

January 26, 2018

Ms. Aisling Kerr, Project Manager
BPDA
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Good morning Aisling:

Please accept this letter as my official comment on the Fan Pier Notice of Project Change and the 2nd amendment to PDA #54.

The following is a subset of Fan Pier planning processes, much of which I participated in as a resident-citizen:

Fan Pier Planning Processes

- 100+ public Seaport / Fan Pier master planning meetings
- Drafting and publication of BPDA Seaport Public Realm Plan (1999) led by BPDA-hired urban design consultants Cooper Robertson & Partners
- Junkets by BPDA and COB officials to waterfronts worldwide
- Drafting of SBW Municipal Harbor Plan filed by BPDA
- Approval of SBW MHP by the MA Department of Environmental Protection

BRA/BPDA zoning objectives derived from Fan Pier Planning Processes:

Fan Pier residential: no less than 33% of full build density ~3.1 msf
Fan Pier office: no greater than 33% of full build density ~3.1 msf

Fan Pier today (built and under way):

Fan Pier office: 65% of full build ~3.1 msf
Fan Pier residential: 16% of full build ~3.1 msf

QUESTIONS:

Why is BPDA authorizing a new, additional office building on Fan Pier, given that Fan Pier has already exceeded BPDA policy maximum office use by 200%?

In authorizing development of a new, additional office building on remaining Fan Pier lots, why is BPDA sanctioning the failure of Fan Pier's Master Developer to meet a 33% MINIMUM residential density standard enacted into BPDA's Seaport planning policy?

CONCERN: Market-driven over-production of office uses on Fan Pier will continue to be detrimental to the district's growth as an urban neighborhood and 24/7 active waterfront. Predominance of office uses in Seaport has already prematurely consumed finite transit resources including MBTA Silver Line. Residential density (units/acre) of the Seaport District north of Summer Street, including Pier 4 and Seaport Square, are on a full build trajectory that will fail to meet the district's potential recognized during a decade of district planning. Massport's imbalanced foray into CRA has compounded this problem. The result is a waterfront district that will, for decades to come, be bereft of anticipated (and necessary) activation on nights and weekends.

MY CONCLUSION: BPDA has used, and continues to use, so-called "master planning" (e.g. PDA approval processes) as a pretext for winning public support in order to streamline multi-acre large project approvals. District wide, Seaport massing has largely filled an envelope set by maximum FAA height limits, predominately for market-driven uses. (This assertion can be supported with full awareness of Pier 4 PDA and Seaport Square PDA approvals).

RELATED NOTE REGARDING CONTEXT:

Housing at Seaport Square, anticipated to be greater than 33% of the project's full build density, would have been a consideration in above comments. But Seaport Square's 23 acres and Fan Pier's 21 acres do not exist in a vacuum. BPDA has been made aware of the 650-acre district's flagging housing numbers for years now. And BPDA is aware of the fact that Massport has produced office space at a far greater ratio than housing, consuming finite resources including public transit.

Furthermore, language in the 2017 Restated PDA at Seaport Square allows hotel uses on all sites identified as "residential." Total residential unit count anticipated at full build was routinely misrepresented as a known quantity during the BPDA public approval process, and misrepresented in nearly every media account of the PDA/NPC approval process. Statements made regarding total residential units were only supportable with the unstated assumption that no hotels will displace residential units.

The following excerpt from The Boston Globe is instructive:

City demands increase in housing on waterfront

By Anthony Flint, Globe Staff, 3/24/2000

<http://www.seaportalliance.org/SAND/Archive/000324bra.html>

"In an attempt to make the South Boston Waterfront a place more people call home, the city will require developers to build more residential buildings and fewer office towers, officials said yesterday.

"This area has to be mixed-use, not another downtown," said Mark Maloney, director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority.

The new policy requires that at least one-third of any new development close to the water be residential. At the same time, no more than one-third of new development can be office space. The policy will be written into new zoning rules for the entire area, Maloney said.

The policy follows mounting criticism that city plans for the emerging district allowed too much office-space development. Under recently drafted guidelines, environmentalists and harbor activists complained that the city's new waterfront would have been too dense and too high, blocking off the water instead of opening public access to it.

The criticism has been chiefly aimed at the nine-block, \$1.2 billion complex on Fan Pier proposed by the Chicago-based Pritzker family and local partners Spaulding & Slye Colliers. That plan calls for three major office towers, reaching heights of 250 feet and in one case nearly 300 feet.

Maloney said he expects that the Fan Pier developers can make adjustments to adhere to the new policy, reducing office space and adding to three proposed residential structures closest to the water, near the new federal courthouse. Approximately 400 units of mostly high-end housing are proposed in the Fan Pier complex now.

"

Fan Pier Planning Context

I am one of over 1,000 stakeholders that rolled up sleeves working on Seaport planning BPDA Seaport Public Realm Plan (BPDA consultants: Cooper Robertson & Partners), and Fan Pier planning with the Pritzker team (Ken Greenberg / Urban Strategies), and Fan Pier Municipal Harbor Planning (MassDEP). I personally attended and/or hosted (with Seaport Alliance for a Neighborhood Design aka SAND) over 100 Seaport planning meetings from 1997 through Fan Pier Master Plan (PDA #54) approval in 2001.

Prior to the Seaport planning effort launched by the BRA in 1997, the South Boston waterfront was largely envisioned as one of the following:

1. Office-centric extension of the Financial District
2. Megaplex / Stadium

Opposition to housing on the waterfront arrived largely from South Boston elected officials, most notably Councilor Jim Kelly. Our South Boston group SAND maintained an excellent relationship with Councilor Kelly, but we challenged Councilor Kelly regarding the importance and opportunity for housing to evolve on the SB waterfront.

We received support for our housing advocacy from many, including BRA officials, Boston Society of Architects Seaport Focus Team and others.

Recognition of the waterfront as a “neighborhood” increased over time. Cooper Robertson and Urban Strategies both recognized the opportunity and advantages of catalyzing the growth of a neighborhood (24/7 activation of a high potential waterfront, for one). All official plans (Seaport PRP, MHP, PDAs) reflected this evolution in thinking.

Housing numbers desired by advocates, for example 10,000-15,000 units called for by SAND and BSA, received pushback by our elected officials. The BRA Seaport Public Realm Plan reached a compromise, estimating full build Seaport at 5,000-8,000 residential units.

Fan Pier Cultural Uses

I'll be brief in my remarks about Fan Pier's civic and cultural offerings, particularly with respect to Fan Pier's development in a post-Pritzker environment (e.g. after ICA groundbreaking).

I read this complaint from the Fan Pier Master Developer about the cost of space for civic/cultural uses on Fan Pier.

The economics have grown worse for Parcel H primarily because the costs of providing space for civic/cultural use in that building have increased substantially. In particular, the required civic/cultural space in Parcel H is 23,557 square feet of gross floor area as defined in the Boston Zoning Code (the "Code"), which will occupy a portion of the ground level of the building and the entire second floor. Both the Agency and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection have recently requested that we provide significant landlord build-out

EAST\144934149.1

Mr. Brian Golden, Director
December 15, 2017
Page 3

and a tenant improvement allowance for the civic/cultural space in Parcel H (and Parcel D), which would add millions of dollars in additional and previously unanticipated cost to that building (as well as to the building already under construction on Parcel D). Those specific additional requested obligations are detailed in a draft Second Amendment to Use Restriction for Civic and Cultural Use to Boston Redevelopment Authority (Fan Pier Parcels B, D, H and J) (the "Second Amendment to Use Restriction"), a copy of which is enclosed.

The 13,000 sf civic/cultural space itself was mandated by the state under Chapter 91. One can reflect today how the Seaport's civic and cultural destinations have flourished without a mandate under Chapter 91.

I remember how Michael Van Valkenburgh's tidal park planned for Fan Pier (BPDA-approved in original PDA) was presented to the public during Fan Pier's 21 acres of massing approvals. And I remember how that Valkenburgh design quietly disappeared in favor of a manicured lawn, firepit and motorized waterfall, largely out of the public eye (unless a citizen fastidiously read BRA Board Memos, or happened to attend one or two TBHA Harbor Use Meetings).

Here are just two Fan Pier headlines provided to BPDA in the context of the latest complaint about Chapter 91 civic and cultural obligations.

Regarding today's complaint over the cost of a 13,000 sf civic/cultural space:

COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE

Goodwin Procter's Seaport home sells for \$447M

Real estate trust buys Seaport towers for \$1.1b

Buys buildings that include Vertex's new headquarters

Enough said.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.

Regards,
Steve [REDACTED]
Resident of Fort Point, 27 years
[REDACTED]
Boston, MA 02210
[REDACTED]



Aisling Kerr <aisling.kerr@boston.gov>

Fan Pier- Notice of Project Change

Joseph [REDACTED]@gmail.com>
To: Aisling.Kerr@boston.gov

Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 5:07 PM

Dear Aisling Kerr,

I hope that this email finds you in good health.

There should be no further development on the waterfront for the entire City of Boston. I agree with Mayor Martin Walsh, global warming is changing our city. We witnessed dumpsters and automobiles floating on our streets on the waterfront during the storm in January. Do we need any further proof that global warming is for real?

I am opposed to the changes to the, Fan Pier, project, it is our duty to protect our fair city. These massive developments have changed the environment of our neighborhood, they change wind direction, because of there size they generate heat in the summer, all contributing to global warming. I appreciate this opportunity to make a comment about this change.

I would like a response to this email at your convenience.

Thank You,

Joe [REDACTED]