LLC must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on-site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge stormwater to the Commission's system. The site plan should indicate how storm drainage from roof drains will be handled and the feasibility of retaining their stormwater discharge on-site. All projects at or above 100,000 square feet of floor area are to retain, on site, a volume of runoff equal to 1.25 inches of rainfall times the impervious area. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer.

6. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) established Stormwater Management Standards. The standards address water quality, water quantity and recharge. In addition to Commission standards, Helm Investment LLC will be required to meet MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards.

7. Sanitary sewage must be kept separate from stormwater and separate sanitary sewer and storm drain service connections must be provided. The Commission requires that existing stormwater and sanitary sewer service connections, which are to be re-used by the proposed project, be dye tested to confirm they are connected to the appropriate system.

8. The Commission requests that Helm Investment LLC install a permanent casting stating "Don't Dump: Drains to Charles River" next to any catch basin created or modified as part of this project. Helm Investment LLC should contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.

9. The enclosed floors of a parking garage must drain through oil separators into the sewer system in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. The Commission's Requirements for Site Plans, available by contacting the Engineering Services Department, include requirements for separators.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,

John P. Sullivan, P.E.
Chief Engineer

JPS/afh

cc: Helm Investment LLC
K. Ronan, MWRA via e-mail
M. Zlody, BED via e-mail
P. Larocque, BWSC via e-mail

CITY of BOSTON
Martin J. Walsh, Mayor

To: Aisling Kerr, BPDA

From: Zach Wassmouth, PWD

Date: November 6, 2018

Subject: 50 Stedman Street SPRA - Boston Public Works Department Comments

Included here are Boston Public Works Department comments for the 50 Stedman Street SPRA.

From the documents submitted, it appears that all proposed roadway work associated with this project will occur within the limits of Stedman Street that is designated as a private way. The following comments shall only apply to work within the public right-of-way should it be required by the project scope:

Site Plan:
Developer must provide an engineer's site plan at an appropriate engineering scale that shows curb functionality on both sides of all streets that abut the property.

Construction Within The Public Way:
All work within the public way shall conform to Boston Public Works Department (PWD) standards. Any non-standard materials (i.e. pavers, landscaping, bike racks, etc.) proposed within the public way will require approval through the Public Improvement Commission (PIC) process and a fully executed License, Maintenance and Indemnification (LM&I) Agreement with the PIC.

Sidewalks:
Developer is responsible for the reconstruction of the sidewalks abutting the project and, wherever possible, to extend the limits to the nearest intersection to encourage and compliment pedestrian improvements and travel along all sidewalks within the Public Right of Way (ROW) within and beyond the project limits. The reconstruction effort also must meet current American's with Disabilities Act (ADA)/ Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (AAB) guidelines, including the installation of new or reconstruction of existing pedestrian ramps at all corners of all intersections. Plans showing the extents of the proposed sidewalk improvements associated with this project must be submitted to the Public Works Department (PWD) Engineering Division for review and approval.

The developer is encouraged to contact the City's Disabilities Commission to confirm compliant accessibility within the public right-of-way.

Driveway Curb Cuts:
Any proposed driveway curb cuts will need to be reviewed and approved by the PIC.

Discontinuances:
Any and all discontinuances (sub-surface, surface or above surface) within the Public ROW must be processed through the PIC.

Easements:
Any and all easements associated with this project must be processed through the PIC.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
Boston City Hall • 1 City Hall Sq Rm 714 • Boston MA 02201-2024
CHRIS OSGOOD • Chief of Streets, Transportation, and Sanitation
Phone (617) 635-2854 • Fax (617) 635-7499

Landscaping:
Developer must seek approval from the Chief Landscape Architect with the Parks and Recreation Department for all landscape elements within the Public ROW. Program must accompany a LM&I with the PIC.

Street Lighting:
Developer must seek approval from the PWD Street Lighting Division, where needed, for all proposed street lighting to be installed by the developer, and must be consistent with the area lighting to provide a consistent urban design. The developer should coordinate with the PWD Street Lighting Division for an assessment of any street lighting upgrades that can be considered in conjunction with this project. All existing metal street light pull box covers within the limits of sidewalk construction to remain shall be replaced with new composite covers per PWD Street Lighting standards. Metal covers should remain for pull box covers in the roadway.

Roadway:
Based on the extent of construction activity, including utility connections and taps, the developer will be responsible for the full restoration of the roadway sections that immediately abut the property and, in some cases, to extend the limits of roadway restoration to the nearest intersection.A plan showing the extents and methods for roadway restoration shall be submitted to the PWD Engineering Division for review and approval.

Project Coordination:
All projects must be entered into the City of Boston Utility Coordination Software (COBUCS) to review for any conflicts with other proposed projects within the public right-of-way. The Developer must coordinate with any existing projects within the same limits and receive clearance from PWD before commencing work.

Green Infrastructure:
The Developer shall work with PWD and the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) to determine appropriate methods of green infrastructure and/or stormwater management systems within the public right-of-way. The ongoing maintenance of such systems shall require an LM&I Agreement with the PIC.

Please note that these are the general standard and somewhat specific PWD requirements applicable to every project, more detailed comments may follow and will be addressed during the PIC review process.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at zachary.wassmouth@boston.gov or at 617-635-4953.

Sincerely,

Zach Wassmouth
Chief Design Engineer
Boston Public Works Department
Engineering Division

CC: Para Jayasinghe, PWD

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

Stonybrook Neighborhood Association Vote to Not Oppose 50 Stedman Street, Jamaica Plain

SNA Steering Committee Wed, Feb 13, 2019 at 7:04 PM
To: Brian.Golden@boston.gov
Cc: Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>, Matthew O'Malley <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, William Poff-Webster <william.poff-webster@boston.gov>, Alexandra Valdez <alexandra.valdez@boston.gov>, Annissa Essaibi-George <annissa.essaibi-george@boston.gov>, Jessica Rodriguez <jessica.rodriguez@boston.gov>, Michael.F.Flaherty@boston.gov, Michelle.Wu@boston.gov, "Malia, Liz - Rep. (HOU)" <Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov>, "Kaufman, Natalie (HOU)" <Natalie.Kaufman@mahouse.gov>, Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov, Jay Walsh

February 13, 2019

Brian Golden
Director, Boston Planning & Development Agency
City Hall, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 50 Stedman Street, Jamaica Plain

Dear Director Golden,

The Stonybrook Neighborhood Association (SNA) has considered revised plans for a 3-story, 21-unit residential building at 50 Stedman Street, currently undergoing Article 80 Small Project Review, and voted to not oppose the project at our February 12, 2019 meeting. The developers revised their plans following a previous SNA vote, in December 2018, in which the motion to not oppose the project did not pass. In response to specific concerns identified by the SNA, the developers made the following changes:

- Side setback on Brookley Road side: After two versions in which the side setback abutting two Brookley Road lots was inconsistent (8 ft vs. 12 ft, then 10 ft vs. 12), the developers agreed to provide an even 11 ft setback. The disparate setbacks adjacent to the two Brookley Road lots were a serious impediment to neighborhood approval of the project. Residents at 41 Brookley Road generously offered to give up 1 ft of their setback if it could be added to the setback next door; the developers agreed. This allows for equal treatment of the properties without requiring any loss in square footage for the proposed building.

- Community Benefits: Although the developers had agreed in concept to providing a community benefit, nothing specific had been defined. The neighborhood preferred to move forward with identifying specific community benefits for this project and named additional sidewalk repairs and/or construction as a desirable benefit. The developers reiterated that they will build the sidewalk area in front of 50 Stedman Street according to city standards along with roadway improvements acceptable to the layout to be submitted to the Public Improvement Commission. In addition, the team has agreed to add new sidewalk that will continue to Brookley Road adjacent to 41 Brookley, while preserving curb cutouts for 41 Brookley parking.

- Relocation Assistance for Displaced Business: The neighborhood remained concerned about the uncertainty inherent in the developers' offer to provide pro bono real estate services in trying to help the owner of Wentworth Auto secure a new location and requested additional monetary assistance. The developers agreed to partially fund Bill Miceli's moving expenses. However, Bill has since asked the SNA to withdraw our request for monetary assistance for his move.

Thanks to negotiations spearheaded by the SNA's 50 Stedman Subcommittee, this project will add a multi-family residential building to an industrial area bordering a long-established residential part of our vibrant neighborhood. The development provides 21 units of needed housing, while limiting building height to three stories so as not to overwhelm existing triple deckers that directly abut this project. Four of the units are to be affordable in accordance with Plan JP/Rox. Parking for residents will be underground and therefore not contribute to the competition for on-street parking spaces. Developers have also agreed to provide bicycle parking and electric car charging stations. The project will address sorely needed street and sidewalk improvements and landscaped open space. Abutters were also able to obtain measures to mitigate noise and pollution from construction and other continuing industrial activities from the developers.

While this project's updated plans reflect the new 11 ft setback abutting Brookley Road, the SNA's decision to not oppose the project and the several variances to be requested by the developers is also contingent upon follow through of the developers' commitments to:

1. Construct and/or repair sidewalks and make additional roadway improvements to the areas adjacent to 50 Stedman as well as along Stedman Street between 50 Stedman and Brookley Road;
2. Provide pro bono real estate services in trying to help the owner of Wentworth Auto secure a new location as well as ample notice of termination of the rental lease; and
3. Continue to engage with the neighborhood on landscaping and building design details.

Additionally, there are outstanding concerns about road access for emergency vehicles on Stedman Street and Stonley Road, which will require BPDA involvement to resolve. The SNA's decision to not oppose this project, therefore, also hinges on the BPDA's continued implementation of roadway plans for the area including Stedman Street and Stonley Road. The SNA is eager to work with the BPDA to make more progress on these critical plans and will be following up separately for an update on that work.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stonybrook Neighborhood Association Steering Committee
Danielle Cerny and Sue Cibulsky, Co-Chairs
Rob Coerver and Alex Ross, Members

Sign Up for the SNA Forum (http://www.sna-jp.org/online-forum.html) to share and receive information with your SNA neighbors. Your postings will be forwarded immediately and you will be able to choose settings on what you would like to receive and when.

Your email address was provided to SNA by you or someone you know. SNA will not give this email list to anyone outside of the SNA. PLEASE DO NOT USE OR DISTRIBUTE THIS EMAIL LIST WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION. If you wish to be added or removed from this neighborhood email list, please notify the snainjp@gmail.com administrator.

The SNA is made up of residents living or owning property on the following streets: Brookley, Rossmore, Williams, Gartland, Kenton, Shurland, Dungarven, Stedman, Plainfield, Meehan, Stonley, Lotus, Burnett, Rockvale and adjacent portions of Forest Hills and Washington Streets

---

50 Stedman_SNA-BPDA Letter_02.13.19_Final.pdf
144K

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

50 Stedman Street, Jamaica Plain

Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 10:13 AM

To: Brian.Golden@boston.gov
Cc: Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov, Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov, MICHAEL.F.FLAHERTY@boston.gov, AYANNA.PRESSLEY@boston.gov, MICHELLE.WU@boston.gov, MATTHEW.OMALLEY@boston.gov, A.E.GEORGE@boston.gov, alexandra.valdez@boston.gov, Aisling.kerr@boston.gov

Dear Director Golden,

The Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Council reviewed the current proposal for 50 Stedman St. The proposal is for a 3-story building with 21 rental units. This proposal is in the Plan JP/Rox area, and should reflect the guidelines in the Plan.

Here are our comments, including reference to Plan JP/Rox where applicable:

- We support this use of this parcel for multifamily residential. This parcel is currently zoned Light Industrial. In Plan JP/Rox, it was recommended that it be rezoned 3-family to blend with the abutting residential neighborhood. This proposal is for a multifamily residential, which would be outside of the Plan JP/Rox recommendation. Because the height of this multifamily at 35' is the same as the allowed height for 3-families, and because the multifamily will create some affordable housing, we support this use.[i]

- The developers need to resolve outstanding issues with the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association. Some of these issues include setbacks, height of roof mechanicals, sustainability, displacement of a commercial tenant, and community benefits. SNA has been actively involved with this project and is currently engaged in conducting a neighborhood vote on the project. The fact that the developers moved ahead with the BPDA Article 80 process without resolving these issues is a sore point with some members. We hope and expect greater agreement can be found.

- The project needs to follow the setbacks for multifamily residential zoning. The proposal is for a multifamily residential building on a parcel currently zoned for Light Industrial. Plan JP/Rox includes the setback guidelines for new residential uses; side setbacks should be 10'. The developers have said they can follow the setbacks based on current zoning (LI), which are significantly less; they have also said they can follow smaller setbacks because in places they border a vacant lot and an industrial space. These are not valid arguments. The 10'side setback reflects the residential use, helps fit the multifamily in with the surrounding 3-families, and allows future new buildings on the other lots to have adequate setbacks.[ii]

- The project can increase affordability. JPNC policy requires that 25% of a project's units be affordable at 65% AMI. This project has 4 affordable units, or about 19%. We salute the fact that these units will be offered at a range of income levels, bringing the overall income requirement to 50% AMI. We ask the developers to lower the AMI requirements further to 40% AMI.

- The project may support reduced parking. We understand 21 parking spaces has some general support in the neighborhood. Given its location next to mass transit and bike paths, this project can provide less parking. We encourage the developers to offer incentives to reduce car use and to offer bike- and car-sharing options.[iii]

- We echo neighbors' concern for the displacement of a current auto repair business. The developers have offered to provide ample notice and relocation help. We ask that commitment be formalized, such as in a

letter to the current tenant.

- We appreciate that the developers are willing to talk further with our Committee about their construction jobs policy.

We are not providing comment on sustainability[iv] or the outstanding issue of connecting Stedman St. and Stonley Rd.[v]

Sincerely,

Kevin Rainsford
Chair of the Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Council
c/o 70 Paul Gore Street #3
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130
617-866-7672

---

[i] Use
"Two small changes are recommended in the Stonybrook neighborhood where it is currently zoned Local Industrial (Figure 68, label 4). These proposed changes would help to blend future development with the abutting three-family residential neighborhood, and reflects a recent redevelopment trend in the Stonybrook area whereby the industrial uses closer to the MBTA Arborway Yard are being proposed for residential development.

Stonybrook Neighborhood East - Local Industrial (LI)- 3 family houses (3F-4000)
Carve out a portion of the existing Local Industrial (LI) zoning subdistrict and add it to the adjacent existing 3F-4000 zoning subdistrict to blend with abutting residential neighborhood and reflect a recent redevelopment trend in the Stonybrook neighborhood." p. 122 & 123

[ii] Setbacks
"• Front Setback - varied by area character:
1. Residential: 10’ to 15’ to allow landscaping and buffer ground floor residential uses.
2. Local Retail / Commercial: 0’ to 15’ to allow for both res-idential and retail uses including outdoor seating and unique conditions.
3. Main Street / Active Commercial: 0’ to 10’ to allow for out-door seating.

• Side Yard and Rear Yard Setbacks - varied by area character:
1. Residential: Side 10’ / Rear 20’.
2. Local Retail / Commercial (a): Side 0’ / Rear 10’ to 20’.
3. Main Street / Active Commercial (a): Side 0’ / Rear 10’ to 20’.

Note (a): When the adjoining use is a 1F, 2F, or 3F residential zoning sub-district, the setback should be 10’ at an adjoining side yard and 20' at an adjoining rear yard." p. 140

[iii] Parking
"Wherever possible, sidewalks on neighborhood streets should be a preferred 11’6” wide on Neighborhood Residential Streets 16’6” on Neighborhood Main Streets, and never less than 7’ wide to allow for ample pedestrian space, street trees and to meet ac-cessibility requirements. Particular attention will be paid to Amory Street, Atherton Street, School Street, Green Street/Glen Road, Williams Street and McBride Street/Rossmore Road. In addition, options for improving sidewalk surface conditions, including saw cut sidewalks and updates to meet ADA-compliant cross slope re-quirements, will be explored." p.92-93

"Based upon the Study Area's proximity to transit, and in line with BTD policy, the PLAN: JP/ROX document recommends the follow-ing maximum parking ratios for amended zoning. Lower parking ratios will be required for projects that are closer to transit. Park-ing should be shared between developments.

Residential:

Maximum of 0.75 spaces per unit for large projects (over 50,000 sf).

Maximum of 1.0 space per unit for other projects." P. 96

[iv] Sustainability

"New projects should set LEED Neighborhood Development Platinum as a goal and at minimum achieve LEED Neighborhood Development Gold.
New projects and buildings will play a crucial role in meeting Boston's 2050 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goal of carbon neutrality. New development planning should target net zero energy performance and in-clude on-site clean and renewable energy systems.
• New buildings and major building renovations should set LEED Plati-num as the goal and at minimum achieve LEED Gold certifiable.
• All new buildings and major renovations should include innovative strategies and technologies for building-integrated and on-site renew-able energy and, at a minimum, must include some on-site solar re-newable energy." p.144

[v] Connectivity

1. Enhance vehicular circulation with new roadway network and connection
2. Extend Lotus Street from Forest Hills Street to Washington Street
3. Extend existing street network at Stonley Road, Stedman Road, and Plainfield Street" p. 164

---

50 Stedman St Article 80 Comment Letter,JPNC.pdf
124K

City Councilor Matt O'Malley
Boston City Hall 02201

October 29, 2018

Chief of Economic Development John Barros
Boston City Hall 02201

Dear Councilor O'Malley and Chief Barros,

I live in Mission Hill, so you might wonder why I'm writing about 50 Stedman Street in Jamaica Plain, there's a story here that I think you should hear. And I hope city hall will help.

A few words about a small Boston business, repairing cars, blue collar, dirty hard work. Essential jobs that usually don't get respect. Wentworth Service Station is a one-man shop, sometimes Bill Miceli the owner has taken on interns and helpers, usually he's solo. Admired and appreciated for his skill, his fair prices and his work ethic, he's rescued many hapless drivers, never had to advertise for customers, word of mouth gets him more than enough.

Wentworth Service Station opened in 1960 at 541 Huntington Avenue in Mission Hill. Arthur Vachon was the first proprietor, he was a kind gentlemanly guy and knowledgeable mechanic. The customers were Mission Hill neighbors, the station was a community gathering spot like a barber shop or bodega. Originally a gas station, the pumps were a distraction from the useful and always in demand auto repair work. There were many gas stations on Huntington then, Arthur and Bill's pumps weren't needed.

After Arthur died in 1991, Bill moved the business to Jamaica Plain first to Washington Street later to Stedman in 2003. A dead-end street in a local industrial zone next to other businesses, hidden away but in a neighborhood. A light industrial block in an urban community, an asset or eyesore, opinions varied. For nearby residents who needed their car fixed or some quick advice; an asset.

50 Stedman Street was a little distant for his Mission Hill customers but still convenient with Forest Hills Station three blocks away, plus the 42 bus on Washington Street. You could leave your car and take the train home. Wentworth Service Station, a Boston based business for almost 60 years, what happens next? Boston's booming real estate market is all about housing, building boxes not an old school single proprietor repair shop. What happens to those essential services that don't fit in anymore?

Sincerely,

Alison Pultinas
81 Lawn St.
Roxbury 02120

4 Dec. 2018

TO: Brian Golden, Director BPDA, City of Boston

RE: 50 Stedman Street, Jamaica Plain, MA Development Project

I respectfully request that Article 80 for the above project should be extended until at least January 2019. The SNA-Stonybrook Neighborhood Association is split on this very controversial project/current proposal. The SNA has not yet voted on this proposal. The comment period should also be extended. At the Nov 27th JPNC Meeting, the Housing Committee explained their proposed comments, updated them in regards to conversations w/SNA members and stated they too would request a delay in Article 80 process but would send a Comment Letter to meet any BPDA deadline set.

Many of the SNA 50 Stedman St sub-committee and SNA members are opposed to this project for many reasons, included but not limited to the actual process of NOT including all abutters in a timely fashion. The follow-up by the developers to questions and reports requested has been ***no response in writing***. Even though many abutters seem willing to approve this project, they do so at the expense of the whole neighborhood concerns.

Since many in the community and an immediate abutter do NOT agree on how the process was handled (misinformation, lack of sub-committee meetings, a rushed public hearing), many of us believe NOT rushing approval is important to the overall process of the project and the final result which impacts other Stoneybrook and JP development projects in flux.

The Oct 29th "public hearing" was quite volatile and both BPDA and the developer agreed to a longer public comment period and further discussion. Clearly the community was split on this project as proposed. The BPDA liaison commented that she could get the meeting wrapped up quickly so people could go home to the football game. This was the only public hearing and many residents who learned about the Hearing/project late and/or were not able to participate in SNA meetings were clearly interested in learning about the development and how it impacts Jamaica Plain as a whole.

In addition, when we spoke to BPDA at the Oct 29th meeting and explained other parcels were being developed and we should be looking at the "overall area in question", we were informed "that's not how it is done". **Well it should be a major consideration.**

For years we have been asking the City of Boston and/or Boston Redevelopment Authority to improve on the

1) Parking ratio to housing (always at least 1 parking space per resident)
2) A more organized working together of Agency(s): BPDA, BRA and others such as MBTA, SWCC etc.
3) Affordable Housing

The local industrial area now being destroyed is also displacing businesses and small business owners while tearing down buildings that could be renovated into housing "as is". Many of these brick and masonry buildings enhance the area. Such buildings in neighborhoods such as Back Bay, Beacon Hill, South End and Charlestown have been preserved and regenerated. **Selling to developers whose only concern are housing and profit are not acceptable as development projects** to the residents and property taxpayers of Jamaica Plain.

.

Now that the Stonley Road development project(s) are being proposed, there is an obvious risk of a "further mish mash" of projects that do NOT reflect Jamaica Plain's and/or the Stonybrook agriculture and light industrial history.

For those of us who moved to JP for its history and "working class" neighborhood, we are devastated that the potential developments are ugly, cheap and yet, cost too much for the working class people to live here.

It's a very sad fact that people (and businesses) have been gentrified and that the housing is not reaching out to be affordable for these people.
It's a very sad fact that so many who used to live in JP cannot afford to come back.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elizabeth A. Charney

Elizabeth A. Charney
15 Meehan Street
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130-3609

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

I support the Development proposal for 50 Stedman

frederick vetterlein Sun, Dec 9, 2018 at 8:35 PM
To: Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

Aisling,

I support the Development proposal for 50 Stedman.

Nearly 2 years ago, the SNA supported the concept of a 3 story apartment building at 50 Stedman. Yet detractors continue to fight-recently by scaring and enlisting an older resident with fears of dense development. This apartment building would have exactly the same if not less setbacks to her property as a 3 family home-10'. The same people pushing her fears have been against reasonable development for 2 years and even without her would have fought moving forward with this project.

I support the project because of these and many other reasons:

-19 Units of housing with 4-5 affordable units
-Underground parking and new landscape surrounding the building rather than driveways.
-Sidewalk and street construction improvements to a largely abandoned Industrial Area.
-The benefit of industrial noise and pollution improvements to abutting neighbors

Regards,

Frederick Vetterlein

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

50 Stedman St, JP - support of the current development proposal

Jana Ryndin Tue, Dec 11, 2018 at 9:27 AM
To: Aisling.Kerr@boston.gov

Hello Aisling,

I support the current development proposal for 50 Stedman St in Jamaica Plain.

I have lived in Europe in such building and from my experience it's really a future of residential housing in the city. Very progressed. Underground parking. Well used space available to accommodate as many residents as possible. I lived at 33 Plainfield Street, #2 from 2013 to 2017 and it's very painful to live there while the current industrial situation - pollution and noise. The porch is very dusty and basically not able to use through year at all and this development negotiation has been going on painfully so long already.

I am hoping my voice will matter. Currently I have been living at 19 Anson St, Jamaica Plain.

Wishing you a nice day.

Jana Ryndin

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

I oppose the 50 Stedman project in Jamaica Plain

Jennifer Uhrhane Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 2:06 PM
To: Brian.Golden@boston.gov, Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>
Cc: Matthew O'Malley <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, William Poff-Webster <william.poff-webster@boston.gov>, Annissa Essaibi-George <annissa.essaibi-george@boston.gov>, michelle.wu@boston.gov, Michael Flaherty <michael.flaherty@boston.gov>, ayanna.pressley@boston.gov, Carolyn Royce , Kevin Rainsford Alexandra Valdez <alexandra.valdez@boston.gov>, "Malia, Liz - Rep." <Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov>, Natalie Kaufman <Natalie.Kaufman@mahouse.gov>, Senator Sonia Chang-Diaz <sonia.chang-diaz@masenate.gov>

Brian P. Golden, Director
Boston Planning & Development Agency

Dear Mr. Golden,

I oppose the 50 Stedman project in its current form on the principals that fair process is not being followed and the local neighborhood process is not complete.

The developers prematurely filed their project with the BPDA, before getting to a good point in their negotiations with the Stonybrook Neighborhood Association. The SNA has not completed discussions with the developer because the project still needs some significant resolutions regarding neighbors concerns including setbacks, roof/height, design, environmental design elements, community benefit, business displacement, etc. For example:

-the subcommittee has not negotiated any specific community benefit yet so we will lose our chance for a commitment if the BPDA gives its approval without this

-the subcommittee has heard no specifics yet on relocation assistance for long-term business garage Wentworth Auto such as a commitment to locate a new garage and financial assistance for relocation.

-this is the third building in a block designed by the same architect (76 Stonley-under construction, 84 Stonley-proposed, 50 Stedman). the designs are blocky, uninspired and practically institutional in character. JP deserves better and i don't believe that one architect should be able to establish his legacy in this area. i urge the BPDA design reviewer to ask the architect to come back with a more interesting design that makes an effort to differentiate itself from his other projects and also fit better within the context of the surrounding historical, smaller scale residential neighborhood.

-the proposal currently features inadequate and uneven side setbacks on the north and south and inadequate front yard setbacks. north side-setbacks are 12 feet behind 41 Brookley Road but only 8.5 feet behind 43 Brookley. South side-setbacks range from 3.6 - 7.9 feet depending on location. Multifamily zoning requires 10 foot side setbacks. Front yard setbacks are between 7.3 - 12 feet depending on location. Multifamily zoning requires 15 foot front yard setbacks. this building should be reviewed in the context of multi-family zoning because it is a multifamily proposal in an industrially-zoned area.

The setbacks and how they were arrived at are probably the most egregiously unfair detail with this proposal. The developers neglected to inform a key abutter, Mary Rigo, about this project so she has missed out on months of negotiations. Mrs. Rigo came late to this SNA process partially because the developers told the SNA she had already been informed and had no issue with the project, both of which were untrue. The developers then separately negotiated larger setbacks to her next door neighbor's property at 41 Brookley but not for her property at 43 Brookley. The developers have begun to address this issue but not completely, and have not addressed the other above outstanding issues.

At the BPDA public meeting on Oct 29, project manager Aisling Kerr indicated that the BPDA thought it was time to move this project along, but I disagree. The 50 Stedman project was first presented to the SNA membership on March 8, 2017. Subsequent communications in May and June 2017 resulted in an 8 month silence from the developers. Later communications in March and July of 2018 resulted in 3 month gaps after each letter. So despite it appearing as if negotiations have taken a long time, in reality there was a lot of waiting.

The SNA just voted to oppose this project, so it will be sent back to the subcommittee to work out the rest of the issues with the developers before voting again. this happened with 76 Stonley, also by the same developers. further negotiation

work after the initial oppose vote resulted in valuable concessions: the top floor was removed and an additional affordable unit added, for example. Consequently the SNA voted a second time to not oppose. The SNA has a strong record of negotiating improvements to projects that better benefit the neighborhood but also result in a more salable outcome for the developers. Please let the SNA's process play out in its entirety first. Every new project that gets built here sets a precedent for the next one; rushing this one at the expense of getting a poorly planned project that won't benefit the SNA in the long term is shortsighted decision making.

Therefore I request that the BPDA suspend the Article 80 review process to allow more time for the developers to resolve the rest of the concerns and come to an agreement that all can live with. If the BPDA approves this project before the SNAs local negotiations are done, the developers will have little reason to listen to the rest of the SNA neighbors' concerns.

Thank you for your time and attention.
Jennifer Uhrhane

cc
Aisling Kerr, BPDA project manager
City Councilors: O'Malley, Essaibi-George, Flaherty, Pressley, Wu
Alexandra Valdez, Mayors Office/Neighborhood Services
Kevin Rainsford, chair, Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Council
Carolyn Royce, chair, JPNC Housing and Development Committee
Rep. Liz Malia
Sen. Sonia Chang-Diaz

—

Jennifer Uhrhane
47 Rossmore Road
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

I oppose the 50 Stedman project in Jamaica Plain

Jonathan McCurdy Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 8:23 PM
To: Brian.Golden@boston.gov, Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>
Cc: Matthew O'Malley <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, William Poff-Webster <william.poff-webster@boston.gov>, Annissa Essaibi-George <annissa.essaibi-george@boston.gov>, michelle.wu@boston.gov, Michael Flaherty <michael.flaherty@boston.gov>, ayanna.pressley@boston.gov, Carolyn Royce Kevin Rainsford Alexandra Valdez <alexandra.valdez@boston.gov>, "Malia, Liz - Rep." <Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov>, Natalie Kaufman <Natalie.Kaufman@mahouse.gov>, Senator Sonia Chang-Diaz <sonia.chang-diaz@masenate.gov>, Stonybrook Neighborhood Association

Brian P. Golden, Director
Boston Planning & Development Agency

Dear Mr. Golden,

I oppose the 50 Stedman project in its current form on the principals that fair process is not being followed and the local neighborhood process is not complete.

Below are some of the reasons why I oppose the project:

1. The local Stonybrook Neighborhood Association (SNA) process hasn't finished.
2. There are still a number of items to negotiate or change with the project.
3. BPDA process shouldn't have been started yet as the developers filed prematurely before they had completed their negotiations with the SNA.
4. The development team lied about their contacting a direct abutter and informing them of the project when they hadn't done so. This party entered the process late and was not given to opportunity to weigh in on the project as others had.
5. If the BPDA votes to approve this before the SNA finishes it's negotiations the developers will have no incentives to continue working with the neighborhood.
6. Unresolved issues include but are not limited to setbacks (developers negotiated different setbacks with neighboring abutters), community benefits, business displacement, roof height.
7. At the BPDA public meeting on Oct 29, it was disturbing that project manager Aisling Kerr did not take notes and that when asked if anyone from BPDA was taking notes she stated that she "had a good memory". She was the only BPDA employee at the meeting. If BPDA practice is that no notes are taken at public meetings, that should change immediately. If there is no record of comments at public meetings the process is inherently unfair.

I request that the BPDA suspend the Article 80 review process to allow more time for the developers to resolve the remaining concerns and propose a plan that the SNA will vote to not oppose.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Jonathan McCurdy

cc
Aisling Kerr, BPDA project manager
City Councilors: O'Malley, Essaibi-George, Flaherty, Pressley, Wu
Alexandra Valdez, Mayors Office/Neighborhood Services
Kevin Rainsford, chair, Jamaica Plain Neighborhood Council
Carolyn Royce, chair, JPNC Housing and Development Committee
Rep. Liz Malia
Sen. Sonia Chang-Diaz
Stonybrook Neighborhood Association
—

Jonathan S. McCurdy
47 Rossmore Road
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

50 Stedman Street: Deeper Affordability, Preventing Displacement, Strong Job Standards, and Resolving Abutter Issues

Keep it 100 for Real Affordable Housing and Racial Justice Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 4:17 PM

To: aisling.kerr@boston.gov
Cc: mayor@cityofboston.gov, Brian.Golden@boston.gov, Jonathan.Greeley@boston.gov, Matthew O'Malley <matthew.omalley@boston.gov>, A.E.George@boston.gov, Michael.F.Flaherty@boston.gov, Ayanna.Pressley@boston.gov, Michelle.Wu@boston.gov, Liz.Malia@mahouse.gov, Sonia.Chang-Diaz@masenate.gov, Alexandra.Valdez@boston.gov

Aisling Kerr:

Keep It 100 for Real Affordable Housing and Racial Justice is writing to call on the developer of 50 Stedman Street to do the following.

The BPDA should hold the developer to doing the following actions, and withhold approval until these commitments are made:

* **INCLUDE DEEPER AFFORDABILITY AND HIGHER AFFORDABILITY:** Currently, the project includes two 70% AMI units, one 40% AMI unit, and one 30% AMI unit. **The affordability in one of the two 70% AMI units should be deepened to 50% AMI.** We believe that Plan JP/Rox requirements would include one 70% AMI unit, three 50% AMI units, and a payout; in conversations with Mayor Walsh, the BPDA, and DND this past year and a half, we have advocated for bonus units to be set at 40% AMI (with a mix of 30% AMI, 40% AMI, and 50% AMI) and City officials have agreed this would be a reasonable modficiation. In addition, we ask that the developer apply for Community Preservation Act funds to further deepen affordability and add units at 30-50% AMI.

* **PREVENT DISPLACEMENT: There must be a written guarantee and plan for Wentworth Service Station to remain at the site or be relocated to a site in the neighborhood of comparable rent, size, quality, etc.** The developer must agree not to evict the business, terminate the lease, or pressure them to leave. If needed, negotiations should occur with the support of City and State officials, with a positive outcome that prevents displacement reported back to the JP Neighborhood Council and the wider community. The community is holding all developers to the expectation that they will prevent displacement of local businesses. Plan JP/Rox says time and again that preventing displacement is a priority of the plan and the City, so the City must ensure that companies are not displacing people while developing projects.

* **ENSURE STRONG JOB STANDARDS:** The developer should meet with JP Neighborhood Council members and good jobs advocates to make an agreement about wages and access to jobs for the construction of the project. **This includes setting a floor of $20/hr for all construction workers, with 51% of construction jobs and hours going to Boston residents, 51% to people of color, and 20% to women.**

* **RESOLVE ISSUES WITH ABUTTERS:** At a JP Neighborhood Council Housing and Development Committee meeting, the developer said they were not willing to make changes to the dimensions of the project in response to an abutter's concerns. **The developer should resolve the issues around setbacks and project dimensions with abutters.**

- Keep It 100 for Real Affordable Housing and Racial Justice

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

Direct abutter in favor of 50 Stedman project

Marat Ryndin Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 3:58 PM
To: aisling.Kerr@boston.gov

Hi Aisling,

As someone who lives directly next to the sight of the proposed project, I'm very much in favor of it. I bought the condo apartment about 5 years ago and while I really like the location and the apartment itself, the sights out of my windows aren't exactly inspiring. Mostly industrial stuff that makes a lot of noise and creates so much dust that it's hard to use the deck in the warm months. The particular location of the proposed project contains a parking for oil trucks and is full of chemical waste. I have reviewed the project and it's a very reasonable solution to turning that location into a residential building. The developers have even gone agreed to compromise greatly on the number of units by agreeing to lower the height of the building so that it doesn't rise above all the triple deckers surrounding it. I see absolutely no reason to delay the project further and do not understand the opposition to it by people who will mostly not even be affected by it. All of the direct abutters are wholeheartedly in support of the project and I urge you to take our opinion into consideration.

Sincerely,
Marat Ryndin

--

INPUT = OUTPUT. Why waste your time obeying the opinions of others?

Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

50 Stedman Street Project

Rosetta Martini Mon, Dec 10, 2018 at 7:12 AM
To: Aisling.Kerr@boston.gov

Hi Aisling,

I OPPOSE this project as it's too dense. 21 units is too many in that small area. I would support 3 Three-deckers there as they would fit into the neighborhood. Pretty soon there won't be a tree in Jamaica Plain. The developers are raping Jamaica Plain and trying to squeeze us out of every open space/lot that we have left. It's disgusting and very hurtful to home owners who have lived all their lives in JP and paid taxes all their lives here.

I OPPOSE this project. I live one street over and my family has been here since 1923.

Rosetta R. Martini
33 Lotus St., JP