



Tim Czerwienski <tim.czerwienski@boston.gov>

Continued OPPOSITION to 72 Burbank Street

Conrad Cizek [REDACTED] Tue, Sep 18, 2018 at 5:38 PM

Reply-To: "[REDACTED]"

To: Tim Czerwienski [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Tim:

I am writing this letter of comment to renew my continued OPPOSITION to the aforementioned project.

A review of the revised plans provided by the developer remains unsatisfactory. The revisions were to say the least.. quite minimal if virtually nonexistent. The minimalist revisions to be quite honest are truly insulting and degrading to the members of the Fenway community. When we heard of extensive revisions that were being made we were expecting far more concessions that would be more favorable to the Fenway Community particularly in this crisis of scarce affordable housing stock. The revisions accomplished none of the goals nor do they respond to the requests and comments that have been verbally communicated and communicated and writing to the BPDA and the developer. The revised proposal of slimming down the number of apartments and minimalist adjustments to the square footage virtually amount to nothing! Clearly there are no improvements here!

Furthermore, the offering of a lifetime lease for the two remaining tenants who survived the Forest properties takeover of Clearway street is very vague. It amounts to to be quite honest nothing but crumbs! What does the lifetime leasing actually mean? Will they still be allowed to remain there but will they be facing exorbitantly high rent increases in the future, poor maintenance, and other unethical ways to force them out otherwise? Do these lifetime leases consist of a freezing of rents for the lifetime of these remaining two tenants? Will they be able to put this in writing and put it in a binding contract that cannot be reversed?

The promise of not renting these new micro units to students is not guaranteed. This has been presented to us by other developers before and they have often times reneged in order to get support or their projects approved. The same can be said in this instance. Obviously, despite Forest properties' presence in the marketplace, they do not appear to understand the marketplace of the Fenway as its residents do. First and foremost their proposed rents are completely unaffordable for low and moderate-income professionals who they claim will reside there. To be honest, low and moderate-income professionals or even small Working Families cannot be able to afford \$3,500 a month for rent. This was a rental amount that was quoted by the developers presenting the earlier plans at the last meeting. \$3,500 a month for a two-bedroom is hardly affordable and is above market price as many two-bedroom apartments in the Fenway range from \$2500 to \$3,000 a month. Who are they kidding when they say this is Affordable?

Secondly, members of the higher income bracket who could afford that amount of money are not going to shell out these outrageous and enormous sums of money for what is essentially a series of luxury priced- glorified shoeboxes where some will be facing an Alleyway and dumpster crawling with rats and trash for that price. Recognizing this and a lack of interest from these parties will result in the company eventually to renting to students in due time. That was conveniently left out of The Proposal. Forest properties will not leave these units vacant if they cannot rent them to their claimed markets. Who are they kidding?

As single moderate income professionals cannot afford that price and as higher-income professionals will refuse to Shell out those enormous prices for shoe boxes termed as micro-units, these units will eventually be marketed to students and transients whom will be the only markets willing to consider residing in those luxury priced glorified shoebox units.

The project should be shelved! The only way that a property should be even considered for development would be a property that is 100% affordable and is marketed to low and moderate-income professionals and comprised of livable square footage that is safe and healthy. The other idea would be to consider building a structure that is a much smaller scale with fewer units and larger square footage and may be offered as affordable homeownership opportunities for low and moderate-income individuals and Families. This will help alleviate (albeit minimal) the scarcity of affordable housing in the Fenway neighborhood. Another idea would be to sell that lot to the Fenway CDC or another nonprofit who will indeed develop a property that is Affordable and will meet the community's needs. Alternatively, if the city and the mayor are really serious about affordable housing as they claim to be, the city should consider seizing that property by eminent domain and turning it over to the Fenway CDC or another non-profit to develop it as affordable housing. If none of these ideas would be considered then maybe it would be in the best interest to just leave the lot as is with open space and green trees and parking for existing residents as well as access and an entryway for sanitation and Public Safety Vehicles requiring access to that immediate area.

In any event, there is great concern about the logistics of building a property there at all. The size and square footage of the proposed buildings whether it's affordable or not poses serious Public Safety threats. What about the fire codes and evacuation? The minimum square footage could be a fire hazard and an eventual death trap. Does Forest properties want to have blood on its hands should a horrific event occurred where the diminished square footage impeded safe evacuation from the property? Cramped quarters filled with personal property can result in clutter and serve as obstacles to Escape Routes and are indeed an accelerant for catastrophic fires.

The building on that vacant lot will obstruct public service, Sanitation, First Responders, and other parties and vehicles who will need to access those immediate driveways and alleyways. Furthermore, despite the claims of the developers there are many Fenway residents who do own automobiles and many of them park there as well as their visitors or other people conducting business in the Fenway. The building on that lot would significantly reduce the availability of parking spaces for residents that are already scarce. Also, there is a concern about the construction causing some structural problems in the neighboring buildings. Before anything is approved there should be contact with neighboring residents on Burbank Street and on Westland Avenue to get their specific concerns as they would be immediately affected by any such Construction.

In summary and conclusion, the revised plans are unacceptable! The minimal revisions offered clearly continue to demonstrate that what is really being offered here is a series of glorified shoe boxes at luxury prices that will eventually be rented to undergraduate students. This is NOT a project that is welcome in the Fenway and this is a project that will NOT benefit the Fenway or its residents or the community in any way form or fashion. The only parties who are going to benefit are the greedy developers who are proposing this project that essentially provides skimpy shoebox units that are unsafe and unsanitary conditions at luxury prices. This project should revised much further at a minimum or essentially should be completely shelved.

Thank you,

Conrad Cizek

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)



Tim Czerwienski <tim.czerwienski@boston.gov>

Comments on 72 Burbank Street development proposal

Mathew Thall [REDACTED]
To: tim.czerwienski@boston.gov

Sat, Sep 29, 2018 at 3:14 PM

Dear Mr. Czerwienski :

I am opposed to the proposed project at [72 Burbank Street](#) in its present configuration.

My objections pertain to the following issues:

1. **Microunits:** I do not feel that the Fenway neighborhood is an appropriate neighborhood in which to promote micro-units. I understand that the City's housing policy staff at both BPDA and DND have been studying this option for some time, but that it has not been officially adopted as part of the City's housing strategy. It is also my understanding that the City wanted to pilot test this approach in the Seaport District. To approve a microunit development in the Fenway neighborhood prior to a complete, comprehensive and open discussion with Fenway stakeholders – residents and neighborhood organizations -- is unsatisfactory policy and practice.
2. **Parking:** There will be no on-site parking for the 32 units in the project. Any residents who are car owners will have to park on the street or rent a scarce off-street parking space. I believe there are more resident parking stickers/permits issued for residents of the East Fenway than there are legal, resident permit parking spots on East Fenway streets. I am not a car owner, but many of my car-owning neighbors at the Fensgate Cooperative (an abutter to the development site), would be seriously harmed by the addition of even more local car owners competing for the inadequate number of restricted parking space in the East Fenway.
3. **Rents of the market-rate units** are likely to be well above what long-term, permanent residents of the Fenway could afford. The developer has stated that they expect their rents to be 25 to 30 percent below rents of the new luxury housing on Boylston Street in the West Fens. I believe that would establish a rent for a one bedroom apartment at about \$2500 a month. This would be affordable to a single person or a couple with an annual income of around \$98,000. Analysis of the American Community Survey data for Fenway Census tracts indicates that less than 12 percent of the households in the Fenway have this level of income....and probably most of them are already residing in luxury rental on Boylston Street or in other condominiums throughout the area. There is a much larger group of middle income households in this neighborhood that are struggling to afford the rapidly rising rents in this market

I believe there could be modifications to the project that could make it more acceptable.

Unit sizes: If the minimum square footage of each unit type (studio , one bedroom, two-bedroom)were set to be comparable to the smallest units that are currently owned by Forrest Properties in the Fenway, I would be comfortable as accepting the units as something other than micro units. I do believe that by and large existing Fenway apartments are on the small size, although not necessarily as small as what are currently considered micro-units. I believe a methodology could be developed to make the determination of the minimally acceptable unit sizes at [72 Burbank Street](#)

Parking: As I stated at the public meeting on the project held on September 17, 2018, no on-site parking could be acceptable if there were a way of excluding residents at this address from obtaining a Fenway Resident Parking sticker, which would effectively limit occupancy to people not owning cars. I strongly urge the BPDA to explore this with the Boston Transportation Dept, understanding that this has already been tested at one or more developments.

Rent levels: First, I believe that the exclusion of this address from eligibility for resident parking permit stickers will have a market impact on rent levels as the market for the market rate units will be somewhat shrunk to eliminate car owners who cannot or will not pay for off-street parking elsewhere in the neighborhood. I would also like to see the developers set several of the market rate units at a rent no higher than 110 percent of the Section 8 Fair Market Rent or Payment Standard, so that such units could be occupied by a Section 8 voucher holder.

10/1/2018

City of Boston Mail - Comments on 72 Burbank Street development proposal

I would like to add that I am pleased that the developer has agreed to exclude undergraduate students from occupancy of the development. Any final approval of this development must be conditioned on an air-tight monitoring and enforcement mechanism for this commitment.

Mathew Thall

[73 Hemenway Street, Apt 306](#)

[Boston, MA 02115](#)



Tim Czerwienski <tim.czerwienski@boston.gov>

Comments on 72 Burbank Street

Fresherfish [REDACTED]
To: tim.czerwienski@boston.gov

Sun, Sep 30, 2018 at 11:00 PM

Tim:

Apologies for this late message. I realize that the comment deadline for [72 Burbank Street](#) is tomorrow, and would like to submit additional comments, although I do not have time for a formal letter:

I was at the last public meeting on September 17th. At it we heard distinct changes to the proposal.

- The project would be 100% deed restricted against rental to undergraduates, using a model that has been effected in Mission Hill. I have not learned what that mechanism is, or how it would work to assure that the goals of the project - to offer affordable rental housing to professionals and empty nesters - would be guaranteed. I would like more details and assurances about this mechanism.
- The project would offer transit assistance in the form of MBTA passes or vouchers to residents. I have not learned how this benefit would be offered or whether it would extend for the lifetime of the rentals. It is difficult to estimate the transit plan without this knowledge. I would like more information about what this benefit means.
- The project has changed the rear of its building to align with existing rear yard setback, a welcome change, and one that would likely have been required during review.
- Forest Properties has stated their intention to contribute to parks and open space. I would like to request these funds be conveyed in a contribution to the Fund for Parks and Recreation, Boston, so that they can be applied to parks near the project area.

I remain concerned at the rental pricing implied by the developer at the public meetings. If the intent of this project is to meet the needs of young working professionals, it is extremely hard to understand who they expect to market to with compact 1 bedroom rents of over \$3,000 a month. Yes, this is less than the recently developed luxury units in the West Fenway, but these are also compact units - not a foot-by-foot comparison at all. If the BPDA seeks to work with developers to build compact units that meet the needs of working residents, it should not only seek to achieve the units, but the conditions that allow working people to live in them. I remain unconvinced that a young couple would be able to afford rent in these units.

Lastly, this is a neighborhood that saw the residential development at [1350 Boylston Street](#) - a proposal that turned into an 100% corporate stay rental building. We need assurance that this project will not be used for corporate or short term rentals - this assurance should be made in the deed.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Marie Fukuda
[120 Norway Street #14](#)
[Boston, MA 02115](#)

October 1, 2018

Mr. Tim Czerwienski
Project Manager
Boston Planning & Development Agency

Via email to: tim.czerwienski@boston.gov

RE: 72 Burbank Street

Dear Tim,

Thank you for hosting the second community meeting a few weeks ago to discuss the updates & changes to the proposed development on 72 Burbank Street.

After careful consideration, the Trustees of the 82-unit Symphony Court Condominiums located at 44 Burbank Street, and on behalf of the unit owners, request that you **not approve** any of the Developer's requests for variances from the established and thoughtfully promulgated City of Boston Zoning Code, based on their current proposal. As you know, the project, as currently outlined in the Developer's application for Small Project Review under Article 80E of the Boston Zoning Code, seeks significant & multiple variances.

Symphony Court is exceedingly close to the proposed development, being only a few buildings down on Burbank Street. We are also one of the few resident-owned buildings on the block.

To start with a positive, we were very happy to see the change to the street-facing design of the building. The updated design would fit much better with the neighboring buildings. Having said that, our remaining objections remain.

Our primary objection to the project is still the micro-unit design, which has been essentially unchanged in the revised proposal. We don't see a single reason for the neighborhood or the city to ignore several significant zoning variances, simply so the developer can make more money from having additional units. While micro-units may work in an area like the Seaport, these tiny units will simply become de-facto dorms in the Fenway neighborhood (surrounded by colleges & universities) and it sets a terrible precedent for all future Fenway developments, if approved. Even more importantly, we would also lose one of the last remaining parking lots in East Fenway at the same time the Whole Foods garage is often full during Red Sox games & Symphony Hall events.

Another very serious topic not discussed at our meeting is the significant environmental impact of adding an additional building on Burbank Street. Our building at 44 Burbank (completed in 2017) has

been forced to heat all units & hot water with oil because National Grid doesn't have natural gas pipeline capacity on Burbank Street and has given no timeline for when pipeline upgrades could occur. As such, we believe that no projects of any kind should be approved on Burbank Street until this issue is resolved. Requiring oil-based heating in any new building (and adding its dirty pollution to our neighborhood) should never be permitted in Boston in the 21st century.

There is a very high hurdle for variances from the thoughtfully adopted Boston Zoning Code for good reason. This project (as currently proposed), consisting of "Micro Rental Apartments," should have an even higher hurdle as it packs in a tremendous number of residents in a very small number of building square feet (and unit square feet, all of which are exceedingly small), and will significantly tax the neighborhood. More specific thoughts on each Variance Request follow:

- 1) FAR Variance: A denser building should not be permitted as there will be 32 micro units in that much denser building, significantly exacerbating the impacts. While the exemption would allow the developer to further profit, it would allow for a large, heavy building with many occupants to impact and further burden the neighborhood. The Variance should not be granted.
- 2) Open Space Variance: Given the building's impact generally, and because of "micro apartments", to have no open space whatsoever further impacts the neighborhood, and, what is more, does not provide residents living in exceedingly small apartments any access to open space. There is not even any garden space in front due to the protruding bay all the way to the lot line, other than an exceedingly short section right at the front door – the bay could be pushed back to allow for at least a small amount of open space in the form of a front garden along the entire front length of the building, as is common on the entire street. The Variance should not be granted.
- 3) Rear Yard Variance: A denser building should not be permitted as there will be 32 units in that much denser building, exacerbating the impacts. While the exemption would allow the developer to further profit, it again taxes the neighborhood by further restricting access to the alley. The Variance should not be granted.
- 4) Parking Variance: To have many units of "micro apartments" on a very small lot without meeting the .75 parking space requirement – in fact, not having any parking at all – will unreasonably tax parking, street traffic, pedestrian safety, etc. in an already dense neighborhood with parking issues. The Variance should not be granted.

Other concerns:

- 1) We had previously raised a concern that this area of the Fenway neighborhood already has an exceedingly high level of rental apartments, many occupied by undergraduate students – and that smaller "micro" rental apartments – including a high number of studios - will encourage more students and more of a dorm impact for the building and the neighborhood, all in an area

that is not zoned for educational use. The once a year third-party audit to prevent renting to undergraduates will not stand the test of time as there is no monitoring department in the city, there is no good way to tell during an audit process short of interviewing all occupants and asking for birth certificates, etc. Given these facts and this significant concern – and, importantly, because the neighborhood is not zoned for educational use - the project should not be micro apartments (especially the heavy use of studios which very closely mirror dorm rooms) that will encourage student use.

- 2) Neighborhoods should have a mix of ownership and rental opportunities. This area of the Fenway is nearly all rental apartments, which results in a more transient population less committed to the neighborhood. Given this, the project should not be rental apartments.
- 3) While there has been much talk about micro apartments as supporting workforce housing, the proposed rental rates will not permit true workforce housing. What is more, given the neighborhood, the building will likely be very heavily occupied by undergraduate students particularly where there is no evidence that third party audits will work or will be able to be enforced effectively in perpetuity. While we strongly believe it should not be rental apartments, to the extent it is, approval should be contingent on workable, enforceable restrictions through the deed and other mechanisms that will truly allow for workforce housing.
- 4) Allowing two additional 'roof floors' that don't match the adjoining buildings is of additional concern to us.

Suggested alternate approach

- 1) We are not anti-development and encourage the developer to amend their proposal to firmly address the above concerns. A building with a smaller number of units meant for home ownership would deal with many of the above concerns and make our 82 owners more amenable to the project and, potentially, supporting variance requests.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

The Trustees of Symphony Court

Mike Jantzen
Steven Moore
Sean Riley

Thomas Bakalars
30 Fenway
Boston, MA 02215

Oct. 1, 2018

Tim Czerwienski, Project Manager
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: 72 Burbank: Proposed 32 Units.

By: Email

Tim;

I have been a resident at 30 Fenway since 1993. I attended the first public meeting for this project and a subsequent Fenway CDC neighborhood meeting after the second public meeting. I have reviewed the original and the revised materials submitted by the development team.

I am in favor of the development of an infill project at this location but I am opposed to the project submitted. The project is a dormitory cloaked in en vogue planning principles. It is socially and environmentally irresponsible; the design is not thoroughly studied and doesn't fit the neighborhood. It is too much of everything while offering too little. It does this at the expense of the neighborhood.

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The Owner and their team tout this project as a response to Mayor Walsh's goal of 53,000 housing units and supposedly part of the City plan to assimilate growth into the fabric of the neighborhoods. This project makes a mockery of that statement. All it delivers is unit count under the guise of meeting planning objectives.

The project has 32 units and 39 bedrooms. The building code calculated occupancy is 104 people on a 3,558 sq. ft. lot. For comparison, my building around the corner has a 3,360 sq. ft. lot, 5 units, the equivalent of 12 bedrooms and occupancy of 50. This proposal is a dormitory. Despite assurances that the student occupancy would be capped and deed restricted there is no mechanism that can regulate this effectively. The sole design goal for this project is unit count and it succeeds by violating numerous dimensional requirements and by creating miserable little units with the majority having poor natural light and no open space.

The Owner's cited \$3,750 as a competitive market rate 650 sq. ft. 2 bedroom. This amounts to \$5.77 per sq. ft. per month or \$69.23 per sq. ft. per year. This is equal to the rents achieved in high rise construction projects around town at somewhere between one half to one third of the hard cost with none of the mitigation.

The recent offer from the Developer for the extension of two lifelong leases at Clearwater Street is a trite attempt at mitigation. If anything these two units should be designated in perpetuity rather than

tied to individual tenant's occupancy. Even then it isn't anywhere near enough mitigation for the number of units and rent potential.

ENVIRONMENT / ENERGY

The project ignores climate change flood protection measures and no special environmental or energy use measures were presented. The basement includes building mechanical equipment and 4 units.

The Boston Harbor Association "Preparing for the Rising Tide" February 2013 clearly shows the vulnerability of the East Fenway at MHHW +7.5 ft. This implies that both the ground floor and basement level are vulnerable to flooding. Since the alley is a full story below the street grade, it is also vulnerable to storm drain failures in conditions that are less than MHHW + 7.5 ft.

The proposed project is does not address these issues yet 2 levels and 25% of the proposed units are vulnerable to flooding.

BUILDING DESIGN

Besides the density I do not believe that this project has been studied enough. The elevations are weak and there should be more 3d development of the form and the facades as well as refining the projects contextual relationships beyond basic massing.

The massing of the 2 story penthouse looms over the street. The window size and pattern are foreign to the context. The attempt to match the unique brick of the abutter is unlikely to be achieved and is an unnecessary choice meant to bail out the larger issues of poorly studied massing and form.

The floor plans are not resolved.

The route to the bike room is circuitous and difficult to navigate with a bike. You go through a door, down the stairs, through another door, down a hallway then through another door. The function is clearly subservient to the main goal of maximizing unit count.

Units 201, 301, 401, 204, 304, 404, 501, 502, 503 and 504 have unit demising or partition walls which conflict with windows.

Unit 203 doesn't have an entry door.

Unit 206 doesn't have a closet and the amount of closet space in most of the other units is sized like a short stay occupancy and is inadequate for a permanent residence

Kitchen and Baths are missing sinks and appliances.

This lack of resolution in the floor plans will lead to significant changes affecting the building elevations resulting in a building design that is unlikely to be an improvement over what is already an awkward design.

FAR

The FAR exceeds that allowed by 50%. The only reason to exceed the FAR is to build more units. This is an infill project and it should infill within the existing zoning dimensional requirements.

PARKING

There are 8 existing spaces on the lot configured with some tandem spaces. Displacing these 8 cars will exacerbate the already impossible parking situation in the East Fenway.

Add an occupancy of 104 with 39 bedrooms. If only 10% of the occupants have cars that will put an additional 10 cars (total of 18) on the street that aren't there now. If 20% of the occupants have cars then it's 29 cars.

Numerous local parking lots and garages have been converted to new construction and all of the remaining East Fenway parking lots have projects proposed that will eliminate all of the remaining parking. There are numerous local residents who need their cars for work. Parking is already more than challenging. All of the other new non-dormitory residential developments in the Fenway have included parking. This is not the place or the project to make an exception. The reasons to not provide parking for this project are to allow additional units and to save construction costs.

This project will destroy the residential parking balance for the entire surrounding neighborhood.

OPEN SPACE

No exterior open space is provided. There are no balconies, roof decks or outdoor green space. A common room of 600 sq. ft. is located indoors on the ground floor. The same building code provision that defines the occupancy of the building at 104 defines the occupancy of the 600 sq. ft. Common room as 3 people. The reason for not including open space is to allow additional units and to save construction costs.

REAR YARD SETBACK

The design and setback dimension exacerbate an already difficult alley that is used by garbage, service and emergency vehicles. The reason to violate the rear yard setback is to add additional units.

CONCLUSION

This project is highly flawed. It is poorly planned. The urban and building design are both below average. The changes from the initial submission to this one are minimal and do not address the principal issues.

The project is unfinished and nothing in the submissions made to date create any confidence that the necessary corrections will be implemented in a way that improves the project.

The project is about maximizing unit count and it achieves this at the expense of the well-being of the neighborhood.

I urge the BPDA to deny the application.

Thank You;

Thomas Bakalars

October 1st, 2018

Tim Czerwienski
Project Manager
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201



Re: 72 Burbank Street
Forest Properties Management, Inc.

Dear Mr. Czerwienski,

The Fenway Civic Association (FCA) is the Fenway neighborhood's oldest all-volunteer neighborhood group that accepts no public or developer funds. Founded in 1961, our mission is to promote a safe and vital neighborhood that serves the interest of its residents.

FCA has commented previously and board members attended the public meeting held on September 17th, 2018 to review revisions to Forest Properties Management, Inc.'s (the Proponent) Small Project Review Form for 72 Burbank Street (the Project). Upon review, FCA still has several serious concerns with the project in its current form.

FAR

FCA believes the proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 5.5 compared to 4.0 permitted by zoning is unjustified on a new construction project on a vacant lot of regular shape. While the Proponent has reduced the proposed FAR from 6.11 to 5.5, it is still in violation of zoning. A 37.5% increase over base zoning without a clear and compelling hardship compromises the integrity of the Fenway's zoning which was established in 2004 following a lengthy consensus-based process. Furthermore, if this project were to set precedent for additional FAR, particularly without a clear and compelling hardship or irregular lot, it may lead to rampant speculation and inflation of property values with the presumption every lot in the neighborhood may have in excess of a third greater buildable area than allowed by base zoning.

Setbacks

While the rear yard setback is still not compliant with the zoning requirement of 20'-0", the Proponent has modified the design to maintain the width of the existing alley by aligning their ground level condition with abutters and providing the required clear turning radius for service & emergency vehicles. This is an acceptable variance request at the ground level, as the proposed design is not encroaching upon the common access of abutters in a manner any different than that already done by abutters. However, the proposed alignment is not consistent with the upper stories with a setback which is only 4'-0" from the property line. The requested variance for the upper stories is excessive and is a driving factor behind the excessive FAR proposed. FCA cannot support the request for a rear yard setback variance unless the ground level condition which aligns with immediately abutting building is consistently applied across all stories.

Trash & Recycling

Upon review of the revised plans we are concerned that there is still no trash room provided within the building. Internal storage of trash is an important amenity for pest control and other public safety & quality of life issues within the Fenway. We strongly recommend that the BPDA require Forest

Properties to amend the design to include a trash room to limit the presence of totters and rolling dumpsters in the alley to waste pick-up days only. FCA would also like to see an updated site plan indicating a waste pick-up zone in the alley to assure sufficient access is maintained to the common path of travel during trash days.

Design Commentary

FCA is pleased that the Proponent has revisited the design of the Burbank Street facade and made significant improvements to articulating the features in the vernacular of the neighborhood. We still think the cornice line and upper two stories require additional refinement. The upper stories read somewhat as a mansard and the proposed cornice lacks the level of detail one sees in other neighborhood buildings. The entrance with its raised garden has been significantly improved in keeping with neighborhood character of well-defined entrances. The entry doors in the rendering appear to be generic storefront; we hope that the architectural team will select an appropriate system and finishes to embellish the entrance accordingly. We aren't sure the selection of brick and cast stone to match the immediate neighbors is appropriate; each building should stand on its own rather than attempt to blend in as an extension, but we do like that the Proponent has changed the material palette in keeping with the neighborhood, and look forward to further refinement.

Open Space

FCA understands the difficulties of providing the amount of open space required per dwelling unit on an infill lot, and that a developer may require limited relief in the square footage requirement mandated by zoning. We appreciate that the meeting presentation now depicts a raised landscape bed on the Burbank Street Elevation with a front yard/garden in keeping with the typical character of most residential buildings in the Fenway. It is our understanding Forest Properties has committed to a financial contribution to the Boston Parks Department, and similar to our comments regarding transportation, we would like such contributions to be made towards permanent improvement to park infrastructure or an endowment fund which would generate a benefit in perpetuity.

Transportation

Forest Properties has indicated they will provide MBTA passes to residents and offer ample bicycle storage facilities as mitigation for minimum parking requirements. FCA does not object to providing less parking than required by zoning in a walkable neighborhood well served by public transit. However, we are concerned that the MBTA benefit is not provided in perpetuity. This building, like its neighbors, may very well stand for a century or more, and any transportation mitigation offered which is not permanent infrastructure should be provided in perpetuity as an enforceable Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and bound with the deed.

Dwelling Units

Forest Properties has offered to restrict their leases to exclude undergraduate students in deference to community interest, with third party verification supervised by the Fenway Community Development Corporation. The Proponent has also offered to provide two accessible units at a subsidized rate to current lease holders with accessibility needs for the duration of their lives, as part of project mitigation. FCA would like those subsidies to remain in perpetuity with the property as a permanent community benefit, such that two units would always be available for the life of the building and not a finite term.

We are greatly concerned that Forest Properties was not open about the price range for their leases within this building. It does not strike us as acting in good faith to expect the public at a meeting to do the math rather than providing the information outright. The proposed units are comparable in size to

existing prewar housing stock in the neighborhood and yet to the best of our estimation appear to charge rates of equal or greater per square foot than luxury high rises. This does not make sense given the lack of community amenities and a concierge as found in luxury buildings. If this is truly meant as workforce housing the overall cost per square foot should be less. A smaller non-luxury unit should be less expensive not only from the smaller footprint, but from reduced costs in not providing extensive amenities or staffing.

While FCA typically supports the creation of new housing within the neighborhood to help alleviate demand, stabilize the market, and provide more universally accessible units to residents, we cannot support this project in its current form despite many steps taken in a positive direction. Given Forest Properties is still requesting a host of variances with significant detrimental implications we cannot support this project until it is further refined and our long-term concerns addressed.

FCA hopes these comments, concerns, and suggestions will be addressed and have been constructive as part of the Small Project Review process.

Sincerely,

The Fenway Civic Association Board

CC: Josh Zakim, Boston City Council
Yissel Guerrero, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services

Comment: Created Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
9/17/2018	Holly	Berry		Oppose	I don't approve the current proposal It is To tall, to dense and the price point are shameful with a neighborhood of affordability... and those units will over time be filled with undergraduates. And the current scope of the design and space will encourage just that. Let's talk affordability the current proposed AMI is truly unaffordable. At 30 or 40. It would. Please take these comments into consideration, Holly Berry
9/18/2018	Robert	Case		Oppose	I am a retired faculty member and have lived in the neighborhood for 43 years.' So I have witnessed the wave of gentrification first-hand, in which a racially and ethnically diverse neighborhood has undergone increasing unaffordability and attendant displacement. Unfortunately, the current Forest proposal for 72 Burbank Street will only hasten this process. The project is not affordable, given median Fenway incomes, and it is not helpful to say it will have lower rents than exorbitant Back Bay housing. Moreover, the project with its small units, will accelerate the trend to create more apartments for temporary visitors, for transient younger professionals and grad students, and perhaps for students with straw signers. The project is a step in exacerbating rather than solving the actual housing crisis of Boston. I urge that the project be disapproved. Thank you. Robert Case, Ph.D.
9/20/2018	Austin	Spencer	Fenway Neighborhood	Oppose	I am opposed to this because it doesn't help families to stay in the neighborhood; these are Not the right size and price points. If you can't building for families, who are leaving the Fenway in droves, then you need to build for low income singles: elders and chronic homeless who are already in the neighborhood but don't have a stable housing situation. If you're going to keep the units this small, they have to be for extremely and very low income singles, not for any kind of student or young professional . once they get a roof over their heads. The principle of Housing First shows that the only solution to turning around homelessness is the Housing First model which is, first you get someone into
9/28/2018	Evan	Ramsey		Oppose	I oppose construction of this project. Our community needs affordable units for families, not micro-units for students and AirBnB that will only serve to increase rental prices for the rest of us. Construction of this project will block alley access along the entire block, during the construction period if not beyond - a severe safety and fire hazard for local residents and children. If this project receives board approval, the board takes responsibility for neighborhood displacement, the ongoing rent burden to Fenway residents, and hazardous conditions for children.
9/29/2018	sherrie	lookner		Oppose	I am strongly against this project because it only serves to exacerbate the density of the neighborhood without contributing to the necessary solutions. It does nothing to contribute to green space, parking, or appearance while crowding too many people into tiny not affordable apartments. Thus the problems are increased and the potential solutions or potential enhancements to the neighborhood are non-existent. I am writing as an individual but I am a member of the BD of the Fensgate Cooperative

Comment: Created Date	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Opinion	Comments
9/30/2018	Brian	Clague	homeowner	Oppose	I opposed this project because it is not housing being built for long term residents. It is very clearly being built as a dorm or for AirBNB. This is not permanent housing for long term residents. And the numbers don't make sense. Nobody making 60-80k is going to pay \$2500/mth to live in a microunit. Further, this development is going to continue to push working people out of our neighborhood. Working people often need cars. Many of us work outside the city in places with no public transit and bring money back into the city, which is a good thing. But housing of this density is going to kill us on parking, which is already a very serious issue. And if I have to get to my jobs using zipcar then it cuts my income in half. The BPDA needs to think about working people in the city and take our needs into account. Thanks for listening.
10/1/2018	Daniel	Stephens		Oppose	As a 25+ year resident of this neighborhood, I must oppose this building. This is the first time I've opposed a new building. As an environmentalist I recognize the value of humans living densely in urban areas in order to stop sprawl but this type of development is not the answer. Over the years I've known many people in the neighborhood who got priced out of the neighborhood and had to flee miles away. These micro units would not have helped them or anyone looking to become a long term resident here or to raise a family. It looks to me like an attempt by a profiteering real estate developer to take advantage of the high number of students in the area. I strongly oppose this project.
10/1/2018	Bob	Tomposki		Oppose	I am not in favor of this development even with the latest changes. I feel there is enough housing in the neighborhood and this only adds to the density.