

50 Stedman Street Public Comments as of 2018-11-07

| 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 |

| Date | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Opinion | Comments |
|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|---------|---|
| 11/6/2018 | Jennifer | Uhrhane | Stonybrook Neighborhood Association | Oppose | I oppose this project in its current form on the principal 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 find this very troubling that the BPDA has already made up its mind before the community has been able to weigh in and is disregarding valid setback concerns. This makes the BPDA public comment practice seem like a charade. 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 needs to play out first. |
| 11/6/2018 | Jonathan | McCurdy | Stonybrook Neighborhood Association | Oppose | I oppose this project in its current form on the principal 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 needs to play out first. |
| 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. |

| Date | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Opinion | Comments |
|------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|---------|--|
| 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. |

50 Stedman Street Public Comments as of 2018-11-07

| Date | First Name | Last Name | Organization | Opinion | Comments |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------|--|
| 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 heights in the closest area and this is what most of the neighbors should only care about. |



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



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