



CITY of BOSTON

Martin J. Walsh, Mayor

To: Raul Duverge, BPDA
From: Zach Wassmouth, PWD
Date: October 18, 2018
Subject: 656 Saratoga Street SPRA - Boston Public Works Department Comments

Included here are Boston Public Works Department comments for the 656 Saratoga Street SPRA.

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.

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.



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



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

While the development proposed at 656 Saratoga St is not, specifically for older adults (55+), it features age-friendly elements. The transit-oriented housing encourages walkability and the use of public transportation. The proximity to pocket parks, Wood Island Station, and the East Boston Greenway promote healthy living. The diversity of plants and private open space create a safe space for people with Dementia. The mix of bedroom units, the inclusion of group 2 units, and unit prices allow people to downsize and create an opportunity for various income levels.

We encourage the developers to strongly consider the following:

- The use of universal design in all spaces. These design features allow residents to age in their home and community. It saves money upfront eliminating the need to make changes over time which are costly to residents and developers.
- Remove the two-step leading from the community room to the garden. Removing the step will create a smooth transition for all people.
- Include armrests on the ends of the big bench to offer stability for those in need.

Enclosed is a white paper developed by the Boston Society for Architects Design for Aging Committee on Age-Friendly Housing. Additionally, Enterprise Green Communities created the [“Aging In Place Guidelines for Independent Living in Multifamily Buildings.”](#) That guide is another resource to consult for aging in place.

Please contact our office if you have any questions. We look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Nicole Chandler
City of Boston Elderly Commission

Boston Society of Architects Design for Aging Committee

White Paper: A Case for Age Friendly Housing

April 10, 2018

The WHO and Age Friendly Cities

The World Health Organization, AARP, Enterprise Community and others are moving to create Age Friendly Cities and Communities throughout the United States and around the world. This is a direct response to the worldwide trend for ever increasing life expectancies and a concurrent decrease in birthrates resulting in dramatic population shifts in age demographics. According to the National Institutes of Health the over 65 cohort is projected to jump to nearly 17 percent of the world's population by 2050 or 1.6 billion.

Boston

Boston is on an even faster track and as early as 2030, its aging population will reach or exceed 20%. Mayor Marty Walsh made the commitment four years ago to become an AARP, Age Friendly City and Boston is well on its way to earn the distinction within the next year. An Age Friendly City encompasses eight domains: Outdoor Spaces and Buildings; Transportation; Housing; Social Participation; Respect and Social Inclusion; Civic Participation and Employment; Communication and Information, and; Community and Health Services. Fortunately for Boston many if not most of

the domains are established, or well on their way to being Age Friendly. However, Boston being one of the oldest cities in the country has some unique challenges when it comes to Outdoor Spaces, Buildings and Housing - especially its existing housing stock. In spite of this, Boston continues to attract retirees from the suburbs and retain its elderly residents. The focus of this paper is the 'Housing' domain, more specifically all-new housing; what constitutes Age Friendly Housing and how it should be applied to an Age Friendly City.

Design for Aging

Design for Aging is a Knowledge Community of the American Institute of Architects. Its mission is to foster design innovation and disseminate the knowledge necessary to enhance the built environment and quality of life for an aging society. The Boston Society of Architects (BSA), Design for Aging (DFA) Committee promotes these same ideals but focused on local issues. At the very outset, the BSA, DFA agreed to assist with the city's Age Friendly initiative and has been working with them for the past four years.



“ According to the National Institutes of Health, the over 65 cohort is projected to jump to nearly 17 percent of the world’s population by 2050... or 1.6 billion people. ”

The assistance includes:

- Producing a 25 minute video documentary of seven seniors living in Boston, and the daily challenges they face <https://vimeo.com/144566535>
- Participation in neighborhood “Listening Sessions”
- Participation in “Walk Boston” neighborhood street assessments
- Meeting and engaging with Boston’s Department of Neighborhood Development (DND)
- Conducting a first ever “Roundtable” with various city departments including: Age Friendly Boston; Boston, Disability Commission, Department of Neighborhood Development, Access Coordinator; Dementia Friendly Boston; Boston Access Specialist; BSA Access Committee, and BSA Design for Aging.
- Conducting a Design Charrette that included architects, designers and advocates specializing in aging and accessibility. The purpose was to refine a pro-

totypical design developed by Boston’s Department of Neighborhood Development for a model Aging in Place apartment. Ultimately, this prototype would provide the foundation for Age Friendly Boston’s Housing Policy.

Age Friendly Housing vs. Disability Housing

Clearly, Age Friendly and Disability Housing overlap, but there are significant differences. Disabilities are far ranging and while mobility impairments are the most common, disabilities are various and do not fall neatly into a “one fix suits all” solution. We do know that about 20% of the population are living with some form of disability. By setting aside an equivalent number of housing units, many individuals currently living with disabilities can be accommodated while others will require specialized housing. Unfortunately, 5% is the typical set aside and that’s far too low. Moreover, Visitability or the ability for someone living with a disability to visit anywhere or any-



one outside of their own home requires an abundance of accessible housing over and above any required minimum. Anything less is unacceptable. But that's not the subject of this paper.

Aging in Place, which lies at the very core of an Age Friendly Community, is a term used to describe the ability for one to remain in their own home, condominium or apartment as they age and over time transition from healthy adults to frail seniors, potentially with multiple disabilities. The transition may take years, decades or a lifetime. Since this is transitional, most residents living in Age Friendly Housing are neither disabled nor even elderly but in time will eventually be. Therefore, the fundamental difference between Disability and Age Friendly Housing is this: Age Friendly Housing residents will always be predominately fully-abled but over time will become frail and disabled relying on housing that can accommodate their evolving needs and a wide range of assistive devices.



Surprising Charrette Results

The Roundtable and follow up Charrette resulted in some surprising findings. First, there were multiple solutions for every challenge, even though the overall space remained the same. In other words, one size didn't fit or apply to all

and none were literally copied from the diagrams contained in 521CMR, which is so often the case when minimum requirements are imposed. Having the benefit of talented designers and architects trained in Universal Design and working together for the common benefit of an aging community yielded multiple options for kitchens and bathrooms, the focus of this particular exercise. Rather than a prescriptive plan that discourages innovation and creativity, it was the consensus of these experts that there should be a wider range of Universal Design options available for consideration. Exactly how that might best be benchmarked to the current code was not clear.

What was clear however is: Group 1 Bathrooms and Kitchens, as defined by Massachusetts Architectural Access Board 521 CMR, are not suitable for Aging in Place or Age Friendly Housing. There is insufficient space for walkers, wheelchairs and other devices as well as assisting care givers, commonly associated with frailty and aging.

Trends

Advancements in technology, wearables, face-time, and skype are keeping seniors connected with family, friends and healthcare practitioners from home; Home Healthcare Services are one of the fastest growing business models in the country, and; according to numerous surveys including AARP, roughly 90% of all U.S. adults would prefer to age in their own homes. All of which points to the obvious: more and more Americans will Age in Place in their own homes. While most are not yet disabled and a generation or more removed from an age when they may become frail and disabled, should they be forced to move to a new home, neighborhood or community when they do become frail or disabled?

Conclusions

As the city moves toward Age Friendly status, the Boston Society of Architects, Design for Aging Committee offers the following recommendations:

1. Innovation and creativity should be encouraged when it comes to Aging in Place and Age Friendly Housing. Merely copying diagrams from 521 CMR or ADA Standards is insufficient. Most importantly, thoughtful consideration especially for lifestyle, movement, storage, cooking, hygiene (bathing/toileting) and everyday use as well as appealing design that ultimately makes "handicapped" disappear. Design should be appealing and marketable to all regardless of abilities.
2. Group 2, Accessible design standards are the only standards applicable to Aging in Place and Age Friendly Housing. Group 1 is irrelevant.
3. With increasing numbers of people living with disabilities, the need for visitability and choice when considering accessible options remains high. In addition, overwhelming numbers are predicted to Age in Place in their own homes, especially as more and more technology and services become available. The demand is there, the need is clear: all (100%) future housing in an Age Friendly City should be designed for Aging in Place.
4. We recognize this is an ambitious goal with some consequences. Estimates suggest about a 4% cost premium (equivalent to approximately one year construction inflation). While we would like to see this set as a goal, it is more realistic to suggest a phased implementation over the next 20 to 30 years when demand will peak. Starting immediately, with a minimum of 20% Age Friendly Housing applied to all forms of housing including single family, multi-family homes, market rate and affordable developments, eventually reaching 100% by, say, 2050. In the interim, Inclusionary Development Policies (IDP) for affordable and accessible housing should also be considered.

For Design for Aging:

James M. Warner, FAIA
Todd R. Hanson, AIA
Ruth Neeman, AIA
Diane Dooley, AIA

April 3, 2018

Boston Planning and Development Agency
City Hall
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

BRA
'18 APR 9 PM2:57:39

Attention : BPDA liaisons to East Boston

Re : Proposed development at 656 Saratoga Street, East Boston

Dear Sir/Madam :

I reside at 666 Saratoga Street, East Boston, MA 02128, three doors down from the above-referenced location.

Having attended a recent meeting of the Harbor View Neighborhood Association at which the proposed developer and his attorney provided a presentation of the 40 unit project, I am reasonably certain that the proposed development will substantially interfere with health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the 600 block of Saratoga Street.

As I see it, four issues in particular will deleteriously affect those interests :

1. Traffic on Saratoga Street is particularly heavy between the hours of 6:00 a.m and 8:30 a.m. on weekdays as people commute to work or to drop off their children at the nearby school. The proposed project would require tenants driving cars to exit the premises on Chaucer Street. From Chaucer Street, those who wish to travel through the Sumner Tunnel would necessarily have to take a right onto Curtis Street and a right onto either Saratoga or Bennington Streets where the traffic is most congested.

Adding more cars to the already heavy traffic would pose numerous problems for the morning commuters who are trying to get to work on time ; it would also increase the possibility of accidents involving those commuters and/or nearby pedestrians, many of whom are school children.

2. The proposed development would contain approximately thirty parking spaces which would include so-called "stacking" apparatuses, devices which even the developer concedes tenants would have to learn to use.

It is easy to foresee that problems with the stackers would lead to tenants who have cars to forego the on-premises parking and take to the streets where parking is already limited and at a premium, especially in the wintertime. Given its Saratoga Street address, it is likely that Amazon and other vendors would make their deliveries from the Saratoga Street side, further entangling traffic and taking up parking spaces.

3. The fact that 40 units are contemplated suggests that each unit will have at least one trash barrel. It is foreseeable that the City's contractor would empty these 40 trash barrels on trash day. I do not know where all these barrels will be kept. Such an inordinate number of barrels placed on the sidewalk on the night previous to trash day will inevitably lead to more trash on Saratoga Street. The likelihood of an appearance of rats and other rodents would increase as well. Though the developer suggests that the barrels would be placed on Chaucer Street on trash day, an assertion to which I have no objection, common sense informs me that not all tenants will be amenable to placing their barrels on Chaucer Street and would instead place them on Saratoga Street for convenience reasons.
4. This project is overly ambitious in size and scope. The tenants of the building are renters who will likely have little or no vested interest in the residents of East Boston. I have no idea as to the extent the property would be supervised and managed. The site drawings demonstrate that the building itself looks like no other in the neighborhood and does not appear to otherwise comport with its character. It is a behemoth compared to the other buildings on Saratoga Street and is severely lacking from the standpoint of aesthetics. It would also cast a shadow over the residences across the street and would take away the view of Route 1A.

The building and its many tenants would prove to be unfairly intrusive and disruptive to the peace and safety of the local community. I therefore oppose the proposed development in its current form.

I would have no objection to another, much smaller development being constructed on the 656 Saratoga Street premises, provided that the foregoing considerations are taken into account and are acted upon directly.

Thank you for your most thoughtful and careful consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,



Dennis J. Bannon

**Boston Water and
Sewer Commission**



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

October 19, 2018

Mr. Raul Duverge
Senior Project Manager
Boston Planning and Development Agency
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 656 Saratoga Street, East Boston
Small Project Review Application

Dear Mr. Duverge:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission (Commission) has reviewed the Small Project Review Application (SPRA) for the proposed residential development located at 656 Saratoga Street in East Boston. This letter provides the Commission's comments on the SPRA.

The proposed project site consists of an existing 16,490 square foot vacant area comprising six parcels. The project proponent, MG2 Group, LLC, proposes to construct a three story, approximately 28,650 square foot building that will include thirty residential rental units and thirty garage parking spaces.

The Commission water distribution system has two 12-inch Northern Low DICL water mains installed in 2000 in Saratoga Street.

For sanitary sewer and storm drain service, there is a 12-inch sanitary sewer in Saratoga Street. There is no storm drain in Saratoga 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, MG2 Group, 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. All new or relocated water mains, sewers and storm drains must be designed and constructed at MG2 Group, 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.
3. 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.
4. 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/>
5. The water use and sewage generation estimates were not submitted with the SPRA. The Commission requires that these values be calculated and submitted with the Site Plan. MG2 Group, 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. MG2



Group, LLC should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.

6. MG2 Group, 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, MG2 Group, LLC will be required to apply for a RGP to cover these discharges.
7. It is MG2 Group, 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, MG2 Group, 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. MG2 Group, 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. MG2 Group, LLC should also provide the methodology used to estimate water demand for the proposed project.
2. MG2 Group, LLC should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular, MG2 Group, LLC should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If MG2 Group, 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. MG2 Group, 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. MG2 Group, 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, MG2 Group, LLC should contact the Commission's Meter Department.



Sewage / Drainage

1. In conjunction with the Site Plan and the General Service Application MG2 Group, LLC will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. The plan must:
 - Identify specific best management measures for controlling erosion and preventing the discharge of sediment, contaminated stormwater or construction debris to the Commission's drainage system when construction is underway.
 - Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control structures or treatment structures to be utilized during the construction.
 - Specifically identify how the project will comply with the Department of Environmental Protection's Performance Standards for Stormwater Management both during construction and after construction is complete.
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. MG2 Group, 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 MG2 Group, 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. MG2 Group, 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, MG2 Group, LLC will be required to obtain a Remediation General Permit from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the discharge.
5. MG2 Group, 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, MG2 Group, 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 MG2 Group, LLC install a permanent casting stating “Don’t Dump: Drains to Boston Harbor” next to any catch basin created or modified as part of this project. MG2 Group, 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: Joseph Donovan, MG2 Group, LLC
K. Ronan, MWRA via e-mail
M. Zlody, BED via e-mail
P. Larocque, BWSC via e-mail

Comment: Created Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
10/30/2018	Skip	marcella		Oppose	I am opposed to the size of this project at 30 Units and the large structure. It does not fit into the neighborhood with the single, two and three family homes that are the neighborhood. This does not compliment other current development in the area. As mentioned in the written proposal perhaps it would fit in on Maverick Street in a section of East Boston that has many other structures that it would compliment. This is a 2F-2000 zoned area and I would support a project of multiple 2 family homes on this site which would not overwhelm the neighborhood but fit in with the area. It has been a great many years since the fire destroyed the multiple residences that previously existed on this property and it would be a welcome site to see new homes on this site. I am in favor of this lot being developed but not with a massive structure like this one. It is commendable that the developer has listened to the community and has made many positive changes to this project: reduced the number of Units from 52 to 30, reduced the height to 3 stories, eliminated the commercial space and only allowing entry and exit for all vehicles to be on Chaucer Street. These are excellent examples of listening to the community. I would hope that the number of Units could be reduced further. The stackers for parking appear to be a creative way to manage the need for parking, but even at 30 parking spaces, a one to one ratio I would state that this will not be enough parking for this complex. If you ask the residents in this area the on street parking is already at capacity without any additional vehicles. I am pleased to see the proposed mitigation plan: Greenway, Salesians and the Transport Plan, but I would like consideration for the Grace Church Federated at 760 Saratoga Street which operates a weekly food pantry for any East Boston resident as well as the Harbor View Neighborhood Association, HVNA, to help with operating expenses. Thank you, Skip Marcella
12/4/2018	Melissa	Campbell		Support	I appreciate the developer working to address the concerns of the neighborhood.
10/16/2018	Roxanne	Curzi		Oppose	This building does not fit in with the surroundings at all. The style should look like the other homes in this residential neighborhood. It looks like a commercial office building. There also needs to be more off street parking.
10/16/2018	kevin	slattery	resident of east voston	Support	This is a beautiful project i am in support of these types of projects i would love to see it approved.
10/17/2018	Joshua	Acevedo	1986	Support	I support this project. From the renderings, I think it would make a great addition to the neighborhood and an improvement from what is existing.
10/17/2018	DINA	ZAWASKI		Oppose	Need more parking spaces. One per unit is not enough. It doesn't account for more than one car per unit, which isn't reasonable, and doesn't have any visitor parking. Visitors to this building will take away from resident parking. Even if they have East Boston resident stickers, they will still take away from the already limited parking available to residents.
10/15/2018	James	Linthwaite		Oppose	This project is far too large for the parcel and the surrounding area. In addition to this proposed project the following projects are also either proposed or under constructions for the same neighborhood: *Proposed: 144 Addison Street - 270 Units 181 Cowper Street - demolish existing single family and build 9 units w/14 parking spaces 1 Short Street - demolish existing single family and build 27 units, 45 feet high, 4 stories, 21 parking spaces for rental 181 Coleridge Street - build 19 units with 22 underground parking spaces Under construction: 128-130 Coleridge Street - demolished single family, 8 condos This scale of development such a small area is entirely too dense. This is over 300 units proposed for a small section of East Boston. The existing infrastructure cannot handle the current vehicle traffic. The MBTA Blue Line is unable to currently cope with morning and afternoon rush hour. While I understand that housing is needed this benefits no one other than the developers. Thank you.
10/16/2018	Paul	Vignoli Jr		Oppose	There is not enough parking for this project and tenant street parking would adversely impact the neighbors.