

Charlestown Neighborhood Council



September 6, 2023

Mayor Michele Wu
One City Hall Square
Suite 500
Boston, MA 02201-2013
BostonMayor@boston.gov

Via: email

Re: PLAN:Charlestown

Dear Mayor Wu,

The Charlestown Neighborhood Council strongly opposes the approval of PLAN:Charlestown due to a lack of adequate and good faith community engagement by the BPDA.

The Council members stand as one in our opposition to the approval of the draft PLAN (and the related zoning code changes) by the BPDA board before in-person community meetings are held. These meetings are necessary so that our neighbors can offer direct feedback to you, Chief Jemison, and your respective staff members. We also expect our elected representatives to be invited to, and to be given sufficient notice to, attend these meetings. This will require an extension beyond the newest proffered comment deadline of September 21, 2023.

At your Charlestown coffee hour in May at the McCarthy Playground, and on many other occasions, you have spoken of your commitment to engaging the city's diverse communities by meeting each neighborhood and community "where they are at" so that everyone not only has the opportunity, but a real, supported ability to meaningfully engage in municipal decisions and civic matters affecting their neighborhoods. For Charlestown and the CNC, that spectrum of engagement includes holding community meetings in-person, in Charlestown where our neighbors can hear, see, and interact with the city's representatives and each other.

We believe that in-person community meetings strengthen the community by: creating a neutral venue where people with opposing opinions can address each other; increasing connections among community members; sharing new information, analysis, and perspectives; and generally fleshing out a broader range of questions than can be fairly vetted on a Zoom call. There is an absolute loss of connection, consensus, and context when the only meetings are on-

line, the comments are severely time limited, and participation is controlled by the proponent of the issue in question.

We are also deeply disappointed in and concerned about the lack of community engagement in other aspects of the process that the BPDA designed to bring the PLAN to a conclusion. The first full draft of the PLAN was presented as a final draft PLAN even though it contained very significant, unilateral changes from the Hybrid model which were in direct opposition to the principles that the BPDA planners assured the community were touchstones of the PLAN. For example, without any prior notice to or feedback from the community, the allowed building heights at 425 Medford St. and the Bunker Hill Mall, both of which are within the residential bounds of the neighborhood and abutt residential housing and historic buildings, were increased in the final draft PLAN to heights that were limited to the industrial areas on the west side of Rutherford Ave. in the Hybrid model. Also, despite very low survey participation last summer, the BPDA once again scheduled a milestone Plan comment period to span the month of August when our community groups are not in session and many community members are away and/or simply not engaged. Finally, the BPDA initially issued the draft Plan on July 28, 2023, a week earlier than the publication date in the community notice, and simultaneously cut the comment period from six (6) weeks which would have ended on September 6th to five (5) weeks ending on September 1st, the Friday before Labor Day weekend. The subsequent “extension” to September 6th merely reinstated the original 6-week comment period communicated by the BPDA. All to meet an arbitrary BPDA board approval deadline.

The significant unilateral changes to touchstone principles coupled with the BPDA’s rush to move a first draft of the PLAN to their board for approval savors strongly of disdain for and disregard of the value of community input and the contributions of those who participated in a years-long process. Community members who volunteered any amount of their time, expertise, or community knowledge to the three-year Plan process in any manner were acting as custodians of a future neighborhood that many of them will never see. They, and the entire neighborhood, deserved far better treatment from your administration and the BPDA than what we have seen in the BPDA’s PLAN approval process.

We are reserving our specific objections to the contents of the draft PLAN released on July 28, 2023 (and its related proposed code changes) while we focus on working with you and the BPDA to establish in-person community meetings this fall. It makes little sense to focus on drafting specific comments until we review the new PLAN draft scheduled for release on September 6th and have heard the community feedback offered at the in-person community meetings. However, we do note that the Council generally supports the objections that the Charlestown Preservation Society so aptly outlined in its recent objection letters submitted to your office, the BPDA, and the Charlestown community.

Please contact me to discuss and schedule the in-person Charlestown community meetings and a more community centered process to bring the PLAN to conclusion.

Very truly yours,



Tom Cunha
Chair, Charlestown Neighborhood Council
cnc02129@gmail.com
www.CNC02129.org

cc: Gabriela Coletta, District One City Councilor
Daniel Ryan, MA Representative
Sal DiDomenico, MA Senator
Tiffany Chu, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office
Arthur Jemison, Chief of Planning, BPDA
Devin Quirk, Deputy Chief for Development and Transformation, BPDA
Aimee Chambers, Director of Planning, BPDA
Sean Breen, Charlestown Representative, ONS
Jason Ruggiero, Community Engagement Manager, BPDA
At-Large City Councilors:
Michael F. Flaherty
Ruthzee Louijeune
Julia Mejia
Erin Murphy



Massachusetts Port Authority
One Harborside Drive, Suite 200S
East Boston, MA 02128-2909
Telephone (617) 568-1000
www.massport.com

September 8, 2023

James Arthur Jemison, Director
c/o Jason Ruggiero, Community Engagement Manager
Boston Planning and Development Agency
One City Hall Square Boston, MA 02201

Subject: PLAN Charlestown

Dear Director Jemison:

On behalf of the Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport), thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the final PLAN: Charlestown draft document (the “Plan”). The Plan provides a comprehensive evaluation of current neighborhood needs and frames the future land uses, development parameters, and infrastructure necessary to support equitable growth in the neighborhood. Recommendations and guidance are also provided on mobility connections, parks and open space, climate resilience, affordable housing, and the preservation of Charlestown’s historic character. The Plan specifically focuses on the emerging industrial areas along Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square as locations for new growth and density, open space, transit connections, and job growth.

The Plan recognizes as part of the Key Proposed Land Use Concepts the continuation of industrial uses in the neighborhood, including an active Mystic River Designated Port Area (DPA), however the Plan includes recommendations related to vehicular access and land use which may negatively impact the viability of maritime industrial businesses, including tenants on Massport land in the DPA. The following comments are related to these topics, as well as proposed zoning for buildings heights as they relate to Logan Airport’s critical airspace needs.

Transportation

The Boston Autoport is a long-term ground lessee to Massport and operates a dynamic multi-purpose marine terminal in the Mystic River DPA comprised of two large parcels, one on Terminal Street and one on Medford Street. The Boston Autoport is a significant source of jobs, taxes, and other economic benefits to the City of Boston and the Commonwealth. Overall, the 80-plus acre terminal is home to Diversified Automotive’s automobile import operation in partnership with Subaru serving New England and Upstate New York. The terminal also supports Morton’s major road salt import operation, layover and services for Hornblower’s City Experiences ferry operations in Boston Harbor, and a diverse mix of other maritime and industrial business sub-tenants. In addition

to these uses, the Commonwealth's Clean Energy Center operates its Wind Blade Test Facility at the site, a critical asset regionally and nationally supporting the growth of off-shore wind as an important sustainable energy source.

The businesses at Boston Autoport are heavily dependent on direct and efficient truck routes to and from the interstate highway system, specifically, nearby access to Interstate 93. Annually, the facility generates approximately 4,000 truck trips for automobile transport; 18,000-20,000 seasonal truck trips for road salt deliveries; and 6,500 other related truck trips. In addition, more than 3,000 customers and visitors come to the site to conduct business with the Autoport and its tenants. For many years, based on the preference of the nearby Charlestown residential community, the Autoport and its tenants have used Chelsea Street as the primary truck access route serving the facility and have limited trucking on Medford Street. Chelsea Street and Rutherford Avenue, which are Federally-designated Critical Urban Freight Corridors, as well as City Square, Sullivan Square and the intersection of Chelsea and Terminal Streets, together constitute an essential network of truck routes serving the Autoport and other maritime industrial businesses in the Mystic River DPA. Protecting and improving direct and efficient truck routes under the Plan will not only support the blue economy active in the DPA, but also it will help concentrate trucks on roads designed to accommodate them and keep them off neighborhood streets.

The mobility recommendations of the Plan emphasize the integration of infrastructure to better support walking, biking, and transit into existing streets, as well as a setting this infrastructure as a requirement for new development. The proposed Bike Network map represents substantial new bike path infrastructure including protected bike lanes on several primary roads including Chelsea Street and Medford Street, which, as outlined above, the Autoport and other maritime industrial businesses in the DPA depend upon. The Mobility section of the Plan also references the need for deeper studies of key corridors such as Chelsea and Medford Streets to provide policy and design solutions to improve safety, better accessibility, and multimodal connections. Any proposed redesign of truck access routes and intersections must also ensure adequate lane widths and turning radii are maintained for large trucks carrying automobiles, salt, and wind blades (often oversized loads). The design of these critical truck corridors and intersections must accommodate a WB-67 vehicle and 11-foot minimum lanes. Massport anticipates working with the City and stakeholders on a priority truck route plan for Charlestown, consistent with the commitments in the April 2020 Memorandum of Understanding between Massport and the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and developing approaches that minimize negative impacts to trucking on these corridors that are essential to businesses in the DPA.

Mystic Wharf Branch Rail Right-of-Way

In partnership with the Commonwealth, Massport acquired the Mystic Wharf Branch Rail Right-of-Way (ROW) in the early 2000s to preserve the corridor to provide potential future access to the DPA. This ROW is one of only two remaining opportunities for dock-side rail access in Boston Harbor, and it is an irreplaceable transportation asset Massport is committed to preserve to respond to yet

unforeseen long-term local and regional needs. That being said, for several years, under the terms of the aforementioned MOU, Massport has been collaborating with the BPDA and other City departments to create new public access infrastructure along the ROW, along the Little Mystic Channel, and at Barry Field. These plans are being developed with an understanding between the parties the ROW must remain unobstructed for future rail service.

The Plan's Key Proposed Open Space Network Concepts reference utilizing existing rail corridors to provide linear parks and greenways. The Network Concepts also include a 'Charlestown Green Loop', represented as a ring of open space connecting the neighborhoods edges, and incorporating the ROW and the Massport-owned "D Street". Any future planning for mobility concepts in and around these assets should include Massport and ensure land use and transportation proposals do not compromise the capacity of the ROW to function adequately for rail service and are consistent with rail safety and design standards.

The Massport-owned "D Street" referenced above is a private roadway adjacent to the rail ROW to the west of Rutherford Avenue. It connects to Rutherford, Spice Street, and other roads in this area and provides access to several abutters. Massport has entered into easement agreements with certain abutters and is in discussions with others regarding access and utility rights on its property. Given the scale and density of the development the BPDA envisions in this area, Massport recommends the agencies meet soon to discuss the future role of "D Street" as well as its capacity, design, and maintenance.

Building Heights

Massport has developed the Airspace Map (Logan Airspace Map or Airspace Map) that defines the critical airspace around Logan Airport. The Map was created with input from airlines, pilots, city officials, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to protect the flight corridors in and out of the airport and to help guide developers and regulatory authorities on building heights. The Airspace Map aids developers in their planning and informs the FAA approval process of individual projects to determine if they present a potential hazard to air navigation.

The Plan references allowing more density around the Sullivan Square and Community College MBTA stations, with heights stepping down towards Charlestown's existing residential neighborhoods. Proposed maximum building heights of 280-feet along the I-93 viaduct are proposed for future zoning. Massport requests that the City continue to coordinate closely with Massport during the review of building proposals to ensure proposed building heights do not exceed the airspace limit as defined by the Logan Airspace Map (see <http://www.massport.com/media/1545/boston-logan-airspace-map.pdf>).

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (617) 568-3705 or at jbarrera@massport.com if you wish to discuss any of our comments.

Sincerely,

Massachusetts Port Authority

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J a b", positioned above a thin horizontal line.

Joel Barrera
Director, Strategic and Business Planning
Massachusetts Port Authority

cc: A. Hargens, S., A Coppola, A. Guerriero, T. Butler, R. Goto, B. Washburn, S. Lee, C. Busch/Massport



BUNKER HILL MONUMENT ASSOCIATION

INCORPORATED 1823

POST OFFICE BOX 291775
CHARLESTOWN, MA 02129
BUNKERHILLMONUMENTASSN.ORG

September 15, 2023

The Honorable Michele Wu
City Hall
Boston, MA

Dear Mayor Wu,

The Bunker Hill Monument Association is the Nation's oldest Monument Association and is celebrating its 200th Anniversary.

It was voted at our last Board of Directors meeting that I inform you of our disappointment in the BPDA's PLAN: Charlestown as most recently put forward.

Our specific concern to the present plan is the heights of buildings. The creation of a "wall" will stop views of this most historic monument, the Bunker Hill Monument. This monument was created by the BHMA to memorialize the first battle fought for freedom and to help establish our independence.

People fought and died during this battle for independence while the town of Charlestown was burning. Families lost everything as they fled to escape the fires. So, we understand the need for housing more than you might realize. But, building a wall that will stop all views of this historic marker is so disrespectful to those who gave everything for the cause of independence. It is our duty to preserve - unimpaired - the views of the Bunker Hill Monument that welcome all to remember our American history.

Please respect what Boston is best known for - our early American history. The BPDA has failed Charlestown in this regard. They say the words but do not show respect for our history in their plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Annette Tecce". The signature is fluid and cursive, written over a light blue horizontal line.

Annette Tecce, President
Bunker Hill Monument Association

The mission of the Bunker Hill Monument Association is to preserve, protect and promote the historic importance of the Bunker Hill Monument; to promote the history and significance of the Battle of Bunker Hill (June 17, 1775) to the course and outcome of the American Revolution and the formation, and development of the United States of America.

James Arthur Jemison
Chief of Planning
Boston Planning and Development Agency
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

September 21, 2023

Dear Chief Jemison,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the most recent draft of PLAN: Charlestown (PLAN). It was helpful for the College and our partners at the Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) to spend time with BPDA staff to discuss PLAN: Charlestown's evolution and the College's campus planning.

This year, Bunker Hill Community College celebrates 50 years since its inception—and while we acknowledge that institutional milestone, we are also acutely aware of the poor condition of the outmoded, 50-year-old buildings on our 32-acre Charlestown campus. Our goal is to build new College facilities through a public-private partnership that will support the needs of our 16,000 BHCC students, foster industry partnerships, and create vibrant, community-connected spaces—obtained at little to no cost to the Commonwealth by leveraging the development of our Charlestown campus.

Recently, the College and DCAMM have been preparing a Request for Proposals to identify a development partner, who we will work with collaboratively to shape the timing and other aspects of this project. While there is much still to be determined about the content of our future campus, at this early stage of planning the College's priority is to preserve development flexibility on the site to maximize a developer partner's ability to deliver new, state-of-the-art College facilities.

There are several elements of the final draft PLAN that are complementary to our institutional goals, including better integration between our campus and the Charlestown neighborhood, the availability of both mixed and institutional uses across our campus, and the stepping up of building heights from Rutherford Avenue towards I-93.

There are aspects of the draft PLAN, however, that we request the BPDA reconsider. The College seeks to preserve as much flexibility around density and height for future development on our campus to ensure that a future developer can deliver on the primary goal of building a new BHCC facility at little or no cost to the Commonwealth.

CHARLESTOWN CAMPUS

250 New Rutherford Avenue • Boston, Massachusetts 02129-2925
Phone: 617-228-2000 TTY: 617-242-2365

CHELSEA CAMPUS

70 Everett Avenue • Chelsea, Massachusetts 02150-2917
Phone: 617-228-2101 TTY: 617-242-2365

ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS

Chinatown • East Boston • Everett • Malden • South End • Quincy

bhcc.edu

Density

We request restoring the previous draft's FAR of 4.0 to the BHCC campus to be consistent with other PLAN parcels adjacent to I-93. This would also be consistent with the proposed FAR 4.0 and 5.0 around the only other rapid transit station in Charlestown, Sullivan Square.

Additionally, we request that the PLAN's housing density bonus eligibility extend to the entire BHCC campus so that the future development may be considered holistically.

Height

We agree with the principle of stepping heights down towards the neighborhood and up towards the highway, but the current approach to managing those changes is overly prescriptive for a site whose layout has not yet been determined. We request that the BPDA eliminate the sectional height planes between Rutherford Avenue and I-93 to provide more flexibility for the College's future developer partner and the BPDA to sculpt appropriate building heights in concert with planned uses and massing through the PDA process.

The College's ability to realize new, modern facilities through a public-private partnership is dependent on a future developer partner's ability to create a master plan for the BHCC campus that includes new BHCC facilities at little to no cost to the state. The requested changes we have included in this letter are critical to realizing that vision, and we thank you for considering them in the collaborative and community-minded spirit in which we offer them.

Sincerely,



Pam Eddinger
President

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/5/2023 19:58	I_live_in_Charlestown	Acknowledgment of Charlestown's historic character.	Allowable building heights excessive. Scary vision of a Charlestown I wouldn't want to live in.
9/6/2023 0:07	I_live_in_Charlestown	There is nothing I like about the draft plan. There is too much development planned and not enough infrastructure in place to support it.	I'd like to see less development happening in our one square mile. The buildings being designed are way too high for the area. Two of the three ways in and out of Charlestown are a mess...the North Washington Street bridge is not completed and Sullivan Square is a traffic nightmare that was promised to be fixed when the Encore casino was built. How will all this development and construction happen with all the trucks and workers coming here when the bridge and Sullivan Sq are not even completed?? And The Helm down the Navy Yard...we are totally against that! No supervision or supports in place and no requirements to be sober. Also there are no stores or transportation in that area to support all these new residents. Please don't turn Charlestown (a beautiful, historic neighborhood) into another Seaport...overdeveloped with high rises everywhere. No one who lives here supports this plan...only the politicians and developers who will be making money off of it.
9/6/2023 6:22	I_live_in_Charlestown	Thought given to provide green space, trees	Unfortunately not enough space allowed here. The scale and density of the plan, the lack of specifics related to infrastructure, safety, traffic, emergency provisions, police, firefighters, public transportation, parking... no specific planning. My letters have been sent to the Mayor and politicians. This is a plan for the Developers, for the city coffers ; not a plan for Charlestown, not for us.
9/6/2023 11:29	I_live_in_Charlestown	It needs a lot more work to be a PLAN! It has some good stuff! But the city needs to hear us which is sadly not doing until the Nth hour! This PLAN needs a >> Serious Pause << to address the communities concerns: - Building Heights that doesn't impose! We don't want to be a fish bowl with mammoth walls of buildings. - Fixing and opening up Ped/cycle connections (not cars!) - Creating a REAL Intra-Community Transit system which runs 6:00AM to 11:00PM weekdays with an extra hour on Friday. Saturday & Sunday 7:00AM to 12:00PM - A firm population density cap which is calculated based on our Transit limitations (all modes and desired directions)	"Section 62-1. Statement of Purpose and Objectives. The purpose of this Article is to establish the zoning regulations for the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The objectives of this Article are to provide adequate density controls that protect established residential areas and direct growth to areas where it can be accommodated; to retain and develop affordable housing compatible with adjacent areas, particularly for elderly residents; to promote the viable neighborhood economy; to preserve, maintain and create open space; to protect the environment and improve the quality of life; to promote the most appropriate use of land; and to promote the public safety, health, and welfare of the people of Boston." This element must stay! You can't remove the check and balance of the community scale. While other areas of the city have many more avenues of egress Charlestown does not! We are a functional island! How many people can fit in a given car? We are no different physically!
9/6/2023 11:37	I_live_in_Charlestown	PLEASE explain what these RED LINED sections are being removed!!!!	This Section 62-56 establishes Residential Subdistricts within the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The purpose of the Residential Subdistricts is to maintain, enhance, and promote the character of the residential neighborhoods in terms of density, housing type, and design; to provide for low- and medium-density multifamily housing appropriate to the existing built environment; and to encourage appropriate development that enhances the Residential Subdistricts while preventing overdevelopment. This section must stay! You care taking the only way to manage our density (control size)! Unlike other areas of the city the community core only has currently three egress pathways! for all modes of access in and out. Densifying along the highway with no means for us to get in and out is not what we wanted and what we were asked needed to be altered in the Code! Red Lining these sections as you have doesn't serve what we need nor want!

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/6/2023 11:53	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Please put back these sections!!</p> <p>REGULATIONS APPLICABLE IN COMMUNITY FACILITIES SUBDISTRICTS Section 62-9. Establishment of Community Facilities Subdistricts. This Section 62-9 establishes Community Facilities ("CF") Subdistricts within the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The purpose of the Community Facilities Subdistricts is to encourage the development and expansion of important community-based facilities in the Charlestown Neighborhood District that provide educational, health, and cultural services to the community and are an important part of the fabric of the Charlestown community. The following Community Facilities Subdistrict is established: 1. Bunker Hill Community Facilities (CF) Subdistrict</p>
9/6/2023 11:54	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Please put this back!</p> <p>Section 62-10. Use Regulations Applicable in Community Facilities Subdistricts. Within a Community Facilities Subdistrict, no land or Structure shall be erected, used, or arranged or designed to be used, in whole or in part, unless, for the proposed location of such use, the use is identified in Table A of this Article as "A" (allowed) or as "C" (conditional). Any use identified as conditional in Table A is subject to the provisions of Article 6. Any use identified as "F" (forbidden) in Table A for the proposed location of such use is forbidden in such location</p>
9/6/2023 12:07	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Please put back! I don't think the replacement of "Business" for "Shopping" is a good choice!</p> <p>Shopping implies buying Goods it doesn't cover Services. It would be better to use a more definitive phrase here like > Goods and Services <</p> <p>So the heading would be Establishment of Neighborhood Goods and Services Business Subdistricts.</p> <p>Section 62-11 12. Establishment of Neighborhood Shopping Subdistricts.</p> <p>This allows personal hygiene services (Hair & Nail) as well as Banks and Lawyers which are not a conveyance of goods per-say but instead of a needed service.</p>
9/6/2023 12:13	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Correct the heading and the repeated element through out to: Neighborhood Goods & Services Subdistricts</p> <p>As I expressed in the earlier post the why</p> <p>Typo! provideing = providing</p> <p>This Section 62-112 establishes Neighborhood Shopping Business Subdistricts within the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The purpose of there are two types of Neighborhood Business Subdistricts: Local Convenience ("LC") Subdistricts, providing convenience goods and services for the neighborhood and pedestrians; and Neighborhood Shopping ("NS") Subdistricts is to, provideing convenience goods and services to the larger neighborhood, and. Both types of Neighborhood Business Subdistricts encourage the development of neighborhood businesses that provide essential goods and services as well as jobs and entrepreneurial opportunities for the Charlestown community.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/6/2023 12:21	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>This list is needed! As we need to protect the spaces. I do agree we need to encourage the space owners to make them workable. I have an idea how but this is the cores list of spaces that are needed and letting them get lost makes it doubly hard to recover them.</p> <p>Yes, it doesn't address new development spaces as such it does need appending now and then. I would recommend the CNC has a role here in managing this list.</p> <p>The following Neighborhood Business Subdistricts are established:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bunker Hill Street Local Convenience (LC) Subdistrict 2. Cambridge Street Local Convenience (LC) Subdistrict 3. Caldwell Street Local Convenience (LC) Subdistrict 4. Main Street Neighborhood Shopping (NS) Subdistrict 5. Baldwin Street Neighborhood Shopping (NS) 6. Mishawum Street Neighborhood Shopping (NS) Subdistrict 7. Rutherford Avenue Neighborhood Shopping (NS) Subdistrict
9/6/2023 12:37	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Please revert back to the older and altering the heading to read Neighborhood Goods & Services Districts and Subdistricts</p> <p>Section 62-123. Use Regulations Applicable in Neighborhood Shopping Business Subdistricts. Within the Neighborhood Business Subdistricts, no land or structure shall be erected, used, or arranged or designed to be used, in whole or in part, unless, for the proposed location of such use, the use is identified in Table B of this Article as "A" (allowed) or as "C" (conditional). Any use identified as conditional in Table B is subject to the provisions of Article 6. Any use identified as "F" (forbidden) in Table B for the proposed location of such use is forbidden in such location. (Text Amd. No. 416, § 57c., 7-2-2015)</p> <p>I can agree the sight of empty store fronts is painful. I would stipulate landlords need to dress the windows & doors so they don't stand out and unsightly! The city should have on its books regulation and fines on what is required, as well as taking!</p>
9/6/2023 12:59	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>This has meaning! It's needed!! This needs serious word-smithing to convey both the original intent and what you are trying to convey. I don't see it here.</p> <p>Section 62-134. Dimensional Regulations Applicable in Neighborhood Shopping Business Subdistricts. The minimum allowed Lot Size, Lot Width, Lot-Frontage, Front Yard, Side Yard, Rear Yard, and Usable Open Space required for any Lot in a dimensional regulations applicable in Neighborhood Shopping Business Subdistricts, and the maximum allowed Floor Area Ratio and Building Height for such Lot, are set forth in Table D of this Article.</p> <p>Missing! >> are set forth in Table D of this Article << Where is the table???? Whats also needed in this table - Sidewalk (frontage) area scaled to the businesses use. - Trash management & disposal - Pest management (inside and out)</p>
9/6/2023 13:02	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Mostly all of it the building heights are way Over ,we are one square mile you are over building and overpopulating we don't have flooding now but neither did the North End before you over build there. Stop the greed and madness of this plan Respectfully, Peggy Lynch 16 St. Martin St</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/6/2023 13:06	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>This is hanging! If you don't want a list then where are they defined?</p> <p>Section 62-156. Establishment of Local Industrial Subdistricts. This Section 62-16 establishes Local Industrial ("LI") Subdistricts within the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The purpose of Local Industrial Subdistricts is to encourage the preservation of the existing manufacturing and industrial base in a manner that is sensitive to and preserves the quality of life of the surrounding neighborhoods, and to encourage the development of new job opportunities within the Charlestown Neighborhood District.</p> <p>I would append the following: The Local Industrial Subdistricts (LI) can be identified within the current Zoning map</p> <p>Otherwise put in a listing of the spaces</p>
9/6/2023 13:15	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>The Article 80 process doesn't work for current areas! So without this you are allowing the areas to be filled in with residential housing! Who needs a gallon of milk or eggs one can get to with a short walk or I need a haircut now I have to venture miles to get it!</p> <p>Section 62-189. Establishment of Neighborhood Design Overlay Districts. This Section 62-189 establishes the Neighborhood Design Overlay Districts ("NDOD") as an overlays to certain subdistricts within the Charlestown Neighborhood District. The Neighborhood Design Overlay Districts are established to protect the existing scale, quality of the pedestrian environment, character of the residential neighborhoods, and concentrations of historic buildings within the Neighborhood Design Overlay Districts.</p> <p>So... PUT BACK the red lined listing!</p> <p>>> OR <<</p> <p>Point to a zoning map that explicitly defines the areas and make sure it is findable from here.</p> <p>>>> I would want to see the map before it is locked in!</p>
9/6/2023 13:54	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing. I am opposed to the plan.	<p>The heights are too high, there is 10+ million square feet being added to the plan than previously studied, the reduction in personal vehicle use that is not supported by public transportation and has not been studied, lack of planning to support the population growth with expansion, inconsistent recommendations for approval of proposed developments, the lack of preservation and adaptive re-use of historic buildings, and loosing the historic context of Charlestown. We do not want to be another Seaport, South End, etc. Charlestown is very historic and should be kept as such. Architectural designs and heights. Thank you.</p>
9/6/2023 13:55	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Part-1</p> <p>The "Map 2E, Charlestown Neighborhood District" Needs some corrections!</p> <p>First PDA-1 is not a Mix Use District! It is a Commercial Subdistrict! It is the primary Goods and Services location within Charlestown. While new developers want to pull away some of the business from here, it doesn't serve the core community!</p> <p>As we are so fractured as it is I shouldn't be forced to cross major road spaces like Cambridge St or Rutherford Ave to gain access to my needs! If I live on Main Street and up Breeds Hill.</p> <p>While the Mall is badly designed of what shopping is, it is not nor should it be Mixed use. The only mixed this site should have is if the buildings gain at most a second or third floor to offer office space for small businesses, Not housing!</p> <p>Please remove the MU and put back the C designation</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/6/2023 14:02	I live in Charlestown		<p>Part-2 The "Map 2E, Charlestown Neighborhood District" Needs some corrections!</p> <p>The Institutional Master Plan Overlay District (MPI) and Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD) elements are missing!</p> <p>The last correction is the label Harborpark: Charlestown Waterfront</p> <p>Lets be clear here! Left of the Tobin is RIVER and to the Right is HARBOR they are very distinct areas!</p> <p>A better heading would be just Charlestown Waterfront if the idea is to define a Coastal Flood Resilience Overlay District (CFROD) map which I would like to see! Not diving into the land use.</p> <p>For the sake of simplicity the Little Mystic Channel can be used as the delineation of the two spaces given how MassPort and the heavy industrial is in between the Sullivan Sq area and Navy Yard area, if land use was the focus.</p> <p>To be clear the Sullivan Sq and Navy Yard areas need to be looked at independently from the MassPort space. While they all have a common water space they need to be viewed differently.</p>
9/6/2023 14:10	I live in Charlestown	<p>There are aspects of the plan I like but I'm deeply concerned at the last minute changes to building heights and the amount of allowable square footage. That is not working with the community in good faith and give us all reason to not trust the city and its development plans. We have every reason to believe that the city plans to remake Charlestown into a version of the Seaport or Cambridge Crossing. That would not only deeply change the nature of Charlestown, but would make living here exceedingly difficult. Driving in out Charlestown is already next to impossible during rush hour. Granted the city needs more housing, but that need must be balanced with not only practicalities but a vision for what Boston and Charleston ultimately become: a generic city of high-rises or one of the country's most unique cities.</p>	<p>The recent changes to building heights along Austin, Bunker Hill and Medford St. They are all too high. More thorough planning on the increased number of CARS. People are not going to all start using bikes or the malfunctioning T because the city wishes that was so. If you make it so people can't live here, they will just leave. A thorough plan on the services Charlestown will need for its increased population, from parks to schools. And to not rush this process through. The way the city has behaved had been so discouraging but you could still renew our faith in the process.</p>
9/6/2023 20:49	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown	<p>Trish Cafferkey, who is no longer involved, I presume partly out of protest of this last DRAFT. You know the Globe is going to be running an expose' shortly right?</p>	<p>The BPDA is closing out the PLAN: Charlestown process prematurely in order to approve development projects. Public comments are due by Sept. 6, a "close-out" meeting is scheduled for Sept. 11 and zoning amendments produced from the PLAN will go in front of the BPDA board for approval Sept. 16.</p> <p>We have lost faith in the process and our comments have been ignored. Charlestown deserves a thoughtful, well considered plan that meaningfully seeks to preserve, grow and enhance the neighborhood, its infrastructure and services responsibly. This draft is not that plan. We ask that you join us in opposing PLAN: Charlestown for these reasons.</p>
9/6/2023 21:00	I live in Charlestown	<p>I appreciate the time and effort put forth by the team. I like the focus on open space/ green space.</p>	<p>I do not agree with the proposed building heights and population densities. There has been a blind eye towards the reality of packing this much 'growth'/buildings/people into Charlestown, with selective data chosen to support the path the city is proposing while ignoring facts that run contrary. Most disheartening is how the community's feedback is being ignored.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/6/2023 21:30	I live in Charlestown	I like the IDEA that the plan is intended to provide limits for developers who might propose to build/develop in ways that the COMMUNITY does not want or that does not enable the current residents and future residents to live in a safe, historic area without impeding on the character of the town.	I would like to see changes made that truly reflect the residents of Charlestown. It seems not matter what residents say, only minor changes are made, and still not adhering to what should be a democratic process. It is disheartening to see and participate in these meetings, and there are SO MANY, and little to nothing is ever changed based on immense vocal feedback. Are there any residents that WANT multistory buildings? That WANT additional congestion? I have lived here for 20 years and I can't imagine being MORE stuck and not be able to leave due to added congestion. Limits on heights NEED to be made especially within the Rutheford Ave area, including the shopping center. I initially was thrilled that we would have a plan, all these years later, I am so disappointed, and feel absolutely helpless and hopeless. And exhausted. Why do the developers ALWAYS win!?
9/6/2023 22:13	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown	limiting garage doors on single family new construction	1. Severely reduce heights along Main St in particular, 2. reduce population growth goals (this is one square mile with water on 3 sides); 3. review the exclusion of a part of Sullivan St (Bartlett to High) from the RH-1500 zone (same as current): with the exception of two properties, all the houses cut out of the "square" are single family houses, mostly very small; 4. an actual plan and innovative solutions for reducing the number of cars; 5. clear improvements in public transportation (we need cross-hill on demand shuttles) and infrastructure, especially electrical power and storm drainage; 6. "other than zoning" solutions, e.g. requirement for sprinkler systems in all gut rehabs, plans to divert traffic from suburbs away from Ctown; and especially, 7. a plan that shows respect for our 3 century historic fabric and actively preserves it, not surrounds it by walls of tall buildings; 8, an end to the off-hand "it's structurally unsound, so you can tear it down" policy of ISD.
9/6/2023 22:14	I live in Charlestown	the Plan does a very good job of cataloging, documenting what is;	I pretty much agree with the Charlestown Preservation Society's position on the Plan. For example: 10+ million more square feet than a 2019 regional planning study More than doubling building heights 8-stories on Austin St and School St (CRAZY!) and 14-stories on Rutherford, Doherty Park from 55' to 180'. That's taller than the Schrafft's tower. Making the "assumption" that personal vehicle use will reduce to 50 percent, ie, creating unbearable traffic congestion and then expecting people to take the bus? When did that every happen? Go look at LA or NYC or Brazil - people having two and three hour commutes. That number is not based on data, planning or forecasting. That's such transparent dishonesty. Does anyone think a couple of thousand new residents in two million dollar condos will leave their Range Rovers at home and get on the 93 bus full of unruly juveniles? Zero planning to support the population increase - none.
9/7/2023 13:08	I live in Charlestown	Not much. It's dishonest. Get everyone worked up hiring engineers and planners, having meetings and then just ignoring it all.	
9/7/2023 14:51	I live in Charlestown	I like the parks	Lower density and do not change the original peninsula height.
9/7/2023 16:25	I live in Charlestown	In theory, more infrastructure	I would like to see a limit on the height of buildings to ensure that the historic views of the city are not diminished. I'd also like to ensure that access to and views of the waterfront are not altered by height of buildings. The lack of full consideration for how the increase in population will affect transit networks, traffic, and city services. This is the holistic approach she has encouraged the BPDA to take. At this time, it does not seem as though the needs and considerations of current residents are being considered as highly as the hope for new residents / offices or the potential profits that individuals may receive as a result of construction.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/7/2023 17:23	I_live_in_Charlestown	We need more housing and retail/housing mix can be great if done well	<p>Public transit? Lots of bike/walking lanes. It is already a traffic nightmare to walk through with school kids - all the developers and the city should be required to stage the develop and only start next step when all green space, safe transit trails/paths are in place.</p> <p>Emergency services/police/doctor offices/dentist - there is already not enough services in Charlestown - how can this growth be supported without adding?</p> <p>A dedicated space near public transit for a new YMCA or city rec facility with pools, fields, gym for working out is available for all residence regardless of whether you own a car; maintain our socioeconomic mix so we don't become the seaport</p>
9/8/2023 0:01	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>I really don't like this plan at all! It's called density. Our infrastructure will not accommodate this plan to build multiple high rise buildings in our one square mile!</p> <p>What are these planners thinking to throw all of this up with few plans for transportation, green space, honoring our historic buildings and spaces, services to accommodate the influx in population, etc...</p> <p>Go back to the drawing board Mayor Wu and planners. This is not going to fly here!</p>	<p>Everything. What happened to one of the original small scale plans? One Charlestown?</p> <p>Please don't push this proposal up our throats. Do any of these planners live here?</p>
9/8/2023 13:56	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	focus on business and services necessary for the residents of charlestown	<p>Building heights do not need to increase. Key to the neighborhood is the 1800s construction and charm. We do not need big buildings.</p> <p>Charlestown is one square mile. The conversion of single family homes to 2-3 family and greater has made it extremely densely populated. parking is impossible. we have two of largest low income housing projects in Massachusetts in our neighborhood already.</p> <p>We do not need our population to grow any larger.</p> <p>Adding housing will decrease our home values and lead to urban flight of the 60s and 70s.</p> <p>Commercial real estate/office spaces in downtown are empty, those will likely be converted to residential. We don't need more housing in Charlestown, we need more green space and services for the current population.</p> <p>The pool is no open. The parks and playground are a mess. The schools are dated and deteriorating. Put your(our) money there.</p>
9/8/2023 15:09	I_live_in_Charlestown	parks, fields, retail activation, better use of the industrial dead zones (though it is way too tall and dense where you are doing it)	<p>Bunker Hill Mall should be affirmatively zoned as part of this historic peninsula. Not a hold out to which you'll return later and add more skyscrapers.</p> <p>Heights and density across the board are too high, should be shorter and better tie to what makes Charlestown special. You've wrapped the neighborhood in exactly what people move here to avoid.</p>
9/8/2023 21:02	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	I am writing in strong support of safer transportation infrastructure, particularly biking infrastructure. As someone who commutes to Charlestown multiple times per week, I consider Main Street to be one of the most dangerous routes in Boston. Due to the placement of the bike lanes, there is a constant risk of door-ing by passengers getting out of their parked vehicles. Additionally, the sharrows painted on the road often make cyclists the target of aggressive drivers. I've experienced multiple close calls and do not feel safe biking in this part of the city.	I would like to see more separated bike paths, especially along Main Street. The current design creates a false sense of safety without actually providing a buffer from parked cars and fast-moving vehicles. It does not surprise me to learn that Main Street is among the highest crash locations citywide.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/9/2023 0:18	I live in Charlestown	Not anything worth a positive comment due to the total lack of insight by the preparers of the plan regarding the impact of the increased density and the complete disregard for the impact of the proposed building heights on the historic nature of Charlestown.	See my preceding comment.
9/11/2023 22:58	I live in Charlestown	Appreciate focus on underutilized parcels at edge of Charlestown and respect for historic core.	Proposed development heights and densities are too great.
9/11/2023 22:59	I live in Charlestown	Happy that there was an effort to work with residents.	So much tall building will inhibit the neighborhood and historical feel of Charlestown. The traffic, lack of green space, how about a grocery store that is affordable to all residents....,
9/11/2023 23:06	I live in Charlestown	The idea of a comprehensive plan for development is a good one, but this Plan ignores the reality of the impacts all of these development projects will have on the quality of life of residents in Charlestown. Too much development, too much density, too much height, not enough attention paid to transportation and parking and infrastructure needs.	Density, height, parking needs, transportation projections need to be more realistic so that it is not miserable for people to live in Charlestown. The Plan would allow for extreme overdevelopment at the expense of residents of Charlestown. It should be delayed. Public transportation is terrible and the chances of drastic improvement are completely unrealistic.
9/11/2023 23:16	I live in Charlestown		
9/11/2023 23:21	I live in Charlestown	Nothing	Cancel it.
9/12/2023 23:10	I live in Charlestown	Nothing	Smaller building heights more open space less people. You have made it to dense . Mix income planning never works. Look at Chicago and other failed projects like Harbor apts @ Columbia Point
9/13/2023 1:08	I live in Charlestown	There was good community input.	I don't see any compelling reason to excluded the Bunker Hill Mall. This argument they it's an underutilized parcel doesn't seem sincere.
9/13/2023 15:22	I live in Charlestown	I appreciate the completeness of the report.	Can you PLEASE include: 1. A clear TIMELINE of when projects are anticipated to occur. When is the OneCharlestown project finishing? When is the Austin St Parking Lot project starting? etc 2. A update on WHAT is going on with New Rutherford. It is a HUGE highway running through our community that represents a massive physical barrier between existing and proposed developments (i.e. Hood Park and Austin St). We have had YEARS of community engagement on this road, and years of the community saying we want it to be more pedestrian friendly and sustainable (and cleaner). I'm mystified as to how it is not getting more significant coverage in this plan and in all these community meetings.
9/13/2023 19:05	I live in Charlestown	NA	Drastically reduce building heights and density in all areas. Keep protected bike lanes on perimeter of original peninsula.
9/15/2023 23:17	I live in Charlestown	As a resident of Charlestown, there is not much to like in the draft of PLAN: Charlestown.	Less density and development. The neighborhood of Charlestown can only absorb so much. <i>We are already among the most dense of neighborhoods in the City.</i> More centered on the historic nature of this neighborhood; not development for development sake because there is an open plot of land. Focus on infrastructure needs - congestion, emergency services, open space, school playing fields - those things that make a community a community. All the new development around the edges of Charlestown will create the feeling of entering Assembly Square. Don't destroy the character of the entire neighborhood. Why are labs being built in the historic Navy Yard? This seems misguided. More attention needs to be paid to the Navy Yard and what an asset its waterfront location is in creating a world class destination for residents and tourists. Please address the blighted nature of significant waterfront assets (Pier 4 and 5, DD2, Harbor Walk) that fall under the purview of the BPDA. Thank you.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/16/2023 12:43	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing. It is destroying the neighborhood and becoming the seaport 2.0 It will be overcrowded without basic services. Not enough first responders, schools and transportation to service the needs of the expected population. And please don't say people will use bicycles!	Build someplace else and leave Charlestown as a neighborhood. We need affordable housing not high rise condos that the our children can't afford. The BPDA is changing the economic make up of Charlestown. Why and for whose benefit. Certainly not the generations of residents.
9/16/2023 14:14	I_live_in_Charlestown	Heights, density, housing	Would like to see taller buildings near the highways and MORE HOUSING
9/16/2023 14:22	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing! We need to rethink 'the Plan'. Growth needs to happen over time not overnight. We need time to adjust and build the infrastructure at each stage. Ensure traffic isn't constant gridlock, ensure we preserve the historic nature and lovely neighborhood feel of Charlestown. I've written to my local representatives and heard back from only one. I hate the idea of turning Charlestown into the next Seaport area with nothing but huge high rises that block the sunlight. I implore our Mayor to step in and stop the Helm project as it will most certainly impact the safety of our neighborhood. I love being able to go outside day or night and not have to look over my shoulder. Please rethink the Plan and work with the neighborhood to grow at a reasonable pace. Fix what is broken (Bunker Hill project, the bridge, etc.). Don't add to the problem. Please!	Stop the Helm, regulate building height in line with current architecture, ensure the traffic isn't gridlock, finish the bridge before starting more construction, ensure there is parking for residents, make sure there is infrastructure in place...fire, police, medical, etc.
9/16/2023 14:31	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	I love the focus on adding retail space.	The last thing we need is more housing. We cannot fully support the communities needs that we already have. Adding more housing is not the answer.
9/16/2023 14:34	I_live_in_Charlestown	Additional green spaces	Buildings need to be smaller. Just because we can build bigger does not mean we should! We are a small neighborhood that is still neighborly and it should remain that way. Also I see nothing about fixing the roads, additional ways in and out! Telling people they won't have parking won't stop them from owning cars so on top of extra traffic there will be a serious lack of parking
9/16/2023 14:39	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing!	The zoning should not change to accommodate rich developers with ties to City government. We voted for Wu based on her position on development, but ultimately money always wins! These zoning changes do NOT increase equity to anyone except the wealthy. The truth is the majority of housing will be market value and not accommodate the poor or families.
9/16/2023 15:47	I_live_in_Charlestown	None of it	The amount of development and dismantling of the BPDA
9/16/2023 16:23	I_live_in_Charlestown	It will significantly impact the traffic patterns and make parking even worse than it is for residents. The plan is ultimately bad for quality of life and the environment. I'm very disappointed that the mayor supports this plan. Her support of the plan and her backing of the Helm has changed my supper FOR HER. I will not be voting for Wu in the next election.	More open green space and trees.
9/16/2023 16:27	I_live_in_Charlestown	Having any plan is a start.	Building height, population density, meeting the needs for services (ambulance, police, schools).
9/16/2023 16:37	I_live_in_Charlestown		Project will cause more traffic and congestion in area. More green space in Charlestown. Disappointed in Mayor Wu's support of this project in Medford Street and support of The HELM in the Navy Yard. It is NOT the appropriate place for a project like this and doesn't have the resources available for the occupants of the project. Should be located near grocery store etc. Safety of the residents of the Navy Yard is not being considered. I will consider moving out of the Navy Yard and NOT supporting Mayor Wu in her next election. Disappointing

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/16/2023 20:30	I_live_in_Charlestown	Thank you for doing this. Us young people are really struggling with high rent, poor walkability caused by cars, and all the other issues caused by NIMBY mindsets. Hopefully this will make more of the next generation to consider staying in this area.	More pedestrianized streets to help new businesses get more traffic and improve lives of those of us who cannot afford a car.
9/16/2023 22:07	I_live_in_Charlestown	More opportunities for housing and retail to grow the neighborhood for generations to come	Allow taller denser buildings in edge properties to keep neighborhood feel in downtown but improve overall density
9/16/2023 23:20	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing.	Everything. Charlestown is one square mile that is overdeveloped without this PLAN. The community will suffer from the increase in traffic, the quality of the air, and the crowded conditions the continuous over-development of the town. We need elected official to do their jobs and represent the people who elected them. If they do not do this then people need to vote them out and replace them with people who actually care about this historic community. What is being allowed is contracts promised to developers and people who do not care about the quality of life for the residents of this town. This plan is not feasible or possible for this neighborhood - it is simply about making as much money as possible while destroying the environment and all of Charlestown's historic elements.
9/17/2023 1:30	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much!	The creation of more high rises and condos that are not affordable takes parking away, adds a lot of traffic and is just way too overwhelming for a small neighborhood like Charlestown. Squeezing in property that has no space to fit
9/17/2023 9:23	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Get rid of it
9/17/2023 10:12	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	No more building of office spaces, labs & condo high rises!! We need roads and access!! Over one hour drive to go two miles is UNACCEPTABLE and DANGEROUS in emergencies. Mayor Wu, STOP the building until you have the infrastructure in place to support the number of people you're bringing in.
9/17/2023 11:55	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like that there is a plan that considers how increasing the number of people in Charlestown impacts all areas.	To me, the large, taller buildings are getting too close to the historic proper of the city. There should not be a large building built near the bunker hill mall and main street should remain at 4 stories max. Has the city considered building a resident parking garage? That would also be helpful.
9/17/2023 13:09	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much	Reduce the height of buildings and the increase in population.
9/17/2023 14:11	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		
9/17/2023 15:51	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing I think it's a terrible idea with a location that makes no sense with no grocery store or public transportation near by.	I would like it to not move forward, it's going to drive a lot of people out of Charlestown
9/17/2023 18:01	I_live_in_Charlestown		The buildings are way too high. Not enough guarantee of infrastructure improvements. Currently, we don't have enough resources for our young people (fields, gyms, community center does not meet the needs of our youth). Additionally, no matter what time of day there is grid lock getting in and out of Charlestown. Adding more residents (let alone 10k+) is laughable and will create a divide in Charlestown.
9/17/2023 20:18	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Don't like the plan	No plan
9/18/2023 19:04	I_live_in_Charlestown		
9/19/2023 15:37	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like that we are talking about the future of our community and coming together as neighbors to respond to the plan.	It's really hard to imagine that the public infrastructure could ever support the amount of development that PLAN Charlestown lays out. I heard in the meeting that we - residents - aren't considering that this is a 30 year plan. I think that the 30 year plan is for the public infrastructure, but quite a bit of the private development has been proposed (some being considered currently) and if approved will be here a lot sooner. I spend quite a bit of time in traffic just trying to do normal things - like go to a doctors appointment - and it's so frustrating to think that it will just get worse. I don't support PLAN:Charlestown. Thanks for the opportunity to comment

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/19/2023 19:08	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	I am glad that a plan is being put into place to guide growth and development, but I am disappointed in the results	<p>My concerns include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building heights on the primary streets are WAY too high 2. There is a lack of concrete, tangible plans to support resources in the face of IMMENSE population growth 3. The plan adds more than the recommended square feet of new builds <p>Charlestown is unique within the whole of the United States -- it has small town feel within a big city, it has a wealth of racial, economic, and social diversity, and it preserves important history in a way that few other locations can. There is truly not another community like it in all of America.</p> <p>Long-term residents cannot stay with these kinds of plans. Please do not make irrevocable changes that make this community disappear.</p> <p>Please do not let irresponsible growth be a part of your legacy.</p>
9/20/2023 10:07	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much	This is a historic neighborhood -keep it that way! Less overall development and height, detailed provision for infrastructure especially medical. Study on air quality and traffic. Keep and add to the "neighborhood" green spaces. We are one square mile and adding thousands of condos/apts means more people who need services, more cars that need parking, schools.....
9/20/2023 12:08	I_live_in_Charlestown	Any open space	Need parking for residents and visitors. High rises ruin views.
9/20/2023 18:41	I_live_in_Charlestown	Shops	The height is terrible! Keep it the same height as it is now!!
9/20/2023 19:48	I_live_in_Charlestown	I am not happy with this plan. I am disappointed the 1-5 rating was removed so you could get clear feedback from the community by rating the plan. Just having comments is subjective.	<p>We do not support PLAN: Charlestown.</p> <p>From the BPDA website, the goal of PLAN is to determine how to accommodate new contextually appropriate growth while preserving the character of its existing residential areas. The PLAN falls short of this stated goal. The PLAN allows buildings with height and density that clearly negatively impact the character of the existing residential areas, allows growth that is detrimental to the existing community and does not fully address the infrastructure required to support such a large increase in residents.</p> <p>Similar feedback against the height, density, and lack of infrastructure has been overwhelmingly shared in the raw survey data as well as the comments and feedback in the PLAN meetings. It is clear for those who live here - we do not want this.</p> <p>Please come up with a PLAN that meets BPDA's stated goal that the community supports. This version is not it.</p>
9/20/2023 22:04	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	As it stands, I can't speak to the positives.	<p>As a longtime resident and business owner on Main Street in Charlestown, I STRONGLY OPPOSE the September 6 version of the plan.</p> <p>What is being proposed, namely the changes to the zoning of Main Street and allowances of FAR higher building heights than have been discussed with the community (including hours of discussions with the CNC and CPS). The lack of consideration for community input and the speed at which these changes have been proposed and included in the draft is abhorrent.</p> <p>What's been shared by the community in these past several years is NOT a desire for lab space, or taller buildings, or a license to build freely without regard for the transportation, parking, and other resources required to support said buildings. Please reconsider and re-engage the community—we've worked too hard on this plan to let a developer rush through a revenue-driving plan that steamrolls our historic community.</p>
9/20/2023 22:04	I_live_in_Charlestown	I don't want anymore new high rises in Charlestown.	I would like a park
9/20/2023 22:22	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nice job capturing the history and significance of what makes the one square mile such a special place to live.	Scale. Density. Respect for the residents concerns and plea to please bring down the scope and scale. This is developer led planning NOT community led planning.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/20/2023 23:26	I_live_in_Charlestown		I don't want any tall buildings in Charlestown. It will start to lose its charm. I love that Charlestown has a town feel to it. It doesn't need to be industrialized with large buildings. Also we don't need anymore condos. Parking is already hard enough as it is. Please don't erect any massive high rises
9/20/2023 23:27	I_live_in_Charlestown		The proposed heights at the Bunker Hill Mall are too high- they would overshadow Main St. Traffic and parking in Charlestown is already a nightmare so that needs to be addressed.
9/20/2023 23:51	I_live_in_Charlestown	I'm excited for increased density and height. While of course it can't be absurd, I think building the Boston of the future will require denser and higher buildings.	More green space, in fact personally I would love higher buildings if it meant more green space.
9/21/2023 0:08	I_live_in_Charlestown	It provides more housing at various income levels.	Lower the heights of the buildings! Particularly the Bunker Hill Mall - our small businesses are VERY important to the community and they will be dwarfed by these characterless monstrosities.
9/21/2023 0:17	I_live_in_Charlestown	The city has a spotlight on Charlestown which is great - it's an amazing community.	Consider the resources and needs of the people of Charlestown rather than the interest of expansion. Allow the community a seat at the table.
9/21/2023 0:22	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		Building heights need to be reduced, and open space preserved for new developments, including but it limited to the Bunker Hill Mall, waterfront development along Medford St, and other areas abutting the original peninsula. The historical character of this town must be preserved! Building heights of 35ft, or 3-4 stores are comp reasonable to allow for growth without swallowing our neighborhood.
9/21/2023 0:54	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	Keep Charlestown zoning laws as they are	No building taller than the buildings are now!!! Keep the charm of our beautiful town.
9/21/2023 0:54	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	Refreshing the space where the existing mall is and modernizing it. Creating additional green space and opening it up to the Main Street.	I would suggest that the height of the buildings match the height of existing buildings on Main Street and limit the amount of space dedicated to residential living.
9/21/2023 0:56	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Not much.	The current proposal would create large shadows in the area and would negatively impact small business in the area as well as the small community feel of Charlestown. Why does this small community need buildings this tall and large?
9/21/2023 0:58	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like in concept thinking about developing the industrial waterfront into homes and public space.	The plans to DOUBLE our population is irresponsible and will choke out what makes Charlestown a desirable place to live. The harm that will come to Charlestown, it's adult, child, a pup residents cannot be overstated for what by all accounts is a short term view of quick increased tax revenue from new construction that will forever change was makes this "one square mile" so attractive to live in. The safety issues regarding congestion, pollution, and traffic will be exponentially worse with this land grab type of development. This is a neighborhood and not a piece of blight to be steamrolled. This development process has been rife with broken trust all along the way, and I urge you to look supporting the voters, constituents, and stakeholders here now and those who will live here in the future. We need to leave this neighborhood better than we found it, not a shadow of what it was or could have been.
9/21/2023 0:58	I_live_in_Charlestown		Limit the building height allowance. Keep main st local and charming.
9/21/2023 1:06	I_live_in_Charlestown		Less of a focus on development and more focus on community. Adding more people, more traffic and high rise buildings without investments in the communities green space, public transportation and schools will further deteriorate the community I have come to love and bring my family up in.
9/21/2023 1:11	I_live_in_Charlestown	N/A	I am concerned that the PLAN as it is currently laid out is a boon for developers while ignoring current and future community members in the process. Charlestown is a small community within Boston and these plans would not only drastically change the character of our community, but also create real issues in terms of increased emergency wait times, increased traffic congestion, less access to public schools, etc. Proceeding with the plan as it currently stands will significantly erode trust with the city, and damage our neighborhood for current and future generations.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 1:11	I_live_in_Charlestown	I think the traffic flow and transport around Sullivan square and the rotary need attention, so I am happy to see progress here. But I am concerned adding additional housing will bring so much more traffic to the area that is already so congested.	I do NOT like the new option to building to 150' in height. Charlestown draws people to this area based on its quaintness, populating the small town with huge building will completely ruin the charm and reason people are drawn to Charlestown.
9/21/2023 1:18	I_live_in_Charlestown	I love the idea of preserving the main sections of Charlestown and NOT building up and above what is currently there (especially on Main Street)	We cannot overcrowd Charlestown. It's already a small town and if more condos are built, it will be too much and no one will have a place to park. We need to preserve the way it currently is and build up by Rutherford with parking garages so it does not take away from our street parking.
9/21/2023 1:19	I_live_in_Charlestown	That the bunker hill mall was removed from the growth area	No tall buildings in Charlestown. Please abide original zonings of heights maximums of 35ft, 50% minimum open spacing requirements, and urban design guidelines.
9/21/2023 1:19	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	N/A	The zoning changes that would allow for buildings that would negatively change this historic neighborhood and overshadow Main Street
9/21/2023 1:30	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like that the city wants to invest in charlestown	I do not approve of the building height limits, how it would cast shadows on the historic district, and block views for many residents and visitors. I would like the Medford street Scraffts lots to be developed for shops and retail but maintain the historic residential feel of Charlestown otherwise.
9/21/2023 1:31	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like a lot of the plans for the Sullivan/Rutherford area. Also appreciate the understanding of neighborhood needs such as laundry, gyms, pharmacies.	Updates to the proposed height allowance for bunker hill mall. This should not exceed 35' as proposed in the original plan.
9/21/2023 1:37	I_live_in_Charlestown		No high rises on Main Street! Let's keep the charm!
9/21/2023 1:44	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>We would like to see an IN PERSON community meeting before anything is approved by the board.</p> <p>We would like the Bunker Hill Mall parcel of land to have to abide by the suggestions from neighborhood organizations in the future. We want the height suggestions from the Preservation Society to be considered.</p> <p>We don't want Charlestown to look like the Seaport.</p>
9/21/2023 1:54	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	Nothing	All of it. This plan does not take any of the people of Charlestown's views, for the future of our town. Not the Mayors town, not the builders town. Our town, the people who live and love this little ONE SQUARE MILE. You will ruin this and drive the people out that love it. This is the most historic part of the city and you want to turn it into another over built apartment ridden area. We have one ambulance and 2 fire houses. There is not even a 24/7 police station. We have schools with waitlists of 30 or more kids long already. One grocery store. Who are the people making these decisions? They aren't the people who actually live here. Enough is enough.
9/21/2023 1:56	I_live_in_Charlestown	Additional green spaces, repurposing of underutilized industrial areas, proposed changes to favor ground level retail in neighborhood shopping districts, simplification of zoning.	Height and density too great in many areas. Have no problem with height along 93, but should step down by Rutherford to match the historic center of town. Not enough consideration for increased congestion caused by proposed density.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 1:58	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown		<p>Please reconsider changing any of the zoning for the Bunker Hill Mall. The current plan already feels like you're building walls up around the neighborhood. The character, charm and preservation of the town is diminishing with these proposals. Seaport, Cambridge Crossing, Assembly square, these are all places of utility, not to grow roots. People don't drive through and appreciate the charm. The roadways can barely handle the traffic now before you have started 425 Medford or the Rutherford/Hood Park expansion. The T is not an option for us to get to work. And parking is filling up. You were able to prevent Rutherford/Hood park residents from parking permits but how do you prevent this. No one wants the nightmares of Southie and parking.</p> <p>It's like we haven't learned anything from these major developments i.e, seaport and Cambridge crossing, assembly.</p> <p>Thank you, Mike</p>
9/21/2023 2:00	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown		No high rises!!!! Traffic in and out of the neighborhood is bad enough as is. Adding high rise condos or office spaces will not only ruin the history of Charlestown but will make driving that much more difficult!
9/21/2023 2:22	I live in Charlestown	This drastically changes the look and feel of our neighborhood. This is absolutely not needed.	The height absolutely can't change from the existing building
9/21/2023 2:28	I live in Charlestown		Do not build up the bunker hill mall that takes away from historic charlestown
9/21/2023 2:30	I live in Charlestown		<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p>
9/21/2023 3:27	I frequently visit Charlestown	Nothing	I don't like the proposal for high rise buildings in the area. It's a charming quaint area of Boston - which few & far are remaining
9/21/2023 3:44	I live in Charlestown	<p>I support the coastal resilience strategies create a vision for the future of the Charlestown coastline that reduces coastal flood risk, improves connectivity and accessibility, and enhances recreation and public amenities along the Harborwalk.</p> <p>I support enhanced transit hub at Sullivan square and expansion of neighborhood bike lanes.</p> <p>I support the notion to plant more trees.</p> <p>I support the notion to preserve and promote history throughout the neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Where Figure XX is mentioned ie the community garden, I would like to see mentions of ways to expand the garden. I've been on a waiting list for almost two years.</p> <p>There are enough local grocery stores. Market Basket is not far and Trader Joe's is very accessible to Charlestown.</p> <p>I do not support the build of a mall along Main Street. I like that Charlestown is charming, historic, and does not have high rises.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 5:25	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown	I appreciate the effort to think ahead	<p>The plan ignores the impact of traffic on the community. Accessing the Town now during rush hour can be a long and frustrating process akin to getting into an island. The traffic back up (particularly from Cambridge/Prison point bridge) is terrible and the current transport number that assume an enormous increase in public transport with no acknowledgment of the challenges there is not reasonable or achievable</p> <p>The plan lacks public safety considerations largely tied to the traffic and unique "island" footprint of the Town. The lack of ambulance access is alarming.</p> <p>The changes in zoning and allowance of taller buildings disregards the neighbors hoods existing history and charm and will create another West End type urban area and decimate the existing community spirit that brings people here</p> <p>The existing people in the Town (never mind added ones) need more fields for kid sports and open space for community gathering.</p>
9/21/2023 7:35	I live in Charlestown		Reduce the size of the development/zoning for buildings. Our neighborhood is filled with old, historic houses and once there is the ability to build newer/taller buildings it will dwarf those buildings and we will lose the charm and character of Charlestown. The Bunker hill mall proposal for example is too big for our neighborhood!
9/21/2023 9:38	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown	Economic development for Charlestown and access to more restaurants and retail is a must, but not in the way it's being done.	<p>Slow down. While we want development for sustainability of Charlestown and growth with the times, there has to be a better way: listen to the people who live and work in Charlestown. Extend the comment period and actually plan to hear and consider what the community has to say.</p> <p>Establish infrastructure. Basic access and safety needs to be put into place before the development starts. It's not even up to par with the development as it currently exists.</p> <p>Cut the numbers. Commercial real estate occupancy in Boston is at an all-time low. The last thing we need is empty commercial space. Residential developments (non-low income) remain at less than capacity as well.</p> <p>Schools. Where is BPS in this plan? Charlestown already cannot accommodate all of the students who live in the neighborhood. Without a permanent middle school and functional high school, you're forcing residents who choose to live in Charlestown to flee to accommodate basic needs as taxpayers.</p>
9/21/2023 10:00	I live in Charlestown		<p>We do not walk tall buildings and an influx of people in Charlestown. We already do not have the infrastructure to support this and any suggested changes have taken years or aren't getting done. Additionally, we do not want to take the charm of Charlestown away with tall buildings and changing landscape. You are alienating those that live in the community.</p> <p>We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.</p> <p>Fix the issues and stop creating them.</p>
9/21/2023 10:19	I live in Charlestown, I work in Charlestown	I think revitalization to the area is great in small doses. I think small business growth is incredible in the area and has really made a huge difference. However, I do not think large scale commercial buildings or multi family high-rises should be put on maine street.	I do not think that historic Maine street should be changed in anyway with high-rises of commercial or multi family nature.
9/21/2023 11:17	I live in Charlestown	Nothing	Reduce the height of the proposed new buildings on Main Street. Charlestown is a quaint, tight knit community with lots of young families, professionals, pets, etc. We do not need or want a high rise in the bunker hill mall.

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 11:45	I_live_in_Charlestown	I agree with new merchants and retail space but not by creating tall buildings. This will not work for our community	I do not agree with the plan for Main Street to have taller buildings lining the street and destroying the historic neighborhood. There is so much history in this city that we must preserve. The landscape and old architecture would be ruined with this new development. I love the neighborhood feel of the community and building large buildings as proposed would turn this into a large city that would no longer have character
9/21/2023 12:03	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing in its current state	<p>More focus on nurturing and fostering a community as opposed to building buildings that will tower over our historic section of the city / the history in Charlestown should be respected with building plans complementing our community aesthetic</p> <p>Building height and capacity limitations alongside appropriate parking plans / parking is already an issue so additional urban growth will only make matters worse</p> <p>Ways to address increasing traffic into, throughout and out of Charlestown / we already suffer from gridlock and the PLAN will only add further impact and traffic congestion</p> <p>Ways to address safety issues such as unsafe emergency response times emergency service understaffing / we already suffer in these areas so the PLAN will only further exacerbate</p> <p>More green space</p>
9/21/2023 12:38	I_live_in_Charlestown	Very little	The plan gives far too much control to developers while giving little attention the the stresses it will place on already overburdened infrastructure. I'm particularly concerned about traffic and public transportation in a neighborhood where it's very difficult to get in and out during many hours of the day. The plan claims to have addressed those issues but it's unconvincing. Answers from the BPDA have been superficial and show little understanding of or concern for this historic neighborhood.
9/21/2023 12:44	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like the focus on further developing Charlestown	I would like you to keep the charm that Charlestown offers vs making it look like any other city. You have to add parking and expand the ways out of Charlestown. We already have terrible traffic without all of this development
9/21/2023 12:47	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		Respect for the current character of Charlestown. We do not want large commercial buildings, especially on Main St. It doesn't seem the PLAN respects the character and culture of our neighborhood. Please rethink the large, tall buildings planned for Bunker Hill Mall area especially.
9/21/2023 13:12	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>This "plan" falls far short of expectations for a cohesive and safe Charlestown moving forward. I live on Main St, where it moves to 1 way past the liquor store, and traffic is already backed up to in front of my door trying to get into city square.</p> <p>Allowing height increases and potentially 40k new residents into Charlestown is a recipe for disaster. There are not enough schools or parking and emergency services would be at a standstill attempting to serve the residents.</p> <p>The neighborhood and residents strongly oppose this plan.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 13:22	I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>As BHCC celebrates 50 years, we are also aware of the poor condition of the buildings on our Charlestown campus. Our goal is to build new College facilities through a public-private partnership that will support the needs of our students, foster partnerships, and create vibrant, community-connected spaces at little to no cost to the Commonwealth by leveraging the development of our Charlestown campus.</p> <p>While there is much still to be determined about the content of our future campus, at this early stage of planning the College's priority is to preserve development flexibility on the site to maximize a partner's ability to deliver state-of-the-art College facilities.</p> <p>There are several elements of the final draft PLAN that are complementary to our goals, including better integration between campus and the Charlestown neighborhood, the availability of both mixed and institutional uses across campus, and the stepping up of building heights from Rutherford Ave towards I-93.</p>	<p>Density</p> <p>We request restoring the previous draft's FAR of 4.0 to the BHCC campus to be consistent with other PLAN parcels adjacent to I-93. This would also be consistent with the proposed FAR 4.0 and 5.0 around the only other rapid transit station in Charlestown, Sullivan Square.</p> <p>Additionally, we request that the PLAN's housing density bonus eligibility extend to the entire BHCC campus so that the future development may be considered holistically.</p> <p>Height</p> <p>We agree with the principle of stepping heights down towards the neighborhood and up towards the highway, but the current approach to managing those changes is overly prescriptive for a site whose layout has not yet been determined. We request that the BPDA eliminate the sectional height planes between Rutherford Avenue and I-93 to provide more flexibility for the College's future developer partner and the BPDA to sculpt appropriate building heights in concert with planned uses and massing through the PDA process.</p>
9/21/2023 13:51	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>I'm enthusiastic about the concept of enhancing the area's pedestrian and cyclist accessibility, and I believe it's crucial to prioritize safety and sustainability by promoting eco-friendly practices.</p>	<p>I'm not in favor of the proposed height increase. What truly makes Charlestown special is its small-town ambiance. The introduction of high-rises threatens to disrupt the unique character of our community and obstruct our cherished views of the water, trees, and sky. Furthermore, structures of this magnitude alter the overall landscape and potentially change the very essence of our neighborhood.</p> <p>Moreover, the construction of such towering buildings is likely to lead to a population surge. Given our existing traffic woes, I'm concerned that our affection for Charlestown will diminish as a result.</p> <p>While I support the idea of revamping Rutherford Ave, the current outline proposal seems excessive, particularly in light of our existing traffic issues.</p>
9/21/2023 14:13	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	...	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zoning requirements that are based on feedback from CPS. 2. Reduction in building heights along Medford and Rutherford that are consistent with historic character of neighborhood. 3. Preservation of existing tree canopy 4. Expansion of green space 5. Mandate high speed EV chargers in development projects
9/21/2023 14:50	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	I do NOT like.	<p>I would like to see more proposals that are from Charlestown residents and businesses that continue the positive growth we have seen on Main St. We have enough residences and the BH/Medford public housing is a big enough project. Focus on that and do that right before adding more tall buildings to Main St. Didn't the elevated railway come down for a reason!! Green space, outdoor seating. Assembly is a monstrosity and I don't want my home of 20 years to turn into that!!</p>
9/21/2023 14:54	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>Resources in Charlestown are already limited and the community is already underserved. The plan serves to eliminate the great things about the neighborhood like the incredible community feel and small businesses in our one square mile. Instead it exacerbates the existing issues like our access to resources, emergency services, parking, accessible housing for those who have lived here their whole lives. Charlestown wants to stay a neighborhood to raise our families in and not a commercial district.</p>
9/21/2023 14:55	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>I want to preserve the historic feeling of Charlestown, not suppress it with oversized buildings.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 14:58	I_work_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Everything.
9/21/2023 15:02	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Nothing! Shameful.	The plan needs to be historically representative of the existing downtown, including the height of the structure (currently casts a large shadow on the main st.). I cannot believe this is even being considered in its current form. Shameful!!!!
9/21/2023 15:22	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		The Bunker Hill Mall should not be built up to the heights in the current plan! That will ruin the charm of Main Street and the character of the neighborhood. Please keep the heights lower as originally proposed. The plan also does a poor job improving transportation in order to accommodate new construction.
9/21/2023 15:44	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	I appreciate the amount of work and effort the BDPA team has put into the process. I especially like the design guidelines as they support what makes Charlestown, Charlestown.	New development areas are an opportunity to add critical green space in Charlestown and to counteract the impact of adding tall buildings- which will change our microclimate. Instead of a parcel-by-parcel approach to open space, consolidate parcels to allow larger, more useful spaces than patches of grass and pocket parks. Cambridge Crossing consolidated parcels and includes climate-smart greenspaces to dominate the experience of being there. The raised central park decreases the perception of building heights and enhances human scale. Distances between open spaces and buildings are generous, and not 15' patches of grass. Add guidelines about how buildings affect the light. The core of human well-being is in the quality of the light around us. Don't make the days shorter by adding tall buildings in the west, or ruin the first parts of the day by putting them in the east. Please, include guidelines about building massing. Cambridge added it to recommendations, and it works.
9/21/2023 16:33	I_live_in_Charlestown	I brings in more development / amenities.	The zoning allowance lets buildings that are far too tall and out of character to be built on areas such as Main Street by the Bunker Hill Mall. There has to be some kind of middle ground.
9/21/2023 16:33	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown		The height of the proposed plan casts a huge shadow on the sunny shops on the other side of the street. Does not fit the quaint small scale buildings in Charlestown. Materials should also match the existing bricks across the street.
9/21/2023 17:05	I_live_in_Charlestown	I support this plan in full.	Nothing
9/21/2023 17:25	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Increased housing density, bike lanes.	More housing density. Even taller buildings, please.
9/21/2023 17:52	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Dont do it. The one square mile has enough high rises and big buildings.
9/21/2023 18:16	None_of_the_above	Test	Test
9/21/2023 18:32	I_live_in_Charlestown	More housing, more bike lanes, most pedestrian friendly walkways, more trees/green spaces, additional grocery store since WF is unaffordable.	More work on sullivan square traffic, public transit, protected bike lanes. Something to help encourage local/family ownership of new developments vs large private developers. Focus on families so people don't have to move when they have children
9/21/2023 18:41	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown		PLEASE don't build up Main Street. The small businesses that make this community so special will be lost. Please please rethink the height limit on buildings in Charlestown to help keep the charm.
9/21/2023 19:08	I_live_in_Charlestown	The proposals/recommendations for public schools, particularly the suggestion that WP be a K-6.	Limitations on building height in the "original peninsula" zone. Recommendations made by the Charlestown Preservation Society were seemingly ignored, especially with respect to the Austin Street mall.
9/21/2023 19:09	I_live_in_Charlestown		Lower buildings heights, realistic population, public transportation improvements to support population, address parking challenges, RESPECT THE HISTORIC TOWN - we cannot have the proposed developments and maintain the historic character of the town with the current proposal. Is it impossible. This is not seaport and plan needs to change
9/21/2023 20:07	I_work_in_Charlestown,I_frequently_visit_Charlestown		Safer streets, more bike lanes, denser housing

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 9/5/23 - 9/21/23

CreationDate	What is your relationship to Charlestown?	What do you like about the draft PLAN: Charlestown?	What would you like to see changed in the draft PLAN: Charlestown?
9/21/2023 20:13	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown,I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	<p>Building Heights Build up. History is important, but the CVS and the yoga studio are not historical landmarks.</p> <p>Bike Infrastructure</p> <p>Traffic Reduction</p> <p>Increased Housing</p> <p>Increased Outdoor Space</p>	More amenities, for all times of day (restaurants, bars, music studios)
9/21/2023 20:16	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like that the plan provides significant density in a previously unused area for housing. I do not believe that the plan should allow for more parking or that the height should be reduced.	I would have liked to see even more density in the plan and a larger focus on bike/MBTA transit.
9/21/2023 20:23	I_live_in_Charlestown,I_work_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Come up with a plan that shows you're listening to a word CURRENT RESIDENTS are saying, not anticipating and designing for people with more money than we currently bring the city.
9/21/2023 20:24	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Improved access to bike lanes	<p>The city should build more protected bike lanes with physical separation from the road. It should also improve connectivity to East Boston for bikes.</p> <p>Additional housing being built would also be good, even without parking minimums.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Date of Comment	Comment
9/6/2023	<p>“We are at a critical point of losing so many species from local ecosystems that their ability to produce the oxygen, clean water, flood control, pollination, pest control, carbon storage, etc, that is, the ecosystem services that sustain us, will become seriously compromised.” -Douglas W. Tallamy, Tallamy’s Hub, homegrounnationalpark.org Dear PLAN: Charlestown team, While I applaud the scope and depth of Plan: Charlestown, I found one glaring omission: there is no mention of protecting or preserving nature. As I recognize that this document is for expanding the built environment in an urban neighborhood, at this time when we are becoming increasingly informed how human settlements have negatively impacted earth, it seems essential to not take any natural ecosystems’ survival for granted. Discussion of open space and green infrastructure is incomplete without inclusion of this topic. Nature not only will protect the neighborhood from rising water and temperature but will also mitigate air pollution, allow us to grow food and improve overall health. Measures for protecting and preserving our wildlife will also provide a valuable opportunity for environmental education. Now and in the future, we need to grow an informed population that understands the importance of nature. It is not an overstatement to suggest our future survival as a species depends on this knowledge. It should be noted that compared to the other neighborhoods mentioned in Plan: Charlestown, our community is unique as it is bound by the ocean and two rivers making it a desirable destination for many avian species. As a coastal community it is part of the eastern seaboard migratory route. As an example, a few years ago I decided to track how many bird species I have seen just on my one block-long street. Native song birds, raptors and waterfowl are on this list. I am currently up to 52 species. Most of these were visitors that stayed only a few days or weeks in the spring or autumn, but nonetheless I expect the list to grow as long as we support an environment in which they can survive. Just by protecting birds in our environment we will retain a thriving ecosystem that will provide many overlapping co-benefits that will enhance the quality of life for all Charlestown residents. There are two very important ways in which we can protect wildlife in Charlestown that need to be outlined in the Plan: • Provide food for wildlife by planting native plant species in green areas including trees, shrubs and plants. Native trees, particularly keystone species such as oaks, provide insects and fruit necessary for sustaining bird populations. The green loop proposed in the Plan is an excellent opportunity to create a life-sustaining landscape while providing recreational enjoyment for all residents. • Protect birds from striking windows by promoting bird safe design strategies and a future plan to incorporate these into our zoning code. Hi-rise building facades are a particular concern for migrating birds. Without addressing this issue, we will inadvertently increase the number of birds wiped out each year, threatening even more avian species with extinction. Healthy ecosystems are necessary for providing natural resources needed for sustaining all life. An urban plan such as this one offers an outstanding opportunity to address this urgent topic. It is an opportunity that we cannot afford to miss. Sincerely, Christine Cavataio 15 Oak Street Charlestown, MA RESOURCES: American Bird Conservancy, https://abcbirds.org Grow Native Massachusetts, https://www.grownativemass.org https://homegrounnationalpark.org</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Mr. Ruggiero:

BPDA's "PLAN: Charlestown" is a terrible redevelopment that will overburden infrastructure and probably ruin this very old neighborhood with reflective skyscrapers and unrelenting traffic jams. Many of the effects of this plan have not received serious consideration and some have had no consideration at all (eg, simply assuming a 50% increase in use of public transit! fn) We Charlestown neighbors have cooperated earnestly and at considerable effort in the BPDA's process. We've had years of dialog and received so many promises. Now it looks like that was all a lie and a costly distraction. BPDA is simply ignoring the recommendations of engineers and planners. The only way to account for this is some form of corruption between BPDA and the developers.

V/r, Kevin Barron

fn - Just imagine bringing in a couple of thousand new residents with Range Rovers and Expeditions and expecting them to take the 93 bus (not in million years).

KEVIN L. BARRON, ESQ.

9/7/2023 [...]

Dear Mayor Wu,

The Charlestown Neighborhood Council objects to the approval of the draft PLAN:Charlestown before in-person community meetings are held in Charlestown. The attached letter outlines our position. We look forward to working with you to create a community centered, transparent approval and close-out process.

Sincerely,

Tom Cunha, Chair

9/8/2023 Charlestown Neighborhood Council

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

An impressive, comprehensive body of work overall! Thank you for listening to community feedback and for the recent adjustments, esp. regarding Bunker Hill Mall. Prioritizing higher density around MBTA stations is good but not at the expense of neighborhood livability, incl. sunlight, sky view, human scale. - Regarding the Medford Street development, I would call for respecting the small-scale residential character across Medford Street by stepping down height and massing there, in addition to the Chapter-91-influenced stepping down toward the waterfront. - Regarding climate and heat, consider recommending PV-solar shade structures atop existing and new large-scale parking lots, similar to Roxbury Community College lot, in addition to recommendation for white roofs atop buildings. - In the Preservation chapter (p. 63), please illustrate one or two examples of the neighborhood's smaller-scale framed structures, e.g., workers' cottages, two- and three-deckers, in addition to the somewhat grander masonry rowhouses already included. - Thank you for acknowledging that preservation is a priority as well as a concern (p. 63); thanks as well for clarifying the NDOD recommendations, p. 68. - Responding to the call (p. 73, bullet point #3) for new locations for public art, I have long dreamt of a prominent Navy Yard Workers' statue at, say, the head of Dry Dock #2! Other public-art ideas could honor lesser-known people and places in Charlestown's history: Samuel Morse, Tufts family, Frothingham family legacy (early American furniture; first Mayor of Charlestown, author of History of Charlestown) -- and even the whimsically notorious "Loopers"! - Regarding open space as well as mobility, I suggest expanding the "evaluate skewed intersections" item for Main Street at Austin Street to include consideration of visually expanding 'Preservation Park' southward by repaving in brick/granite, adding safety bollards, etc. Keep the road spur open but give it a pedestrian character. - Regarding the Charlestown Branch Library, recommend ways to better-utilize the existing (building and garden) space, e.g., rooftop PV solar, garden and/or program space. Consider as well, future connections between the Library and the redeveloped Bunker Hill Mall -- an enhanced crossing, a pedestrian bridge..? - Regarding land use (Ch. 3 scenarios, maps on p. 119, also p. 207), consider extending "good location for commercial" (and/or mixed-use) further north along Main Street, acknowledging Louis Mian and (underutilized) Santander branch parcel. - Regarding the design guidelines, why were mansard roof references deleted? C'town has buildings with original and added (incl. our house!) mansard roofs; I think that the key point here is that new-construction mansards must be done WELL, with appropriate details and proportions -- not fake and/or pastiche. - Regarding masonry materials, it's true that historic brick and mortar patterns can be difficult to replicate but the range of "modern building materials" should continue to include masonry. As with roof forms, new masonry in a historic context must be approached deliberately as well as "carefully." - Regarding facade alterations, I agree wholeheartedly with the directive that "Vinyl windows will not be allowed." Can we back this up with reference to the environmental costs and relatively short service life of PVC/vinyl, in addition to the historic inappropriateness? - Regarding shutters, can we (also) use the more-correct term "blinds"? Considering louver blinds, perhaps we can also cite the need for correct orientation of the louvers. - Little typos(!): p. 58 National Park Service, not "Nation"; p. 66 Phipps Cemetery, not "cemetery"; p. 70 National Park Service, not "Parks..." Thanks again.

9/10/2023

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

<p>9/10/2023</p>	<p>As a 19+ year resident of Charlestown I would like to express my opposition to the proposed PLAN CHARLESTOWN.</p> <p>The proposal includes over 10 million additional square feet of building space over the 2019 regional plan. How was this significant increase justified?</p> <p>The new building's height has also been increased significantly. The original proposal limited new buildings around the Bunker Hill mall to 3 stories and 5 stories on Austin St. and Rutherford Ave. Also, the Medford St. plans show building heights over 120' which is more than planning recommendations. How were these increases justified?</p> <p>Another aspect of the plan is a personal vehicle reduction of 50%. A significant reduction of this magnitude is not realistic. Again, what study or data supports this reduction?</p> <p>Charlestown is one square mile. We cannot support population growth as significant as this plan proposes. The roads in and out consist of only 3. Two are single lane and no speed limit is over 30 MPH.</p> <p>The BPDA has issued inconsistent recommendations for approval of proposed developments that ignore the preservation of historic buildings. Examples include:</p> <p>1-2 Thompson Square addition was recommended for approval despite the project's requirements to demolish portions of the historic mansard roof line. The 10 Thompson Square project was recommended for approval with insufficient off-street parking required of buildings with over 6 units.</p> <p>I ask that you stop this new version and return to the original plans. Reduce the square footage, reduce the building heights, preserve the historic building, and respect our community.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jackie Trudel</p> <p>Resident of Charlestown</p>
<p>9/11/2023</p>	<p>Hi Jason:</p> <p>The General Comments document is defective. Text is chopped off at the bottom of 3 pages of the 33-page document: pages 13, 14, and 16.</p> <p>FYI, I obtained the document by clicking on:</p> <p>"PLAN: Charlestown General Comments Received 7/28/23 - 9/6/23"</p>
<p>9/12/2023</p>	<p>What is the total possible square footage build out for the industrial areas? I feel like that's one number we need to get right. Everyone is all over the place.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Good Morning Jason, We here in the Warren Street and Park Street area of City Square do not want our present property rights diminished by changing the CONDITIONAL USE to an ALLOWED USE for LARGE RESTAURANTS -----We presently have Tatte, Prima, Blackmoor and Sorreles all within 100 feet of our residences ----- and the presently empty and unused Ironside -----which in March 2020 filed plans to increase its capacity from 85 to 225 plus the 40 outside dining area -----the ISD zoning inspector approved the plan in error and the day after he approved it he had to review his initial decision and reverse it to denied ----- Last evening the Chief in his opening remarks stated that the PLAN will prevent "ONE OFF DEVELOPMENT"--- well removing the CONDITIONAL USE designation for large restaurants certainly appears to be a " ONE OFF" -----in reviewing your zoning tables LARGE RESTAURANTS are the only type of business that are receiving this "ONE OFF" change in use ----- the removal of the CONDITIONAL USE prevents the abutters from protecting their property and the peaceful enjoyment of our homes ----- We have no objection to large restaurants (over 2500 sq ft) in other sections of the Town as they may be needed and we fully expect that the owners of the Ironside will be filing another set of plans in the near future and the removal of the CONDITIONAL USE designation for large restaurants greatly impacts and diminishes the direct next door abutters from negotiating with the proponents to protect the peaceful enjoyment of our homes. Astrid Walker-Steward last evening stated that the proposed zoning changes were MINOR ---well they are NOT MINOR ----they are MAJOR changes as to LARGE RESTAURANTS and this must be corrected back to CONDITIONAL USE for large restaurants at least for the City Square Area This "ONE OFF" for the restaurant industry especially in City Square does not sit well with us -----and it could be interpreted as a way around the abutters in the City Square area. We hope that is not so and therefor we want the "CONDITIOAL USE" for large restaurants to be left in our zoning by laws for the City Square area

Thank You and please advise me as soon as possible that our zoning will not be changed for the restaurant industry.

Ken Flynn

[...]

9/12/2023

I wondered why the PLAN filesize was so large.
It is 107 Mb. I used acrobat pro to save it as "reduced file size" and the result was 22Mb. It looks the same.

Just a suggestion. If your editor doesn't want to do that you could point out the 12 largest images:
(attached file " Large Images list.pdf").

Those stand out. The median filesize of all the images is only 0.1Mb

9/12/2023 Smaller files seem more accessible.

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Hello,

The PLAN:Charlestown design contains many positive aspects for residents, businesses and tourists. I am writing this email to voice my concern over the zoning changes proposed in PLAN:Charlestown. Specifically the impact to the historic character of the town and the impact to quality of life for current residents from increased density and building heights.

This plan compromises one of the historic neighborhoods of the country in an irrevocable way. Boston is one of the oldest cities in America, and certain neighborhoods, including Charlestown, are cherished for their colonial character and remind visitors of a livable European city. Key factors in this comparison are walkability/bikeability, access to center city, public transportation and low-rise residential areas. PLAN:Charlestown encourages the first three and threatens the fourth. Let's do what many cities in Europe have done over the centuries to preserve their historic areas - limit the maximum building heights to 90 feet (8 stories). It's commonplace. There aren't many neighborhoods in the entire US that compare with Charlestown, Beacon Hill, Bay Village, North End, South End, etc. Please don't take a near term view on this for economic development. It is an obligation for all of us to maintain the historic nature of these neighborhoods for future generations in a way that 150' (14 story) structures will fail to do.

In addition, the increased density will further aggravate an already difficult traffic situation in the greater C-town area.

Please reconsider the density and building heights in PLAN: Charlestown. The current and future residents of Charlestown will thank you. The commuters to/from Charlestown will thank you. The 4 million visitors per year that spark their imagination along the Freedom Trail, patronize our businesses, and recommend it to their network...they will thank you too.

Regards,

9/13/2023 Nate Nottke

Jay,

Per the document, I see the stated objective of the plan is to at a min retain the current secured open space ratio of 2.5 acres per 1000 residents. With the projected increase of residents to 30K, my math shows we would need to add roughly 40 additional acres of open space to simply maintain that current ratio.

Can you confirm my math is correct and how does the city plan to accomplish this?

Thanks,

9/13/2023 Tim

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Dear Mayor Wu, Chief Jemmison, Councilor Coletta, Representative Ryan, Mayor's Rep Breen, and BPDA Representative Ruggiero;

I was born and raised in Charlestown and have lived here for 29 years. I am very concerned with the development density proposed by PLAN: Charlestown. It is way too big.

While I support reasonable development in Charlestown, the heights and densities proposed in PLAN: Charlestown are overwhelming, and do not respect the scale of the historic residential neighborhood or our historic waterfront. I'm appalled at the proposal. A few details about why I am horrified of the plan:

Buildings along the Mystic River (425 Medford) should mediate between the Medford Street residential scale of 3-4 stories AND the scale of industrial buildings of 6-8 stories.

Buildings along the I-93 Edge should be tall enough to block views of I-93 & create a neighborhood edge, but NO TALLER than 120 feet.

Buildings at Sullivan Square should be the same scale of our historic industrial buildings on Cambridge & Alford Streets, and be no taller than what has been approved at Hood Park.

Broad sites with multiple properties within the same ownership should be required to be Master Planned. Developers have not included the massive parking lot as part of their vision – we will continue to view this eyesore for years to come, and it will be locked from public use on weekends.

The three priorities of the plan should be Charlestown residents' public safety, quality of life, and historical preservation of Charlestown.

I would request that more time be provided for community review.

Best,

9/14/2023 Rachel Wolsfelt

Hi Jason.

I'm writing to you because I am fed up with the NIMBY negativity of my Charlestown neighbors who claim that every Charlestown resident is fearful about the plans for the Constitution Inn re-development into low-income housing. I have contacted my elected representatives to let them know that Boston needs more housing units, and that an unused empty space is just waiting to serve. They all told me that the development is opposed by Charlestown residents. Not true!

Please know that there are residents in Charlestown who want this development, who see the need for more housing, and who are not afraid of change. I urge you to continue the quest for more affordable housing and for more compassion for those in difficult straits.

9/14/2023 Dr. Maureen McCoy

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/15/2023	<p>Dear Elected Officials:</p> <p>Please note that my family and I; life long Bostonians, strongly oppose the draft PLAN Charlestown and related zoning code changes. Charlestown is losing its historical charm and neighborhood feel daily due to the constant building, traffic, etc. This revised plan to increase the square footage and height is, at the very least, irresponsible, reckless and completely unnecessary. The only people that will benefit are those that will profit financially; which is not the Charlestown Community at large. This lunacy has to stop and an in person meeting is a must! We the people who live in this community pay your salaries therefore, at the very least deserve an in person meeting to discuss.</p> <p>Emily Flanagan [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>Mayor Wu:</p> <p>As a Charlestown resident I am a supporter of your administration and I voted for you.</p> <p>In 2019, you stated on WGBH that the Boston Planning and Development Agency is woefully unprepared for the challenges facing this great cityand continues to exist because it's a concentration of political power.</p> <p>I agreed with your comments in 2019 and we are now witnessing the BPDA about to make yet another decision, influenced by political interest groups, which is not in the best interests of, nor supported by, the majority of your constituents in the Charlestown community.</p> <p>Accordingly, I urge you to please reconsider the PLAN Charlestown as revised on September 6.</p> <p>Louis Slaughter</p>
9/20/2023	<p>Mayor Wu,</p> <p>I am a supporter of your administration but concerned you and your office are pushing through PLAN Charlestown, revised on September 6, without the support of the Charlestown community. As you must be aware, The Neighborhood Council, The Preservation Society, local businesses and many, many residents like myself oppose this Final Draft and feel our significant concerns are being ignored.</p> <p>The future of Charlestown is at stake and we deserve a process that will give us responsible, sustainable development in harmony with the character of our town, addresses the impacts of climate change and improves our quality of life.</p> <p>Janet Logan [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>Hi Jason,</p> <p>I'm seeing a lot of stuff on Intstagram about PlanCharlestown allowing for 150 ft buildings on Main Street via the Bunker Hill Mall. I am generally pro development. I know the solution to unaffordable housing is more housing, and I like the idea of apartments on the Austin Street lots and in Hood Park. But a giant building on Main Street is just too much. Even for me. You guys don't do this stuff to the Back Bay. Please stop doing it to us.</p> <p>If this is really part of PlanCharlestown, then I'm going to have to oppose PlanCharlestown. I have resisted so much of the anti-plan noise until now. But I adore Mockingbird and Junebug and Monroe. And if they are concerned about this - then so am I.</p> <p>Charlotte</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>William Woodruff</p> <p>[...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Bill ceglarski</p> <p>[...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mark Svevar [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>Hi Jason,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable and will drastically impact our neighborhood.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Alexandra Fonseca [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jeff Zettel [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Evan Jones [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jennifer Zinner [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable. We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Mary Young [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>Please keep our neighborhood special and homey!!! It's a small town in the middle of a big city and it's what makes it the most special place to live and raise our family!</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Jen Martin [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>Keep Charlestown cute, and fix the parking situation and traffic in/out of town before you develop and bring more people here!!!</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Stephanie Roch</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Evan Brett</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Hello-

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,
Jessica McNiff

9/20/2023 [...]

Jason - I'm sure you've gotten the below canned email re: opposing the current plan many times by now. In short, I also oppose it for the below reasons but also because it's a half-assed plan cooked up by people that the results won't affect. The city's time is better spent understanding what Charlestown's residents' issues are and then working to address them. Until then, screw this plan.

Mike

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,

Mike O'Connell

9/20/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Amanda Kachinsky [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Mike Gould [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Kate Curro & Chris Colarusso [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jake Spiak Pearl Street, Charlestown</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>James Gironda [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Vanessa Poirier MSN, FNP-C [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Casey Porter [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>[Samantha Kussmann Gildea] [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Deidre Collins [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/20/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kyle O'Sullivan [...]</p>
9/20/2023	<p>Dear Jason Ruggiero,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Chris Zirpoli [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kristen Neily [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you Erin Doherty Evers [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>Chloe Kimball [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>Jason,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Lisa Novak 10yr Charlestown Homeowner</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jennifer Luring [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>Jason - We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Matt Katz [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Mayor Wu,

You've been outspoken about your desire to "Reform the Boston zoning process to meet community needs." Now is your chance.

Charlestown demand and deserve transparency, and we're asking for your help.

Our community has spent years participating in a collaborative "PLAN Charlestown" process. Jason (cc) has been involved throughout, perhaps starting most notably with a community meeting at the Charlestown Public Library on August 19th, 2019. That was a contentious start, but both sides have worked in good faith for four years to produce a framework that meets the needs of the community and promotes sensible growth and development. Most of us are NOT anti-development. We just want to make sure we're not steamrolled by massive checkbooks from outside money and influence.

The most recent iteration of PLAN Charlestown throws out four years of community engagement and collaborative planning in favor of a massively lopsided giveaway to New England Development Corp. We can only conclude that a backroom deal was made between someone at City Hall and NEDC leadership.

This plan allows for building height and mass 2/3 the size of the Encore Casino right on Main St. This doesn't make sense even in the most aggressive development scenarios. This current PLAN must be halted, and we all need an explanation of how and why these changes have been introduced. None of this aligns with your principles for city planning and "empowering all voices."

Respectfully,

David Garlough

Charlestown Resident & Business Owner (Monroe Home)

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Anna Snook [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>Jason,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN:</p> <p>Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Kathryn Scahubhut [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

> We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

>

> We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

>

> This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

>

> Thank you,
Tiffany Michalak

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Roberta & Edmund Freeman

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Tracy Engels [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Rebecca A. Morin [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>I am writing in support of PLAN: Charlestown. I do not believe the plan is perfect and I think it involves a certain amount of wishful thinking, but on the whole I believe it embodies a sane approach to updating the zoning for our neighborhood, protecting the historic core, and promoting necessary, and frankly inevitable, growth. I would like to commend the BPDA for their years' long community engagement and their receptiveness to revising the plan in response to local feedback. I do not think we should let the perfect be the enemy of the good, especially when that good represents a drastic improvement on the status quo.</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,

Kelli Gille -Forbes

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Kelli Gillen-Forbes

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Julia Gaynor Charlestown resident</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>J.J. Gilmartin</p>
9/21/2023	<p>As there seems to be a concerted effort in the Town to generate a slew of pre-written emails against the plan, I thought I would add my two cents here in favor of the plan so you don't think everyone here is against. I took the time to read the plan from front to back, so I feel educated what is in it. I realize the potential burdens caused by the new development, but I also see the need for more housing - and particularly affordable housing - in Boston. We can't just stick our heads in the sand and ignore the demographics and the needs of the greater community of Boston.</p> <p>I found the plan to be fair and balanced in most ways — not perfect, but waiting for perfect is not a solution. Thanks to all the public servants who put in the work to get us this far. I trust you will carry it forward through the execution phase with similar effort, concern and care.</p> <p>Dave Horton</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Sharlene Cahill [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Lindsay Flood [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Lindsay Flood</p> <p>[...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>Dear Mayor,</p> <p>Please press pause on PLAN Charlestown and tell your team at the BPDA to do planning in partnership with the community. The process thus far has ignored community input, instead highlighting trivial concessions about parks and shuttles. The BPDA streamrolled this historic community and it clear you and your team do not value community input.</p> <p>In particular, while removing the Bunker Hill Mall from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown is a good start - your team's track record indicates this is but a bait and switch. The BPDA should remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. Right now the BPDA will just return in a month with the same outlandish heights.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>This process makes me question your administration's approach to policy and community engagement across the board.</p> <p>Ryan Gavin Charlestown</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Shannon Lynch [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Jessica Brodie [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Allison Weber [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Mallory Gonzalez [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>Dear Mr. Ruggiero,</p> <p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we do not want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford Street is unacceptable and will negatively impact the quality of life in Charlestown.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines. This should be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you, Quincy Kayton [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility and abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

PLEASE do not ruin the charm of our neighborhood! We feel like this entire thing has been a bait and switch situation! Every family that has chosen to make Charlestown their home, has made sacrifices to stay in this neighborhood because the pros have always outweighed the cons. But this plan has the potential to turn our charming, historic neighborhood into an overcrowded mile of skyscrapers. NO THANKS!!! Please don't break your promises to us!

Thank you,

Janna & Ryan Donohue
(16 year residents)

9/21/2023 [...]

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,

Maggie Moriarty

9/21/2023 [...]

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Julia Rabkin [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Colby Cahill [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>J.J. Marshall and Liz Whiteley [...]</p>
9/21/2023	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Jennifer Smartt [...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,

Jenn Kelley

9/21/2023 [...]

As a resident of Charlestown who wants to see our neighborhood improve, I wanted to submit my general support for Plan: Charlestown. It's not perfect, but I believe it moves us in a positive direction towards a brighter future for our neighborhood. Building Heights The biggest topic of consternation, a lot of residents are concerned about the effect that tall buildings at the Bunker Hill Mall will have on the historic character of our neighborhood. One of my favorite parts of Charlestown is the history that flows through so many of these streets, so I would like to preserve that character whenever possible. That being said, I don't recall William Prescott gazing upon I93 over the rooftops of CVS Pharmacy or Dunkin' Donuts before attempting to repel the British, so I think we can safely build up that lot and add some desperately needed housing stock without removing any important history from the neighborhood. This also goes for the industrial areas of Charlestown, as well as the dilapidated Austin Street lots. Those lots seem like one of the biggest wastes of space in the city, sitting next to two T stations, TD Garden, and the North End. A housing development there with some bike paths and sidewalks would be amazing. Traffic Traffic certainly is an issue at a few key intersections (basically anything that New Rutherford Ave touches), as many of my fellow residents have pointed out. As such, we should improve those problem intersections, while encouraging more people to take advantage of our compact neighborhood by improving sidewalks, adding separated bike lanes, and generally advocating for the improvement of the T system. I would actually also support the addition of parking garages in new buildings, if we removed resident permit parking at a 1:1 ratio (excluding some additional parking for the new residents of the buildings). We need some street parking for our local businesses, but one of the greatest benefits of Charlestown is how a car is not needed for day to day life. Anyone who wants to drive a car daily in an environment that supports heavy car usage can take advantage of 95% of the rest of the country that is car-focused, including most of the rest of this state. Open Space We definitely need more public open space, including sports fields, courts (pickleball, tennis, etc.) and perhaps a dog park. Late-Night Food/Drink We could use more late-night food and drink options, especially if more people end up moving in. This is partly limited by the draconian liquor licensing regime in place at the city and state levels, but more food options after 9pm would be great. We need way more housing in this and every neighborhood in Boston to meet demand, more amenities in our neighborhood, and safer ways of navigating it. Don't let the vocal minority drown out the majority of people that support a better future for our neighborhood.

9/21/2023

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

<p>9/21/2023</p>	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start.</p> <p>Why is there an obsession to jam a huge building in every open inch of space? Can't we respect the historic 35' height limit?</p> <p>We don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Andrew Jay</p> <p>[...]</p>
<p>9/21/2023</p>	<p>We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.</p> <p>We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.</p> <p>This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Gaye Williams</p> <p>[...]</p>

PLAN: Charlestown Emailed Responses - 9/6/23 - 9/21/23

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

This would significantly change our home neighborhood, a place so many of us love so much just the way it is. As a small business owner based in Charlestown and a member of the Charlestown Business Alliance this would seriously impact many of our peers running and operating out of this neighborhood.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

Thank you,

Gaby Levesque

9/21/2023 [...]

From: **Chris Mian** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Sep 4, 2023 at 4:05 PM
Subject: Charlestown Draft Zoning comments
To: astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov <astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov>

Hi Astrid,

I would like to make a few comments in regards to the zoning of our parcel at 547 Rutherford Avenue and 500 Main Street. These parcels are currently zoned industrial, which does not allow for residential (with neighborhood services) to be possibilities for redevelopment of these parcels.

I would like to see the parcels be changed in zoning to mixed use with an increased FAR and height. By allowing the buildings some additional height, development can focus on green space and community integration on the lower levels. These parcels are in close proximity to the T And directly abutting parcels that are slated to have an up zoning to MU-5, the highest density allowed. It would create better urban design transition into the residential neighborhood to have buildings with some greater height and density on our parcel and those adjacent. We would appreciate seeing some type of modifications to the current restrictive use, FAR, and height to allow for the economics to work to redevelop these parcels to a more-favorable community use while incorporating open space and neighborhood services.

Thank you for your considerations to this request.

Regards,

Chris Mian

Sent from my iPad

From: **Kate Kennen** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, Sep 4, 2023 at 4:35 PM
Subject: Comments - Charlestown Rezoning
To: astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov <astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov>

Astrid-

Thank you for the zoning meeting in August. I support the smart growth redevelopment of underutilized industrial parcels near the public transportation. As a landscape architect with our business in Charlestown (right in Sullivan Square), I find this to be a key moment for the city to target growth where it makes most sense!

A few specific comments on the zoning:

There are several existing 'light industrial' zoned parcels around Sullivan Square at the tip of original peninsula that have not been included in the mixed use rezoning. These include 500 Main St, 547 Rutherford Ave (which my husband's family owns), and a few light industrial parcels on Medford St near the intersection of Main St. These should be included in the rezoned mixed-use area, creating a denser 'transition' zone with good open space connections to the residential density in the original peninsula. These current zoning for Light Industrial is no longer appropriate in this location. New mixed use zoning here and would incentivize redevelopment to create better connectivity to the neighborhood and a critical gateway component to the urban design completion of the new Sullivan Square. They have a very short walk-distance to the Sullivan Square T stop and regional transit (less walk distance than many of the parcels in the study area west of Rutherford) and are an ideal place for housing density.

The Teamsters parcel in Sullivan Square is included in the plan as the highest Density MU-5 (FAR 5) and PDA-9- This is very dense development immediately adjacent to the parcels at 547 Rutherford and 500 Main Street which have not been included at all in the rezoning. A better density step-down transition should be made between these adjacent parcels. Without a transition, MU-5 will stand out like a singular building in the middle of a wide-open roadway intersection and an attractive community-scaled fabric will not be created. These current light industrial parcels at 547 and 500 Rutherford should be changed to mixed use and serve as a 'step down' from the highest density immediately adjacent. These parcels may want to be considered as a 'transition zone' to the residential community of the original peninsula.

I lived on Rutherford for over 10 years. It is a wide-open area that needs some height on the west side to create a comfortably scaled public realm. Ideally the rezoning can be included on

these parcels to consider the scale of the wide Rutheford Corridor, especially at this gateway moment to the community.

Kate Kennen, FASLA (she, her)

Offshoots, Inc.

Studio: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

www.offshootsinc.com

From: **Bill Mian** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, Sep 5, 2023 at 12:31 PM
Subject: Proposed Charlestown Sullivan Square plan
To: astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov <astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov>

For 500 Main St and 547 Rutherford Ave should be included in the proposed plan, for the following reasons.

- There are several existing 'light industrial' zoned parcels around Sullivan Square at the tip of original peninsula that have not been included in the study area. These parcels are currently underutilized and would create a critical gateway component to the urban design completion of the new Sullivan Square. They have a very short walk-distance to the Sullivan Square T stop and regional transit (less walk distance than many of the parcels in the study area west of Rutherford) and are an ideal place for mixed-use smart growth, including new residential development to meet the housing needs of the city. These include 500 Main St, 547 Rutherford Ave, and a few light industrial parcels on Medford St near the intersection of Main St. These should be included in the study area and rezoning area, creating a 'transition' zone to the residential density in the original peninsula.
- The teamsters parcel at Sullivan Square, is shown in GREEN on the PLAN Charlestown document, but in the revised draft zoning, is included in the plan as the highest Density MU-5 (FAR 5) and PDA-9- This is very dense development immediately adjacent to the parcels at 547 Rutherford and 500 Main Street- which have not been included in the study area. These light industrial parcels should be changed to mixed use and serve as a 'step down' from the highest density immediately adjacent. These parcels should be considered as a 'transition zone' between the new areas to receive more density and the existing 'preserve' area. All be greater than 3 stories with higher FARs to support redevelopment.
- From an urban design standpoint, the entire belt around the northern tip of historic Charlestown requires a more satisfying urban gateway into the neighborhood and the axis along Bunker Hill Street. Very tall buildings would not be appropriate here, but an incentive to redevelop the light industrial parcels that are currently not included in the study area should be created. The current vacant and underutilized parcels should be incentivized to create a more attractive transition zone to the neighborhood. These parcels should be included in the study area.

- . The light industrial parcels along the east side of Rutherford ave near Sullivan Square should be included in the study area to be incentivized for redevelopment that would have more appropriate scale and community connections.
- This PLAN is the City of Boston and Charlestown's one opportunity to guide sustainable housing development close to the T. The light industrial parcels near Sullivan square at 547 Rutherford Ave and 500 Main Street are closer to the T than many of the parcels in the study area on the west side of Rutherford and area an ideal location for appropriate, mixed- use redevelopment. Redevelopment of these parcels could help connect the existing community through and enhanced open space and pedestrian network alongside appropriately scaled mixed-use redevelopment.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Amanda Zettel** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Sep 13, 2023 at 2:53 PM

Subject: comments on redraft

To: Jason Ruggiero <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>

Hey Jason,

Here is my list for changes / updates that should be made regarding preservation and urban design guidelines. Happy to talk them through if needed.

I will send a second email shortly with some questions around the transportation analysis.

Thanks,

Amanda

- The draft states a goal to further the protection of the historic "original peninsula." It should include the recommendations issued in Charlestown's "Survey Project Completion Report" commissioned by the Boston Landmarks Commission and completed in 1990. Including the following:
 - Districts Meeting qualifications for National Register and Boston Landmark Designation:
 - Town Hill District (already NR)
 - Charlestown Navy Yard (already NR)
 - Monument Avenue District
 - Bunker Hill Monument (Individual Building)
 - Phipps Street Burial Ground (already NR)
 - 57 Bartlett Street
 - 2,3,4 Dexter Row
 - Francis Austin House, 58 High St (already NR)
 - Saint Catherine of Siena Roman Catholic Church Complex
 - Saint Francis De Sales Roman Catholic Church
 - Roughan Hall, 15-18 City Square
 - Districts / Buildings requiring further study
 - Auburn Street / Baldwin Street District
 - Bunker Hill Street District
 - Main Street Commercial District
 - Sullivan Street District
 - Union Street District
 - Washington Street District
 - 33 Brighton
 - 238-240 Bunker Hill Street

- 252 Bunker Hill Street
 - 11 Concord St
 - 56, 60 Elm St
 - 85 Elm St
 - 59-61 Elm St
 - 207-217 Main St
 - 315 Main St
 - 62, 64 Pearl St
 - 89, 91 Pearl St
 - 5 Russell St
 - 1 Seminary St
 - 39 School St
- PLAN: Charlestown should reference and encourage the BLC to commission a Study for **our most recent petition for an Industrial Architectural Conservation District that would preserve some of our heritage buildings for reuse. We need these mentioned in the PLAN so that we are eligible for funding the studies needed to establish districts.** Recommendations to continue the districting process should be included in the 'adaptive reuse' section and implementation chart p 150 and p 221 of the 9/6 draft
- Recommendations are made to "continue the Monument Square Landmark District designation once the study is complete." Should be updated since the study report was completed June 1. The BLC is waiting on the Mayor's office to confirm their nominations for the study committee (waiting 6+ months.)
- I appreciate the BPDA's removal of this parcel from the designated "growth area." However, I ask that the PLAN: Charlestown document include this parcel under the design guidelines established for the "Original Peninsula / Lost Village."
- We ask that the maximum building height for the area between Medford Street and the Mystic River be reset to planners recommendations of 120'.
- Significant changes to off-street parking requirements have been made in the PLAN. Recommendations should be made for a street parking study that looks at how many neighborhood parking permits are issued in each zone compared to how many permits are issued. Consider recommending neighborhood parking permit reform.
- The BPDA's planning recommendations for development projects seeking zoning relief at the Zoning Board of Appeals are not consistent with the changes to the Urban Design Guidelines in PLAN: Charlestown. Specifically when it comes to the placement of garage doors, minimum parking requirements for buildings over 6 units, and rear and side yard set backs. BPDA's recommendations to the ZBA for zoning relief should only recommend approval if a project conforms to these guidelines, and denial if they do not. This language should be included on Page 164, last paragraph. (Page 189, Urban Design Guidelines & Zoning to support design.)
- The National Register district for Monument Square is larger than it is illustrated. There was an expansion that was deemed eligible. Same for the Town Hill district expansion, and Phipps Burial Ground and needs to be indicated as listings on the National Register (Page 59, Image of Map)
- Dormers. (First paragraph) "where there are original dormers at the facade of a structure, they should be preserved. When variances to the NDOD's roofline restrictions

are sought for the facade elevation, the BPDA should recommend denial to the ZBA. (Page 178 revised draft)

- We do not support the reduction of the “rear yard setback” from 25’ to 15’. This reduction increases the allowable building area on sites within the historic neighborhood and reduces permeability and increases density in a neighborhood with low tree canopy and open space. Variances sought for 4 projects out of 2,098 in 3 years does not meet the threshold for a change in zoning. (Data produced through a public information request by CPS and available upon request.) (Page 181, Zoning to Support Design.) I would rather see an elimination of FAR so that people can build out their basements and attics without triggering a violation (I see multiple projects every year with only this variance sought.)

- We need further planning in the form of a Neighborhood-wide electrical plan to replace outdated and unsafe street lights and overhead electrical wires. Please work with Boston Public Works for a recommendation to create a lighting and electrical plan for Charlestown that addresses safety, security, aesthetics, wellness, sustainability, and maintenance. (Page 178, Street Lighting)
 - - This section calls for “arched pendant fixtures” to replace street lighting throughout Charlestown. Most areas in the Original Peninsula are cylindrical post-top gas lantern fixtures (shown on p. 179 as the Wells Bach Gas Lights). To replace them with arched pendant fixtures would be inappropriate, as pendants are typically mounted on higher pole heights with wider spacing and have a much different distribution that is not pedestrian-scale and are not intended for the same applications. Consistency with existing light fixtures should be maintained.

--

~Amanda

Comment Letter for PLAN: Charlestown

From: Kathy Elliott

Long time resident of Charlestown

September 15, 2023

I am writing in **strong opposition** to the entirety of PLAN: Charlestown. The approach and process are flawed, it is a sophomoric exercise that ignores the unique historic character of the neighborhood, has outsized height and density which seriously threaten the attractive livability of the neighborhood, neglects to address infrastructure, emergency services and school seats while estimating an incredible increase in population from 19,273 to 35,000 people. How can this type of growth be projected onto a one-square mile peninsula already suffering from congestion? PLAN: Charlestown defies logic and practicality. I would ask if anyone involved in this plan has ever actually visited Charlestown?

I have more questions than answers:

1. Why has this plan been put forth and why should we comment on Plan: Charlestown when the City is basically admitting the process is flawed and soon to be obsolete?

This is an excerpt from an article in the *Dorchester Reporter* dated May 18, 2023:

"But PLAN: Mattapan may also be among the last of its kind, as city officials say they're shifting away from that style of planning and attempting to remake the way developers and residents interact with City Hall.

"We need more predictability, we need a clear sense of what the rules are, so it's not a frustrating, counterproductive, and exhausting process to see how your neighborhood grows, and we also need to incorporate standards for affordability and transportation access and all of the other quality of life needs that the development process is supposed to really deliver for communities," Wu told Reporter editors in a sit-down inside City Hall last week, days before the BPDA vote on Mattapan.

The neighborhood-by-neighborhood planning process is "not the best vehicle" to get to that point, she said."

PLAN: Charlestown as it is currently presented is lacking in what is being talked about here - there are no standards incorporated for transportation access and other quality of life needs - what a development process "is supposed to really deliver". Of course the city drastically needs housing, but stuffing it wherever it fits without the infrastructure to support more people is not a good approach and this is what the PLANs were supposed to prevent.

The recent emergency session of the City Council discussing the lack of staffing, vehicles and infrastructure for BPD, BFD and EMS to adequately service the City of Boston and its various neighborhoods was eye-opening. In just about every case mentioned regarding lack of service, Charlestown was used as a case-in-point. Our one ambulance, often sent out to other locations, the necessity for a new fire station, and the fact that many 9-1-1 calls are being answered by the North End station which has to navigate over the North Washington Street bridge construction and traffic were all cited as cases in point. We have severely stretched systems and forced overtime leading to poor morale and health risks for first responders.

2. **What happened to the Mayor's promise to abolish the BPDA?** This process is BPDA-driven, shows how much power they still have and the outcome of PLAN: Charlestown is pure status quo - a clear gift to developers and a slap in the face to residents.

3. **Why so much height and so many developments in Charlestown when there is a glut of vacant commercial space in Downtown Boston?** As commercial real estate vacancies soar to over 20%, why not take a holistic approach and guide some of the new development proposals toward the City's financial center and try to fill the unused and underutilized existing space? Why not amend PLAN: Charlestown to account for a potentially serious problem for downtown and try and encourage some shift from the massive development in Charlestown which threatens the character of an historic neighborhood, while existing spaces go underutilized. This is why a more holistic city-wide approach should be considered.

4. **Why would leading neighborhood groups come out in such strong opposition to PLAN: Charlestown?** It should not go unnoticed that the **Charlestown Preservation Society** came out in strong opposition to PLAN: Charlestown. They cite height and density, the characterless nature of what is being proposed and public safety concerns among other. Most telling is the BPDA's reference to "errors in communication". Could it be that the BPDA was neglecting or chose to neglect meaningful neighborhood input?

Likewise, the **Charlestown Neighborhood Council** votes to oppose the Plan decrying the lack of in-person meetings, true community input and involvement and no solutions for infrastructure.

5. **Why is there no representation on the Charlestown IAG by residents of the Navy Yard?** Several of the proposals regarding the Navy Yard are to the detriment of its unique historic character. Why is PLAN:Charlestown not representative of the Navy Yard character and the IAG not have any representation by Navy Yard residents?

An NPS document from 1978 outlines the "envelope" of the Navy Yard and of the transfer to the BPDA and reference to the Act of Congress establishing the Navy Yard as a National Historic Park. This area should not be transformed into another commercial enterprise.

The BPDA has been notorious for its lack of stewardship of valuable Navy Yard assets. This is not addressed at all in PLAN: Charlestown. Why was Pier 4 allowed to deteriorate to the point of an emergency closure? Why has Pier 5 been sitting behind a chain link fence blocking public access while the BPDA ignored maintenance suggestions dating back to 1988? Why is the Harborwalk in such a perpetual state of disrepair? The BPDA collects millions of dollars each and every year in transfer taxes on condo sales, on lease payments on Navy Yard properties and other revenues. Why is there no accountability on how these dollars are spent and if any of this revenue actually is spent on keeping the historic Navy Yard in reasonable shape. Millions of tourists and school groups come to this area every year. It is time the BPDA is held accountable.

PLAN: Charlestown fails to view the Navy Yard and its location as other city's do by recognizing its value in access to healthy open space, supporting tourism and creating a world class destination. Look at the waterfront developments in a city like New York and see the difference in approaches.

PLAN: Charlestown envisions zoning changes that threaten the character of the historic CNY. The recent proposal regarding the Constitution Inn saw a process that bypassed neighborhood engagement having been put forth in secrecy with no neighborhood engagement. Subsequent community meetings were exercises in frustration with the process being halted by the proponents announcing they will not be holding further community meetings and shortly after they filed their Letter of Intent. The proposal for the Constitution Inn will see an influx of residents who will have an high need for medical and other services in an area already stretched thin and highlighted by the City Council hearing as placing residents at risk.

There are many granular details contained in the report, but it is not worth drilling down to those elements when the overall outcome that is being proposed is so wrong, flawed and misguided. Please go back to the drawing board. Please have open meetings in public and please revise this plan to be more reflective of the character of the neighborhood. What is being presented looks like a walled city resembling Assembly Square cutting off the heart of Charlestown.

Thank you for your valuable time in reading this.

Sincerely yours,
Kathy Elliott
Charlestown, MA

September 15, 2023

Mayor Michelle Wu
1 City Hall Square, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02201-2013

To Mayor Michelle Wu:

I have been a Charlestown, MA resident for over twenty-five years and I am writing in opposition to "PLAN CHARLESTOWN."

I have been able to sit and listen to many of the zoom meetings with the Boston Planning and Development Agency (BPDA) with regards to Plan Charlestown and I have been completely baffled that our voices have not been heard. The bureaucracy of the BPDA just undermines our voices and just moves ahead with no concern for the Charlestown residents.

I understand the need for more affordable housing. I do. I work closely with Tom McDonald and the Harvest on Vine food pantry. I have seen the need for simply basic food to be met. However, please note, we have the LARGEST low-income housing development in all New England here on twenty-seven acres of land with almost seven thousand residents in 2700 units. Charlestown more than adequately meets this need.

We live in one square mile and the current PLAN Charlestown will take away not only more green space but increased traffic congestion; increased pollution and take away from the historical character of this community. This is why I moved here over twenty-five years ago. Currently, the plan is to add 20,000 more residents and add fifty massive building on every parcel of land that is left to build on.

I must work for a living and do not have the luxury of being home and playing tennis or pickleball all day. I am a middle-income single resident who was able to afford to get into Charlestown over twenty-five years ago. I have found myself having to leave my house over an hour and a half earlier to get to work appointments just to get out of Charlestown and burn more gasoline to add to more pollution. You do not live here and have no idea how hard the traffic and congestion already is. It is absurd to think that adding more massive buildings into Charlestown and to be told by the BPDA that the new population of residents now do not own cars. They do. Families are moving into Charlestown. They need a car. It is foolish to think that the Gen Z population is moving here to live. They cannot afford to live here so I am done with hearing the line that people do not buy cars anymore. Do you know what, they do, and we are seeing a lot of them especially considering the broken train system.

Is there a reason that the Seaport area, The Back Bay area, Roslindale is not being faced with such incredible demands of overdevelopment? We need to protect our community and I fear we will not be able to. I am hoping my letter will shed light on your office and the BDPA to re-think this disastrous plan.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Lisa Talbot

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

CC: Arthur Jemison, BPDA

September 18, 2023

Mayor Michelle Wu

1 City Hall Square, Suite 500

Boston, MA 02201-2013

Dear Mayor Wu:

I have been a Charlestown, MA resident for over 20 years and I am writing in opposition to “PLAN CHARLESTOWN.”

I have been on many of the Zoom meetings with the Boston Planning and Development Agency (BPDA) with regards to Plan Charlestown and am completely baffled that our voices have not been heard. The bureaucracy of the BPDA undermines us and just moves ahead with no concern for the Charlestown residents.

I understand the need for more affordable housing. I volunteer with Tom McDonald and the Harvest on Vine food pantry. I know the need for basic food to be met. However, please note, we have the LARGEST low-income housing development in New England here on twenty-seven acres of land with almost seven thousand residents in 2700 units. And the reality is, most of the growth being proposed is NOT low income housing.

We live in one square mile and the current PLAN Charlestown will take away not only more green space but increase traffic congestion, increase pollution and take away from its historical character. This is why I moved here instead of the North End 20 years ago. Currently, the plan is to add 20,000 more residents and 50 massive buildings on every parcel of land that is left to build on.

I work and am a middle-income resident who was able to afford Charlestown over 20 years ago. The traffic going in and out of Charlestown to go 1 mile is ridiculous now. It is absurd to think that adding more massive buildings into Charlestown won't cause congestion and to be told by the BPDA that the new population of residents will not own cars. Families are moving into Charlestown. They need a car. It is foolish to think that the Gen Z population is moving here to live. They cannot afford to live here and it is untrue that people do not buy cars anymore. Example; people need cars to go grocery shopping because there's no affordable grocery store within walking distance of Charlestown and, with no car, when people do need a car to get somewhere, there will be Ubers all over the place, taking up parking and adding to traffic. The expectation that people will not have cars is UNREALISTIC and frankly, assuming we are stupid to agree with the statement that traffic and congestion will not worsen.

Please re-think this disastrous plan. Any development proposed needs to be scaled way back (I'd suggest by 50%) AND include parking above or below the proposed developments, keep within the character of the neighborhood AND better the community by providing safe walkways, more lighting and green space.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tracy Yemma

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



- CCarthur.jemison@boston.gov
- gabriela.coletta@boston.gov
- dan.ryan@mahouse.gov
- sean.breen@boston.gov
- jason.ruggiero@boston.gov
- info@charlestownpreservation.org
- Mayor@Boston.gov

To: Jay Ruggiero (BPDA, PLAN: Charlestown)

Comments on PLAN: Charlestown Final Draft (7/28/23)

I have lived in Charlestown for over 25 years and have been a homeowner for 22 of those years. To many of my neighbors, I am a newcomer, but I have grown to love this neighborhood and this city. This is a safe, family-oriented community where people watch out for each other and care about where they live. I have been involved in many of the PLAN: Charlestown meetings and am disappointed to see that many components of PLAN: Charlestown do not reflect the voices of the people of Charlestown.

Development in Charlestown is occurring at an alarming rate. I am fully in favor of developing underutilized areas. It is better to have attractive, welcoming spaces than unsightly parcels that are not being maintained. This development, however, must benefit the community and address challenges for the current residents. PLAN: Charlestown does not do this and sets us on a path that is increasingly irresponsible and will diminish the quality of life in Charlestown for future generations.

We lack **basic resources** for our current population, which is already trapped in the neighborhood due to unbearable **traffic congestion**. This is before the completion of the current Bunker Hill Housing Development expansion. There is no relief included in the PLAN, and the outlined drastic increase in housing will further paralyze traffic and further exhaust non-existent basic resources. The BPDA has a “build it and they will come” philosophy, which has yet to come true. Please let Charlestown recover and help us to address basic needs before allowing enormous developments. Accelerating the development of the Sullivan Sq./Rutherford Ave. areas will take away any options for diverting traffic congestion forever. Right now, we have an opportunity to improve our infrastructure by using that land to provide alternate routes to alleviate some of the burden on Rutherford Ave. Once that land is developed, opportunities for better creative solutions are gone. Zoning guidelines can be changed later once Charlestown has returned to some sense of calm, but to make these changes now is cruel.

I am mystified as to why increasing **population density** vs. other neighborhoods in the City is a driving benchmark goal. This is a random metric that does not correlate to the health of the neighborhood, but only to the return on the investment of developers. Perhaps the City believes this will lead to higher tax revenue, and it may, but it does not correlate to the quality of life for residents. This goal drives high-rise residential construction, which does not build community or residential engagement. These types of buildings are occupied by transient people, not by families that are invested in the community. This metric might be useful in the Seaport or the Back Bay, but it does not support the character of Charlestown. We have no interest in becoming Manhattan. We don't have the resources, amenities, or transportation infrastructure to support the development projects that are already underway. Increasing the population density further will only stress an already faltering system. Developers need to be held accountable to promises that they make to the community during their project approval process. We have too many projects with unfulfilled promises of ground floor FPAs for community benefit. This is irresponsible.

To achieve these high population densities, the BPDA is advocating **excessive building heights**. The recommendations for increased FARs and added bonuses are outrageous. Charlestown is Boston's oldest neighborhood and **one of the greatest economic benefits that we have is tourism**. We are a destination for those interested in being transported back to Colonial times. The high FAR and building recommendations would rob Charlestown and the City of Boston of some very important views. Tourists

come to the Bunker Hill Monument to be able to visualize history. Standing at the base of the Bunker Hill Monument, you can see the Charles River, the Customs House tower, the Old North Church, and out toward Lexington and Concord. People can transport themselves through time and imagine the activities that lead to our independence. To build to the heights and densities described in PLAN: Charlestown would deprive us of those views forever. Once they are gone, we will be left with renderings and images in books. Driving into Boston from the north along I-93 is an impactful reminder of Boston's historic significance. Once views of the most historic structures in our country's history are gone, we will look like any other city in the country or world – just a lot of concrete, steel, and glass. Am I the only one who feels an immense sense of **civic pride** when I see these symbols of our Nation's history as I drive into the City over the Tobin Bridge or I-93? Why would Boston want to lose that cherished significance? Will the Bunker Hill Monument be viewable by anyone on approach to Boston?

I support the redevelopment of underutilized formerly industrial areas, but the current proposals are irresponsible. **Building heights** that are nearly 3 times the height of I-93 will thrust adjacent areas into shadow for much of the day through most seasons. This will create dark wind-tunnel areas that will not promote outdoor activities. It will feel cold and unwelcoming, similar to North Washington Street where the taller buildings are 9-10 stories tall. What is being suggested in PLAN: Charlestown would be even taller. We need much more **open space** in Charlestown, and those spaces must have **generous sunlight** exposure throughout the seasons for good health and wellness benefit. If not, we are simply building another area that promotes **inequitable development** in the City. While claiming to address the housing shortage with affordable options, in reality it will be an alternate Charlestown where residents are crammed densely into an area that will have minimal sunlight hours, no sky views, and little usable outdoor space. This is not a solution that improves the equity issue in Boston.

We must have **comprehensive shadow and view studies** for the building height and density recommendations that are being made. It is important to understand the impact of what is being suggested. We should be protecting the view of important landmarks of the City of Boston and our Nation. We should be assuring that residents of our neighborhood have ample access to daylight throughout the year to support circadian rhythms and health and wellness needs. Developers must be required to produce detailed shadow and view studies showing structures that they are proposing to show how their project will affect the neighborhood, as well as future and existing residents. Many of the spaces with the highest FARs are on the western edge of town, which will cast very tall shadows on the neighborhood and rob much of the town of sunset views. We need gardens and vegetated spaces, and that flora needs sunlight to thrive. This is of great concern particularly as our winters are harsh, and exposure to daylight is critical for mental and physical health. There is a severed mental health crisis, and lack of access to ample daylight will make that worse.

There are so many details in this document that do not support what the Charlestown community has asked for, nor what would preserve what makes Charlestown and the City of Boston unique and a desirable place to visit or live. I am hoping we can do better to formulate a development plan that truly meets the goals set forth at the beginning of the PLAN: Charlestown process.

Best regards,
Karen Lee
Charlestown resident, homeowner, and voter

Detailed comments re: PLAN: Charlestown Draft 7/28/23

- Charlestown is a walking community that needs more green space. So many development projects are being considered that could offer more outdoor public spaces. A Lighting Master Plan could offer a cohesive plan to address placemaking and ensure a consistent look throughout each area of the neighborhood. Lighting is a critical component of urban design to ensure safety, security, and desirable aesthetics. We need to limit light pollution, particularly in residential areas and along the Harborwalk and rivers. Nobody wants to enjoy evening leisure time in an area that is lit like Times Square. We need to protect sky views and the circadian rhythms of people, marine life, animals, and plants.
- (p. 10, Why We Are Planning) Lower population density should not be viewed as a negative. Many people prefer Charlestown because of this. It's what makes our neighborhood desirable! We actually have some homes with yards and grass. We are not the Back Bay or Beacon Hill. We do not want to be New York City. While I am not opposed to developing formerly industrial areas and adding residential buildings in those locations, high rise apartments do little to contribute to an integrated, thriving community. Those types of residences attract transient people who do not engage in building community connections. Charlestown is a family-oriented neighborhood. Population density is a poor metric to use to measure the health of a community.
- Development must be done while respecting the unique character of Charlestown and its historic significance. Tourists come to Charlestown with the hope of feeling like they can be transported in history. The building heights and density that are being advocated by the BPDA will destroy the ability to visually imagine what Colonial Boston was like. We should be able to see the Customs House tower and the Old North Church when approaching Boston from the North. We should be able to see the Charles River and the Prudential Tower from the base of the Bunker Hill Monument. These views are a critical element of placemaking for the Charlestown community. Once we lose the views and character, they will be gone forever and we will be left with renderings, movies, and pictures in books. Please don't allow that. Why would tourists want to visit when the views are gone?
- No changes in zoning parameters should be made without conducting **comprehensive shadow and view studies**. The proposed building heights will not only rob Charlestown of views, but also of sunlight. This is particularly concerning relative to the Rutherford Ave/Sullivan Sq areas, as they are along the western edge of the neighborhood. Buildings will cast long shadows across all of the proposed open spaces being proposed, and create dark and windy areas that people will not want to frequent, particularly in cold weather seasons when the arc of the sun is low. This is exactly when people need to be outside to support health and wellness. These excessive shadows will also challenge the ability for plants and trees to grow. They will not have enough sunlight hours to sustain anything but shade trees. We need flowering shrubs and community gardens, not just grass and moss.
Every developer should be required to conduct comprehensive shadow and view studies as part of their project proposals, so the community can understand the true impact.
- (p. 23, Demographics: Population – Projected) Why is population density a goal? Families are smaller than they were in the 1950s. More single people live in the City, as families move out to the suburbs when they have children in favor of larger homes in towns with more resources. Having a goal of high population density attracts tall buildings with smaller units that are not

conducive to families or multi-generational living. If we want families to stay in the city, then the goal should be to improve resources and amenities in the City. Affordable living spaces are much smaller in the city vs. suburbs, which makes public amenities more critical. **Population density targets do not lead to better quality of life.**

- (p. 29, Housing) I find the use of the phrase “Charlestown’s stubbornly low housing density” to be offensive. I don't think this editorial comment is necessary. **Housing density should not be a development goal.** It is a bad metric that does not capture quality of life or economic health of a community. This shows a bias of the BPDA toward developers that are proposing high rise residential projects to force this statistic up. This is not what the community wants.
- (p. 31, Housing) People who own their homes are more invested in the **community** and building relationships than renters. This is what makes Charlestown unique and why comparison to many other neighborhoods is invalid.
- (p. 38, Challenges: Retail Loss + Vacant Storefronts) Developers must have some skin in the game. Too many have gained approval with the promise of FPAs for the community, but then the space sits vacant for years. Businesses have tried to lease space in these buildings, but the developers push much of the buildout cost burden onto the lessee, making the option unachievable. There has been a recent application to change Harborview ground floor usage to FLAs, but that does not serve the community in the same manner. **Developers have an obligation to fulfill their commitment to the community.**
- (p. 41, Alternative Food Resources; Open Space) **Charlestown’s community gardens have a 4-year waitlist of over 110 people.** This clearly shows the interest in such a program and the need to have more open space dedicated to this type of use. This is not only an equity issue, but also one that would contribute to health and wellness of the community. We need more community gardens in areas that receive at least 6-8 hours of full sun through the growing season to be viable.
- (p. 42, Open Space) Lighting design parameters should be a part of this. It is important that we can enjoy open space safely all year round. Lighting of open **spaces** should also be respectful of residential living spaces with minimum light trespass and sky glow.
- (p. 47, Sports Fields and Courts) A **public swimming pool** should be added to this chart. This is a basic need for a community. Children should learn to swim at a young age as a life skill for their own safety. Also, pools offer an important cooling option and a gathering spot during the heat of the summer.
- (p. 49, Open Space – Recommendations) A **lighting master plan** and **swimming pools** should be included.
- (p. 57, Preservation) **Lighting design restrictions and guidelines** should be included in this section. Luminaire designs should be appropriate to the history of Charlestown, particularly for the historic core. Color temperature should support the residential feel and should mimic light sources used in the period. Nothing >3000K should be permitted. Overlighting and light trespass should not be allowed.
- (p. 64, Arts and Culture) Lighting is a significant part of **placemaking**, yet there are no qualitative descriptions. A lighting master plan would be useful to define these goals.
- (p. 68, Mobility) Charlestown is so fortunate to have access to water, yet this resource is underutilized. We should have more **water transportation options**. Routes need to be more bike-friendly if we really expect people to turn to biking as a transportation option. It would be

nice to have more bike racks available for those who ride their own bikes (as opposed to BlueBikes). It would be ideal if they had some integrated locking option, so people didn't have to always carry their own locks, but that's probably just a dream...

- (p. 74, Transportation Safety) Where is Elden Street? It would be nice to know where this is to try to troubleshoot why there are so many accidents here. Typo?
- (p. 88, Mobility – Recommendations) As a cyclist, it would be nice to see more covered bike parking to really make it feasible to rely on biking as a mode of transportation. I have a bike, so I don't need a BlueBike membership. I would take my own bike, but it's often difficult to find a safe place to lock it.
- (p. 111, Sullivan Sq + Rutherford Ave) This area will have a unique identity, different to that of the historic core. Part of establishing its personality should be in a **lighting master plan**, as lighting serves a large part in **placemaking** and defining that **identity**.
One element should be lighting color temperature restrictions. In a mixed-use area, it might not be appropriate to encourage gas lantern levels of warmth for the light color, but cool CCTs characteristic of commercial/industrial areas should also not be permitted, as this does not support relaxation and nighttime socialization.
Guidance of luminaire styles, cutoff (i.e., Dark Sky compliance and glare control), and lighting quality targets would also be appropriate.
- (p. 119, Sullivan/Rutherford – Height + Density) Higher density areas also have many disadvantages. These building heights are absurdly high. These heights are almost 3 times as high as I-93. That is awful. They will rob views and daylight from Charlestown that will never be returned. Historic value will be taken from this neighborhood. Pedestrian areas and sports fields that are scattered among these tall buildings will be shaded most of the day. Vegetation will be a challenge - we need flowering shrubs and having a community garden would be great, but it will not receive enough daylight hours in this scenario.
Tourists come to Charlestown to take a walk through time. From the base of the Bunker Hill monument, they should be able to imagine what colonial times might have been like - not look into a wall of skyscrapers.
Main Street will be a dark wind tunnel like Washington Street. Nobody wants to be there - it's cold, dark, and windy. This is not what we want for Main Street in Charlestown. The street is too narrow and daylight will be lost from many homes and pedestrians. These shadows will worsen traffic conflicts, as visibility will be challenging.
We must have **shadow and view studies** for this proposal. Buildings this tall on the western edge of the neighborhood will cast shadows over most of the proposed development area all afternoon, and will be even worse during fall and winter when the sun is lower on the horizon. This is exactly when fields and outdoor spaces will be used the most, and when people need exposure to daylight for health and wellness.
These are irresponsible recommendations.
- (p. 122, Sullivan/Rutherford – Open Space) We desperately need more open space in Charlestown, but the proposed building heights will shroud them in darkness. Cold and windy. Where are the shadow studies that accompany this recommendation? This will not create desirable neighborhoods for residents or tourists. Nobody wants to walk or bike through dark wind tunnels.

- (p. 124) These building heights are far too high. They create a space that is isolated from the rest of Charlestown, which will be shaded much of the year. Please require shadow and view studies for all development proposals.
- (p. 140, Building Design) No stepback will compensate for the excessively high building heights being allowed in these recommendations. Unless streets are extremely wide or open spaces are enormous, we will lose sky views, sunsets, and orientation views with respect to other Boston landmarks.
- (p. 141, Urban Design Guidelines – Sullivan/Rutherford – Preserve Views & Sunlight) I would like to see actual shadow studies for the areas being addressed (Sullivan, Hood Park, Austin St., Main St.). Requirements should require shadow studies be submitted for ALL development proposals. The graphic is fine to demonstrate the concept, but we need to understand the reality. How many hours of sunlight will we have in the streets and parks during the summer and winter? What will we be able to see as we walk on the sidewalks?
- (p. 143, Mechanicals & Utilities) Mechanicals should be included in the building height. These are often very tall and unsightly.
- (p. 146, Connectivity) The City’s design guidelines have limited references to **lighting quality and performance requirements**. **Boston Complete Streets (BCS) mentions an outdated standard** only as it pertains to illumination levels; the ANSI/IES RP-8-00 Recommended Practice: Roadway Lighting is over 20 years old and has been obsolete for years. Lighting quality should be specified using today’s current best practices and should reference all applicable industry standards. Compliance with these standards is critical to create an environment that is safe for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles, comforting for residents, welcoming to tourists, sparing of our natural resources, and not disruptive to animals and plants. We must be able to enjoy and be safe in our streets and open spaces after dark, which mandates that we go beyond the construction details outlined in BCS and pay attention to proper lighting quality.
- (p. 150, Open Space and Landscape) We desperately need more open space in Charlestown. We need vegetation that will thrive, which means ample exposure to daylight. We need a tree canopy that will offer shade during hot summer months. Design of streetlighting adjacent to those trees must be done with care, as trees (in fact, all plants) need a nighttime, too, to be able to thrive. Excessive uncontrolled light adjacent to flora will negatively impact their growth. Charlestown’s community gardens have a 4-year waitlist of over 110 people, which clearly shows a need for this in our neighborhood. Most garden vegetables require **at least 6-8 hours of full sunlight** to be able to grow during summer months. Shadow and view studies must be done to demonstrate that those conditions will exist in the areas being developed.
- (p. 155, Urban Design Guidelines – Original Peninsula) There should be a lighting component added to the design guidelines. Maximum exterior light levels should be established to maintain the quality of a historic residential neighborhood. Excessively high illumination on a home competes with street lighting and creates an unsafe contrast condition for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers. Any exterior lighting should be limited in color temperature, so as not to appear harsh against the warmth of the gas lanterns. Color temperatures are best <2700K but should not exceed 3000K. In addition, any lighting should be Dark Sky compliant and should not trespass beyond the property line at ground level or above. That is, no light should be allowed to enter a neighbor’s living space or yard and produce a nuisance.

- (p.176, Urban Design Guidelines – Original Peninsula, Public Realm) The **Boston Complete Streets Guidelines contain limited and outdated lighting requirements**. The illumination level standard is over 20 years old and has been obsolete for years. I would like to see the BPDA support an immediate revision of that document, so that our streets and public spaces will be safer, more efficient, and more attractive. The **verbiage** in the Street Lighting section (p. 178) of PLAN: Charlestown is **factually incorrect and misleading**. This must be rewritten to include proper lighting terminology and ensure good lighting quality. The arched pendant fixture being recommended is inappropriate for most of Charlestown’s streets.
- (p. 181, Urban Design Guidelines – Original Peninsula, Zoning) Many of the suggested changes to the zoning code will hurt our neighborhood. **Parking** is a severe problem in Charlestown. Not requiring provisions for parking for ≤ 6 housing units will make this even worse. Your data shows that the average is one car per housing unit. Six cars added to the street with no accommodation on the property itself is too much. Lowering the threshold to 3 housing units would make more sense, but 6 units is too much. Many housing units have 2 cars. This is a tremendous impact. Why not limit the curb cut to one driveway width? One curb cut effectively removes 2 street parking spaces; setting the parking requirement at 3 or 4 housing units would be a net balance to the neighborhood. Developers should be required to address the parking issues that they are creating.

I strongly oppose the change to the **rear yard setback** requirement. Charlestown is unique in Boston, as we actually have several lots with real usable rear yard space. Decreasing the setback requirement will encourage developers to buy parcels and build larger structures with more units to increase their revenue at the expense of outdoor space and off-street parking. This is a very pro-developer action that will change so much of what sets Charlestown apart. If a homeowner wants to modify their home, let them apply for a variance as is done today. So many people come to Charlestown looking for homes with yards; pretty soon there will be none. Developers will consume the rear yard and provide no provision for parking for the housing units. This is a tremendous burden to the community. The developer should have to balance this. The yard should be used as outdoor space and parking for the residents. Existing homes that are not in compliance would be grandfathered, which avoids the need for a variance and preserves the current fabric of our historic row houses.
- (p. 186, Charlestown Navy Yard, Past Plans) The statement is often made that the Navy Yard is the “most planned” area of the neighborhood. As a resident and homeowner in the Navy Yard, I would argue that many of the plans that were created regarding the Navy Yard are **too old and obsolete to provide valuable planning guidelines**. When many of those plans were created, people could not have imagined that nearly every person would have a car and that it could take nearly an hour to exit the Navy Yard at rush hour. The plans may not expire, but the residents of the Navy Yard have been asking for them to be updated and revised for decades. We need to do a better job of protecting our waterfront. Allowing the extreme height of Harborview structure to be built at the water’s edge is inexcusable. Over half of the abutting Basilica building was cast in shadow as a result. The height should have stepped down from existing surrounding buildings. Parking requirements for new developments are inadequate, which has made parking even worse.

The street lighting in the Navy Yard needs to be re-evaluated. The acorn post-top fixtures were converted to LED technology, but with inadequate optical systems. Light pours into adjacent

residents' living areas even as high as 2nd and 3rd floor units. This is an annoyance as well as a waste of energy. New fixtures being tested ("arched pendant") are even worse, as is evidenced by the use of large, unsightly shields to block light from entering adjacent residences in the test on Constitution Road. **We can do better. Please do better.**

- (p. 192, Charlestown Navy Yard, Future and Ongoing Work) Boston's waterways are an underutilized transportation opportunity. We must have more options for transportation to and from Charlestown. More options for water shuttles and taxis would be very helpful. What we have is a start, but there is an opportunity for so much more. More routes, longer schedules, more stops. Please make this a priority. City Square and Sullivan Square are horrendous. 425 Medford St. will make traffic even worse.

Too many development projects have been approved with a promise to the community that they will add amenities. Time after time, this does not happen. There needs to be some way to hold developers to their word. Harborview has yet to fulfill their commitment to the community. We need more amenities in the Navy Yard.

- (p. 204, Recommendations Table) I would like to see the commissioning of a **Lighting Master Plan** added to this table, **in conjunction with departments/agencies such PWD, BPRD, BTM, MOAC, and the Boston Landmarks Commission.** This is an important planning tool that establishes a roadmap for so many issues. It defines the character of each section of Charlestown and ensures that each will be safe at night with lighting that is at the appropriate levels and designed properly with respect to the activities in each area. Residents shouldn't be blinded by street lighting while enjoying a quiet evening in their living rooms or when trying to sleep at night. Drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists should not be blinded by excessively bright and glaring street lighting. Tourists and residents should be able to enjoy our parks, streets, and the night sky with a sense of security while also being able to appreciate inviting surroundings. Proper street and area lighting should guarantee the visibility of people enjoying our streets, parks, and waterfronts without causing nuisance or disruption to health and wellness of our residents, visitors, and nature. This is not only a safety issue, but also one that affects aesthetics, the ability for our economy to thrive, and fiscal responsibility. We should be lighting Charlestown using the industry's current standards and best practices.

Subject: PLAN: Charlestown Comments - please help us do better



K Lee [redacted] Tue, Sep 19, 4:11 PM (2 days ago)
to jason.ruggiero@boston.gov, Mayor@boston.gov, arthur.jemison@boston.gov, gabriela.coletta@boston.gov, Dan.Ryan@boston.gov

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

To: Jay Ruggiero (BPDA, PLAN: Charlestown)

Comments on PLAN: Charlestown Final Draft (7/28/23)

I have lived in Charlestown for over 25 years and have been a homeowner for 22 of those years. To many of my neighbors, I am a newcomer, but I have grown to love this neighborhood and this city. This is a safe, family-oriented community where people watch out for each other and care about where they live. I have been involved in many of the PLAN: Charlestown meetings and am disappointed to see that many components of PLAN: Charlestown do not reflect the voices of the people of Charlestown.

Development in Charlestown is occurring at an alarming rate. I am fully in favor of developing underutilized areas. It is better to have attractive, welcoming spaces than unsightly parcels that are not being maintained. This development, however, must benefit the community and address challenges for the current residents. PLAN: Charlestown does not do this and sets us on a path that is increasingly irresponsible and will diminish the quality of life in Charlestown for future generations.

We lack **basic resources** for our current population, which is already trapped in the neighborhood due to unbearable **traffic congestion**. This is before the completion of the current Bunker Hill Housing Development expansion. There is no relief included in the PLAN, and the outlined drastic increase in housing will further paralyze traffic and further exhaust non-existent basic resources. The BPDA has a "build it and they will come" philosophy, which has yet to come true. Please let Charlestown recover and help us to address basic needs before allowing enormous developments. Accelerating the development of the Sullivan Sq./Rutherford Ave. areas will take away any options for diverting traffic congestion forever. Right now, we have an opportunity to improve our infrastructure by using that land to provide alternate routes to alleviate some of the burden on Rutherford Ave. Once that land is developed, opportunities for better creative solutions are gone. Zoning guidelines can be changed later once Charlestown has returned to some sense of calm, but to make these changes now is cruel.

I am mystified as to why increasing **population density** vs. other neighborhoods in the City is a driving benchmark goal. This is a random metric that does not correlate to the health of the neighborhood, but only to the return on the investment of developers. Perhaps the City believes this will lead to higher tax revenue, and it may, but it does not correlate to the quality of life for residents. This goal drives high-rise residential construction, which does not build community or residential engagement. These types of buildings are occupied by transient people, not by families that are invested in the community. This metric might be useful in the Seaport or the Back Bay, but it does not support the character of Charlestown. We have no interest in becoming Manhattan. We don't have the resources, amenities, or transportation infrastructure to support the development projects that are already underway. Increasing the population density further will only stress an already faltering system. Developers need to be held accountable to promises that they make to the community during their project approval process. We have too many projects with unfulfilled promises of ground floor FPAs for community benefit. This is irresponsible.

To achieve these high population densities, the BPDA is advocating **excessive building heights**. The recommendations for increased FARs and added bonuses are outrageous. Charlestown is Boston's oldest neighborhood and **one of the greatest economic benefits that we have is tourism**. We are a destination for those interested in being transported back to Colonial times. The high FAR and building recommendations would rob Charlestown and the City of Boston of some very important views. Tourists come to the Bunker Hill Monument to be able to visualize history. Standing at the base of the Bunker Hill Monument, you can see the Charles River, the Customs House tower, the Old North Church, and out toward Lexington and Concord. People can transport themselves through time and imagine the activities that lead to our independence. To build to the heights and densities described in PLAN: Charlestown would deprive us of those views forever. Once they are gone, we will be left with renderings and images in books. Driving into Boston from the north along I-93 is an impactful reminder of Boston's historic significance. Once views of the most historic structures in our country's history are gone, we will look like any other city in the country or world – just a lot of concrete, steel, and glass. Am I the only one who feels an immense sense of **civic pride** when I see these symbols of our Nation's history as I drive into the City over the Tobin Bridge or I-93? Why would Boston want to lose that cherished significance? Will the Bunker Hill Monument be viewable by anyone on approach to Boston?

I support the redevelopment of underutilized formerly industrial areas, but the current proposals are irresponsible. **Building heights** that are nearly 3 times the height of I-93 will thrust adjacent areas into shadow for much of the day through most seasons. This will create dark wind-tunnel areas that will not promote outdoor activities. It will feel cold and unwelcoming, similar to North Washington Street where the taller buildings are 9-10 stories tall. What is being suggested in PLAN: Charlestown would be even taller. We need much more **open space** in Charlestown, and those spaces must have **generous sunlight** exposure throughout the seasons for good health and wellness benefit. If not, we are simply building another area that promotes **inequitable development** in the City. While claiming to address the housing shortage with affordable options, in reality it will be an alternate Charlestown where residents are crammed densely into an area that will have minimal sunlight hours, no sky views, and little usable outdoor space. This is not a solution that improves the equity issue in Boston.

We must have **comprehensive shadow and view studies** for the building height and density recommendations that are being made. It is important to understand the impact of what is being suggested. We should be protecting the view of important landmarks of the City of Boston and our Nation. We should be assuring that residents of our neighborhood have ample access to daylight throughout the year to support circadian rhythms and health and wellness needs. Developers must be required to produce detailed shadow and view studies showing structures that they are proposing to show how their project will affect the neighborhood, as well as future and existing residents. Many of the spaces with the highest FARs are on the western edge of town, which will cast very tall shadows on the neighborhood and rob much of the town of sunset views. We need gardens and vegetated spaces, and that flora needs sunlight to thrive. This is of great concern particularly as our winters are harsh, and exposure to daylight is critical for mental and physical health. There is a severed mental health crisis, and lack of access to ample daylight will make that worse.

There are so many details in this document that do not support what the Charlestown community has asked for, nor what would preserve what makes Charlestown and the City of Boston unique and a desirable place to visit or live. I am hoping we can do better to formulate a development plan that truly meets the goals set forth at the beginning of the PLAN: Charlestown process.

Best regards,
Karen Lee
Charlestown resident, homeowner, and voter

Subject: Concerns and comments on PLAN: Charlestown



Sarah Sands [REDACTED]
to mayor, arthur.jemison, Gabriela Coletta, dan.ryan, Sean Breen, Jason Ruggiero

Tue, Sep 19, 3:02 PM (2 days ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Hello,

As a 10-year resident of Charlestown who hopes to live in Charlestown for many decades to come, **I have some major concerns with PLAN: Charlestown** -- not to mention my disappointment at how the final stages of the process have felt rushed and non-inclusive.

My concerns include:

- Building heights on the primary streets
The proposed building heights are way too high and will fundamentally and irrevocably change the neighborhood structure for the worse. **People in the future will look at Charlestown as an example of what NOT to do.** Please don't make uber-growth part of your legacy.
Particular concerns: the current building height is critical to Main Street's character and Austin Street's ability to "welcome" people into Charlestown
But even for School Street, Rutherford Ave, Mystic River, and Medford Street, the proposed increases to building heights are going to make Charlestown feel more like Assembly Row than the vitally important historical neighborhood that it is. **Please don't irrevocably change our historical roots. This is a unique community within the whole of the United States -- truly, there is not another place like Charlestown. Please preserve it for future generations.**
- The lack of concrete, tangible plans to support resources in the face of MMENSE population growth.
Please imagine the place where you live growing like it's on steroids. Then imagine what it feels like to try to live a productive, fulfilling, long life there. Long-term residents won't stay if you drain the services more than they are now. Imagine what it would feel like to have gridlock to greet you every morning and every evening on your commute. Imagine not being able to find a parking spot to go get groceries or go to the post office. Imagine not having faith that the local schools will work for you. **Please treat the plans for Charlestown's resources as if you lived here, too.**
- Adding more than the recommended square feet of new builds
According to the CPS: A 2019 Lower Mystic Regional Planning Study indicated that Charlestown could add eight million square feet, this plan greatly exceeds that. Please treat expert findings as expert findings and adhere to them.

Thank you for your care and attention and putting democracy to work,

Kindly,
Sarah Sands

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: You Must Reconsider PLAN: Charlestown



[Redacted]

Wed, Sep 20, 7:05 PM (23 hours ago)

to Mayor, arthur.jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sean.breen, jason.ruggiero, cnc02129, info

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Elected Officials,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%. Our community also asked for more time, at least 60 days, in which to be involved in the redrafting of this proposal. We live here... we believe it is important that we are involved in the fate of our beloved town.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership and puts our historic town at risk. It will not be tolerated.

Signed,
Christopher A. Zirpoli

[Redacted Signature]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Donna Garlough** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 7:34 PM

Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown

To: <Mayor@boston.gov>

Cc: <arthur.jemison@boston.gov>, <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>, <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <info@charlestownpreservation.org>

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to

present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Donna Garlough

Homeowner, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Opposition to PLAN Charlestown



Ellen Powers [REDACTED]

Wed, Sep 20, 9:58 PM (20 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

I oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues, and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Sincerely,

Ellen Powers

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: DO NOT approve the Final Draft of PLAN Charlestown



Heidi S [REDACTED]

Wed, Sep 20, 11:02 PM (19 hours ago)

to MAYOR, arthur.jemison, Gabriela Coletta, dan.ryan, Sean Breen, Jason.Ruggiero, cnc02129, Charlestownpreservation Info

Dear Mayor Wu,

I have lived in Charlestown for 10 years and I'm considered a newbie here. Having lived in over 6 neighborhoods in Boston I can attest that Charlestown is unique, it's a true neighborhood and operates more like a small town where people look out for one another, stay for many generations and consider it their home.

The community in Charlestown deserves more than the final draft of the PLAN provides. It focuses more on building buildings than building a community. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

Instead of taller, bigger buildings we need protection for our historic neighborhood. We need more green space. We need buried utility lines to prevent fires. We need lead free water pipes. We need parking solutions for the people who live here. We need room in our schools for our children. We do not need more people. We do not need more buildings. That is not the answer and not what our town needs.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect.

The PLAN as the final draft stands undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood entrances/exits and within neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

This final draft feels like you are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%!

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development not only erodes our trust in city leadership but leaves us in a potentially unlivable, toxic and unsafe living environment.

Signed,
Heidi Solomon

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Heidi Solomon.

Subject: Please Reconsider PLAN: Charlestown



Jeff Ventre

to mayor, Gabriela Coletta, arthur.jemison, dan.ryan, sean.breen, Boston Planning & Development Agency, cnc02129@gm

Wed, Sep 20, 8:34 PM (21 hours ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We strongly oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building 'buildings' than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

We formally and respectfully request a 60 day extension of the comment period, along with in-person community meetings in Charlestown.

Signed,
Jeff Ventre



From: **Jennifer Cain** [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 7:23 PM
Subject: PLEASE RECONSIDER PLAN: CHARLESTOWN
To: <mayor@boston.gov>, <arthur.jemison@boston.gov>, <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, Sean Breen <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>

Dear Mayor Wu and team,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is

already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Jennifer Cain



Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown



Katie Hassell

to mayor, arthur.jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sean.breen, jason.ruggiero, cnc02129

Wed, Sep 20, 8:18 PM (22 hours ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Kathryn Hassell



From: Liz Whiteley [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 4:49 PM
Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown
To: <astrid.walker-stewart@boston.gov>, <mayor@boston.gov>
Cc: Gabriela Coletta <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>

Dear Mayor Wu, Members of the BPDA

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, limited green space and an eroding tree canopy and many children can not get a seat at a high-quality school. Development and zoning amendments that do not respect the historic character of the neighborhood are not solutions, they are drivers of increased population that strain infrastructure and services.

PLAN seems to be relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City and State agencies. There could be creative ways to pay for improvement of services that do depend on overdevelopment of our neighborhood. As a citizen and a tax payer, it is not my role to make these suggestions but as a voter I do depend on elected officials to act in best interest of community. I struggle to see how that is happening here.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect.

We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population.

This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation.

In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the

community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and address safety issues and in fact, PLAN may well compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership. We can have smart development that respects the historic character of the neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Liz Whiteley



On Wed, Sep 20, 2023 at 11:38 AM <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear Jason:

Re: The upcoming 9/28/2023 Thursday 5pm-7:30pm virtual BPDA Board Meeting.

Specifically, the vote to approve “PLAN: Charlestown.”

I called Brigitte Martin because I could not find info about the 9/27/23 Board meeting. She will update that page in a few days. (OK. No rush just for me.)

But that got me worried about how rushed you must be preparing materials for that Board meeting. And how rushed the Board will be reading those materials.

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
17	18	19	20 Today!	21 Comments due on 9/6 PLAN	22	23
24	25 Publish Revised PLAN	26	27	28 Board Meeting Zoom 5pm	29	30

Please consider postponing the hearing by one month.

Your 9/25 target for a revised plan is not realistic because you have only one or maybe two working days to address comments received on 9/21. (Mine alone will take days of staff time.) Comments that you don't have time to address will then have to be listed for Board consideration, complicating what Members have to think about during the mere 10 minutes of time allowed this agenda item at the hearing. It would be easier for the Board to read a no-nonsense truly final version. That would be more respectful of their time.

You are also rushing Board Members. You assume that they only need a couple of days to read your materials, plus the materials for the other 10 or so agenda items. If Members lack time to read the materials, they can only decide whether to approve based on whether the staff cover sheet says that there was a lot of outreach but not enough anger to worry about politically. By rushing them you disrespect the wisdom they are capable of sharing.

Another reason to postpone is to allow time for public comment on your next version of the plan. You know that I will find many editorial errors. Plus, the section on school has numerical inconsistencies, and the appendix on traffic must be substantially rewritten for clarity and relevance.

Only then will the materials be worthy of consideration by the Board.

Respectfully,

Mike Mickelson

Michael J. Mickelson, PhD

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Subject: Opposition to PLAN: Charlestown



Amy Federico [REDACTED]

10:36 AM (7 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Amy Federico (19 years Charlestown resident) and Mark McVeigh (25 years Charlestown resident)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Bart Higgins <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 5:18 PM (15 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, Gabriela Coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129, Info at CPS

Hi,

There are many shortcomings in this Plan; the likely "revised" building height limits on the Bunker Hill mall, for instance, being just one of them.

Maybe the largest, though, is the fact that the BPDA -- an organization that you, Mayor Wu, knows better than anyone else, has a past not to be proud of -- is once again trying to rush an approval here, like a football team who knows they've committed a violation but who hope they can get the next play off before the referees blow the whistle -- the victims, in this case, being the general public and residents of Charlestown, who are being deprived of a fair chance to consider the implications of this plan, and then make their opinions known.

I could go into specifics, but then we'd be here all day, so I thought it best to copy, below, the Charlestown Preservation Society's complaint and request for help, with which I agree. Charlestown, in the last decade, has become even sweeter, and even a better place to live, than it was before. Should this Plan go through, I think we have a good chance to mobilize the residents here -- many of whom moved here over the course of the last decade, specifically because they could see how sweet and livable it has become -- against it, and, of course, the system being fundamentally designed this way, against our representatives who agreed to approve it. Does anyone really want to go down, in the public eye here, in street-corner conversations and coffee-time chats and posters here and there along the sidewalks, as being one of those who voted to approve this thing -- as the buildings get higher and uglier, and the traffic gets thicker and thicker? Really?

With fingers crossed, and best wishes in carrying out what is obviously a difficult job,

I remain,

Bart Higgins

[REDACTED]

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.



Bridget O'Connor <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 3:58 PM (16 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129, info

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions,

consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Bridget O'Connor

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.



Chloe Rideout

Thu, Sep 21, 4:05 PM (16 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129, info

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Charlestown Preservation Society, Board of Trustees

Amanda Zettel, President

Richie Banerji, Vice President

Chris Doggett, Treasurer

Darrell Villaruz, Secretary

Nora Blake

Ryan Gavin

Lisa Ha

Marley Kanda

Ellen Kitzis

Pippa Nava

Chris Remmes

Tiffany Riddle

Molly Stern

What the BPDA must address BEFORE releasing a final draft of PLAN: Charlestown:

1. Planning for Public Safety: The zoning guidelines encourage development at a scale that increases the neighborhood's population 80% and pushes our road traffic even further above capacity. This poses a threat to our already strained emergency response systems, including egress routes, fire, police, and medical services. There is a glaring absence of a comprehensive plan to ensure our safety and well-being. *Scale back building maximums to a level that our available resources can accommodate.*
2. Planning for Climate Resiliency: PLAN: Charlestown merely references other plans which studied the impact of rising sea-levels along shorelines and flood zones, and have not been adjusted for the current reality. Reducing the amount of permeable open space and building sea walls that direct rising waters elsewhere does not encourage climate resiliency. In its current form, PLAN: Charlestown only requires 25% permeable area. Greenspace at Bunker Hill Community College is reduced in this plan, and greenspace at the Bunker Hill Housing Development was reduced. This emphasizes parcel-level open space requirements over considering overall neighborhood spaces cohesively. This approach results in narrow, impractical patches of grass and pocket parks, broken up by new streets and intersections, that will struggle to thrive in the shadow of towering buildings. *Look to Cambridge Crossing, a good example of consolidated greenspace that created a centrally located community space. New greenspace enabled by PLAN: Charlestown should be quoted in the form of "net new space."*
3. Planning for Traffic Congestion: There is no plan for alleviating current traffic issues, and there is no accounting for the influx of people and vehicles that will come from regional development in Somerville and Everett. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the amount of proposed new square feet of development considered in a 2019 regional transportation study, and overly relies on expanding MBTA services, a promise the BPDA cannot guarantee. The 2019 regional study, which the City of Boston cooperated in, recommended 8,000,000 square feet of development. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the 8,000,000 number to 22,000,000+. BPDA members comment about our responses to their work by claiming that full buildout "won't happen for another 30 years." The truth is, with the Bunker Hill Housing and Hood Park in development, and another 4,512,148 square feet currently under review, roughly half of the proposed development will be complete in 10 years. *PLAN: Charlestown should recommend an updated regional transportation study after Charlestown has approved 8,000,000 square feet of new growth.*
4. Prioritizing building heights for a vibrant Charlestown. PLAN: Charlestown proposes heights that represent a staggering 160%-233% increase from current zoning limits. BDPA's rationale for noise reduction overlooks the impact on light and how it will shorten our winter days, and create irreversible changes to our microclimate. Ensure the buildings taller than 75 feet are located where they won't obstruct light from the east or west, prioritizing residents' well-being. For example, the 2013 Plan for Sullivan Square promoted varying building heights from 3-12 stories across the area, with lower buildings located closer to the Schrafft's Building and increasing heights toward the train station, using

buildings located near the I-93 via-duct to block the noise and air quality impacts of the highway (12 stories max.) It required maintaining sightlines to the Schrafft's Building and recommended the building of an iconic 7-story building on the MBTA station property. Additional parcels range in building height max from 3-12 stories (5 stories on Main Street.) This plan respects the scale of the historic Sullivan Square and Lost Village neighborhood and allows more light than the new recommendations of 15-25 stories for the same parcels. *The Sullivan Square planning framework should be incorporated into PLAN: Charlestown.*

5. Including the Bunker Hill Mall in the Original Peninsula / Lost Village, where it is a critical building block of what makes Charlestown a livable, walkable neighborhood. *Development in this space should align with the Urban Design Guidelines for the historic peninsula and lost village and respect the existing 35' building height zoning on Main / Austin and School Streets and the 73' Gatehouse 75 precedent on Rutherford. The original peninsula should not be allowed a planned development agreement that furthers parcel by parcel development.*
6. Including new development at Charlestown's waterfront within the existing scale of the industrial waterfront and residential buildings. Redevelopment of this area is an excellent opportunity to add waterfront access to residents, continue the amount of green space, and extend Doherty Park to the river. We support upzoning in this area in the form of a change of use and minor height increase above 55'. Development in this space should respect the existing 3-4 story residential buildings on Medford Street with buildings that taper down in height toward Medford Street in addition to the River. *The maximum building height allowed should be no taller than what planning consultants recommended in previous PLAN scenarios (120'.) Wind tunnel impacts on Doherty Park should be studied within the planning context.*
7. Including the Charlestown Industrial Architectural Conservation District in the Adaptive Reuse section, making preservation a priority for many reasons. Even before PLAN: Charlestown has been adopted, development is already in progress to demolish two historic buildings on Roland Street. Preserving these buildings not only aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, it also aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, and it represents a greener, more sustainable solution that honors and aligns with the historical character of the surrounding area, instead of wastefully tearing it all down.

Chloë Rideout

www.chloerideoutinteriors.com

Christine Amisano <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:55 PM
(15 hours ago)

to Mayor, arthur.jemison, gabriela.coletta, Dan Ryan, sal.didomenico, Jason Ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy@boston.gov, ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov, julia.mejia@boston.gov, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129@gmail.com, Charlestown Preservation Society

Dear Mayor Wu,

I write again to reinforce my family's opposition to the PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead **focuses more on building buildings than building a community**. The PLAN **undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning**.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, and traffic gridlock from outside the neighborhood that backs up into the neighborhood.

We agree with the Charlestown Preservation Society's goal to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. **We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population**. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

What the BPDA must address BEFORE releasing a final draft of PLAN: Charlestown:

1. Planning for Public Safety: The zoning guidelines encourage development at a scale that increases the neighborhood's population 80% and pushes our road traffic even further above capacity. This poses a threat to our already strained emergency response systems, including egress routes, fire, police, and medical services. There is a glaring absence of a comprehensive plan to ensure our safety and well-being. *Scale back building maximums to a level that our available resources can accommodate.*
 2. Planning for Climate Resiliency: PLAN: Charlestown merely references other plans which studied the impact of rising sea-levels along shorelines and flood zones, and have not been adjusted for the current reality. Reducing the amount of permeable open space and building sea walls that direct rising waters elsewhere does not encourage climate resiliency. In its current form, PLAN: Charlestown only requires 25% permeable area. Greenspace at Bunker Hill Community College is reduced in this plan, and greenspace at the Bunker Hill Housing Development was reduced. This emphasizes parcel-level open space requirements over considering overall neighborhood spaces cohesively. This approach results in narrow, impractical patches of grass and pocket parks, broken up by new streets and intersections, that will struggle to thrive in the shadow of towering buildings. *Look to Cambridge Crossing, a good example of consolidated greenspace that created a centrally located community space. New greenspace enabled by*
-

PLAN: Charlestown should be quoted in the form of “net new space.”

3. Planning for Traffic Congestion: There is no plan for alleviating current traffic issues, and there is no accounting for the influx of people and vehicles that will come from regional development in Somerville and Everett. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the amount of proposed new square feet of development considered in a 2019 regional transportation study, and overly relies on expanding MBTA services, a promise the BPDA cannot guarantee. The 2019 regional study, which the City of Boston cooperated in, recommended 8,000, 000 square feet of development. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the 8,000,000 number to 22,000,000+. BPDA members comment about our responses to their work by claiming that full buildout “won’t happen for another 30 years.” The truth is, with the Bunker Hill Housing and Hood Park in development, and another 4,512,148 square feet currently under review, roughly half of the proposed development will be complete in 10 years.
PLAN: Charlestown should recommend an updated regional transportation study after Charlestown has approved 8,000,000 square feet of new growth.
 4. Prioritizing building heights for a vibrant Charlestown. PLAN: Charlestown proposes heights that represent a staggering 160%-233% increase from current zoning limits. BDPA's rationale for noise reduction overlooks the impact on light and how it will shorten our winter days, and create irreversible changes to our microclimate. Ensure the buildings taller than 75 feet are located where they won't obstruct light from the east or west, prioritizing residents' well-being. For example, the 2013 Plan for Sullivan Square promoted varying building heights from
-

3-12 stories across the area, with lower buildings located closer to the Schrafft's Building and increasing heights toward the train station, using buildings located near the I-93 via-duct to block the noise and air quality impacts of the highway (12 stories max.) It required maintaining sightlines to the Schrafft's Building and recommended the building of an iconic 7-story building on the MBTA station property. Additional parcels range in building height max from 3-12 stories (5 stories on Main Street.) This plan respects the scale of the historic Sullivan Square and Lost Village neighborhood and allows more light than the new recommendations of 15-25 stories for the same parcels. *The Sullivan Square planning framework should be incorporated into PLAN: Charlestown.*

5. Including the Bunker Hill Mall in the Original Peninsula / Lost Village, where it is a critical building block of what makes Charlestown a livable, walkable neighborhood. *Development in this space should align with the Urban Design Guidelines for the historic peninsula and lost village and respect the existing 35' building height zoning on Main / Austin and School Streets and the 73' Gatehouse 75 precedent on Rutherford. The original peninsula should not be allowed a planned development agreement that furthers parcel by parcel development.*
 6. Including new development at Charlestown's waterfront within the existing scale of the industrial waterfront and residential buildings. Redevelopment of this area is an excellent opportunity to add waterfront access to residents, continue the amount of green space, and extend Doherty Park to the river. We support upzoning in this area in the form of a change of use and minor
-

height increase above 55'. Development in this space should respect the existing 3-4 story residential buildings on Medford Street with buildings that taper down in height toward Medford Street in addition to the River. *The maximum building height allowed should be no taller than what planning consultants recommended in previous PLAN scenarios (120'.) Wind tunnel impacts on Doherty Park should be studied within the planning context.*

7. Including the Charlestown Industrial Architectural Conservation District in the Adaptive Reuse section, making preservation a priority for many reasons. Even before PLAN: Charlestown has been adopted, development is already in progress to demolish two historic buildings on Roland Street. Preserving these buildings not only aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, it also aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, and it represents a greener, more sustainable solution that honors and aligns with the historical character of the surrounding area, instead of wastefully tearing it all down.

We insist on an immediate, in-person opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved **lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions online allowing for limited neighbor feedback.** PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not community needs.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. **4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.**

This is truly frightening.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and sincere consideration of our request.

The Amisano-Margolis Family
residents of Charlestown since 1982
Christine, Lance and Nick

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Emily <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, Sep 19, 2023 at 10:03 PM
Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown
To: <Mayor@boston.gov>
Cc: <info@charlestownpreservation.org>

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is

already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Emily Hodge



Erin Maloney <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:23 PM (16 hours ago)

to MAYOR, arthur.jemison, jason.ruggiero, gabriela.coletta, sal.didomenico, erin.murphy@boston.gov, ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov, julia.mejia@boston.gov, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129@gmail.com

Dear all,

I oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of the shared vision with your Office and the community, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning. We don't want to be the Seaport! Keep Charlestown a neighborhood or start another Seaport in Roslindale!

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions,

consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Erin Maloney

Charlestown Resident

Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown



Fiona & John McMahon <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:04 PM (16 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.lou

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Fiona McMahon

[REDACTED]

Subject: Charlestown



Jenn [REDACTED]

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.lou

Thu, Sep 21, 4:04 PM (16 hours ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.


We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Jenn Kelley
Dunstable St
Charlestown

Sent from Jenn's iPhone 

Subject: We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft



Jesse M. MacDonald

to mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.lou

Thu, Sep 21, 4:20 PM (16 hours ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Good Afternoon All,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children cannot get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Mr. Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Thank you,

Jesse MacDonald





Jon Skarin <[REDACTED]>

10:43 AM (7 hours ago)

to mayor@boston.gov, gabriela.coletta@boston.gov, dan.ryan@mahouse.gov, Jason Ruggiero, sean.breen@boston.gov, natalie.deduck@boston.gov, Info at CPS, Kathleen Glunz Skarin, priscilla.rojas@boston.gov, bpdaboard@boston.gov

Honorable Michelle Wu
Mayor
City of Boston
1 City Hall Square, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02201-2013

Dear Mayor Wu:

As a nearly 20-year resident of Charlestown and a homeowner in the Town Hill District of the neighborhood abutting the Austin Street parking lots, I am writing to again express my strong opposition to the most recent final draft PLAN: Charlestown (“Plan”) document that was released by the Boston Planning and Development Agency (BPDA) and is open for public comment until September 21. Although some positive changes were made to the most recent draft, in particular the removal of the Bunker Hill Mall site from the plan, most of the concerns raised by Charlestown residents during the numerous community meetings, including the “close-out” meeting on September 11, and in the dozens of comments submitted to the BPDA, have not been addressed. It is truly unfortunate that the BPDA seems intent on moving forward with finalizing the plan over the strong objections of the community.

If implemented in its current form, the Plan will irreparably alter a unique, historic neighborhood by adding more than 15,000 residents and tens of millions of square feet of residential and commercial space to a one-square mile peninsula. Once these spaces are developed, there is almost no planning for what these residents and businesses will bring: congestion on neighborhood streets; a need for more seats in public schools; increased emergency and public safety services; and athletic and cultural facilities for neighborhood residents and visitors.

The fundamental problem with the Plan is rooted in two concepts advocated by the BPDA. First, that certain parcels of land in Charlestown are “underutilized”, primarily because they contain surface parking or industrial uses. The second concept is that these “underutilized” parcels should be developed with the highest possibly density of residential and commercial development – far greater than the density required in most other Boston neighborhoods. Comments from Charlestown residents throughout the PLAN: Charlestown process have been largely focused on the lack of infrastructure planning incorporated into the Plan: greatly increased traffic, the need for more seats in public schools, lack of open space for already over-capacity youth sports programs and community use, and increased emergency and public safety services. All these concerns can be traced back to the BPDA’s insistence on high levels of residential density and little off-street parking on the parcels detailed in the plan, most importantly the Austin Street Parking Lots.

As I noted in my previous comment letter, while I understand the need to increase the number of affordable units in Greater Boston, the Plan places a disproportionate burden on Charlestown to fulfill the City's housing goals. Twenty-five (25) percent of the housing in Charlestown is income restricted, making it the fifth highest percentage among Boston neighborhoods. In contrast, your neighborhood of Roslindale has just 13 percent of its housing as income restricted and several neighborhoods (Back Bay, Beacon Hill, Hyde Park and the Seaport, among others), all with access to public transit, have single digit percentages. I am not aware of any other neighborhood where proposed development is anywhere near the density incorporated in the Plan – certainly not in the areas noted above. Finally, having worked on affordable housing issues for many years, it is my strong belief that the City of Boston, and Charlestown specifically, cannot solve the region's housing crisis. Suburban communities in Greater Boston have been allowed to ignore or be openly hostile to the region's housing needs and difficult conversations must be had with the business leaders who live in many of these towns about supporting affordable, multi-family development in their communities. This is a regional problem that demands regional solutions.

Having submitted several detailed comments on the Plan, reviewed the numerous letters collected by the Charlestown Preservation Society and the survey results from the BPDA website, I am extremely disappointed and disheartened that the BPDA has chosen not to address the many thoughtful comments and concerns regarding density, building height and infrastructure improvements in the most recent draft. The community has essentially been told by the BPDA that its planners – not longtime neighborhood residents – are more capable of determining the future of Charlestown than those of us who live here, have invested here and work to improve our community. It was my belief that during your tenure on the City Council and throughout your mayoral campaign, you were opposed to the type of “top down” planning that was a hallmark of the former Boston Redevelopment Authority. It appears that your administration is now supportive of top-down planning when it helps you realize other policy priorities that may or may not be supported by the neighborhood. As much as the BPDA planners may have good intentions, we have seen numerous examples of poor city planning in Boston: the razing of the West End, development of Government Center, the inner belt and southwest corridor highway plans, and many others. Planners may be adept at deciding what a city should look like based on their own preconceived notions, but they are far less prescient in determining human behavior, commuting patterns and municipal, state and federal budget priorities.

As has been noted, the Plan continues to rely on “aspirational goals” rather than data driven recommendations. Many of the transportation planning recommendations rely on state agencies (MBTA, MassDOT) and state and federal funding to implement. The history of the MBTA missing deadlines and being unable to perform even basic maintenance of the system does not inspire confidence that any of the wished-for improvements to Orange Line service or the changes to the bus lines will materialize in the next five years, when hundreds or thousands of new residents will have moved into the housing units developed as part of the Plan. As we all know, budgets and transportation priorities can change significantly over a 30-year period. Since funding is not already committed to these projects, including a proposed commuter rail station at Sullivan Square, which was part of the proposed Urban Ring that has been largely abandoned by the MBTA, and private shuttle routes, the burden will be on the Charlestown community, municipal leaders and elected officials to advocate for these changes in future decades.

As an abutter to the Austin Street parking lots, I will focus the remainder of my comments on this section of the Plan. While the BPDA continues to assert that the PLAN: Charlestown process has been ongoing since 2019, it is important to note that the planning for the Austin Street lots was not

incorporated into the broader discussion until October 27, 2022 – less than one year ago – with the final meeting being held on March 8, 2023, a disposition RFP released on May 4, 2023 and the final responses due in July 2023. While this was clearly done to expedite the development so it could be subsidized by federal ARPA funds, the accelerated process provided inadequate time for public feedback and has resulted in the BPDA presenting a plan that is willfully inconsistent in the building height requirements so that it can achieve its goal of high-density residential development – not address the neighborhood’s legitimate concerns.

In fact, the Ensemble Charlestown submission proposes a 148 ft. building almost directly on Rutherford Avenue, not sited close to I-93. This is in direct contradiction of the Plan’s stated goal of “Stepping down heights and densities towards Charlestown’s existing residential fabric.” The parcels abutting the Town Hill District are the only area along Rutherford Ave where buildings up to 150 ft will be allowed -- between Austin Street and Sullivan Square, heights will be capped at 90 ft along the roadway. In addition, the Austin Street lots is entirely in a “density bonus” area, where “residential projects that wish to take advantage of this density bonus would also need to include aggressive transportation demand management (TDM) measures including low parking ratios to qualify for the density bonus. This density bonus is specifically designed to incentivize the development of housing near transit.” I strongly believe that any developer-proposed “transportation demand management (TDM) measures” are likely to be unrealistic, unworkable and designed solely to increase profitability with little regard for the actual commuting patterns and behaviors of current and future residents.

The two submitted plans for the Austin Street lots envision approximately 690 residential units and a .4 parking ratio of 245 parking spaces (Trinity Financial) or 760 residential units and a .26 parking ratio of 195 spaces (Ensemble Charlestown) on a 5.6-acre parcel. I remain extremely concerned that the City is planning to add conservatively 1,000-1,500 new residents to an already congested area without the necessary transportation and other infrastructure improvements in place. With seemingly no end to the poor state of the MBTA and the proposed re-routing of the 92 bus into Cambridge, connections to downtown will be limited and many of these new residents will own cars that they will park on the streets nearest to their homes – specifically areas in the Town Hill District. This will increase traffic on neighborhood streets and do nothing to alleviate the existing gridlock on Rutherford Ave, the Gilmore Bridge and other major arteries.

In addition, throughout the public meeting process there was significant support for green space incorporated into the Austin Street development. Unfortunately, neither proposal contains even a full-size soccer field, instead proposing much smaller U-10 fields, which limit which teams can play and practice in these areas. The Plan does note that:

“[T]he Bunker Hill Community College (BHCC) fields...are also important community resources for active recreation, although they are owned by the college. Historically, they have not been open for use by Charlestown residents, but as of 2023, BHCC had agreed to let Charlestown’s youth soccer league use the fields. In the future, as the BHCC campus changes, maintaining public sports amenities here will be a priority.”

Unfortunately, as a parent of a CYSA player and a former CYSA coach, the state of the current field at BHCC and the city owned Barry Field are poor. BHCC has no lighting and the playing surface is in poor condition while City maintenance and upkeep at Barry Field has been sporadic at best over the years my son has played soccer. It is unclear from the Plan what the timeline is for replacing the BHCC fields and creating “public green space that will serve the needs of Charlestown residents.” Realistic, measurable

project timelines for infrastructure improvements will help reassure the community that the enhancements will materialize and provide us with benchmarks by which to assess the success (or failure) of planning decisions outlined in the document.

It is also disappointing that the Plan is not integrated into the broader redesign of Rutherford Avenue. I am writing this letter at 4 PM sitting on my back deck looking out at Rutherford Ave, the upper and lower decks of I-93 and the ramps to and from the Tobin bridge. There is complete gridlock on all these roads, which will likely not fully abate for another 1-3 hours. Emergency vehicles, MBTA busses, trucks and private cars struggle to get through the bottleneck at the Charlestown bridge. This doesn't even take into consideration the truck traffic from Boston Sand and Gravel that begins long before sunrise. A development of the scale proposed, combined with a separate timeline for the Rutherford Ave reconstruction, will subject us to years of construction noise making it difficult to work at home during the day and substantially worsen traffic as construction vehicles mix with the current gridlock.

I am especially concerned that the Ensemble submission includes a large, elevated concrete ramp and bridge structure connecting parts of the development that is sited directly on Rutherford Avenue. Based on the elevations provided by the developer, this proposed bridge, combined with the ground floor design of Building A, make it difficult to envision how this will be an inviting streetscape once Rutherford Avenue is raised to grade. These are the types of design decisions that should be integrated into a broader vision for the Rutherford Ave corridor.

I would also note that the extended comment deadline for the Plan closes just one day after the Austin Street RFP responses are presented to the community. The two responses contain 369 and 378 pages of information, with the actual plot plans, elevations and pertinent information buried deep within each document. While I am not in the real estate field, I have worked on many complex projects over the years and to expect members of the community to digest these plans in less than 24 hours and provide meaningful comments is disrespectful and speaks to the larger issue of a lack of community involvement in the PLAN: Charlestown process. This is directly antithetical to your announcement of a "community-led process" and shows a disregard to those of us who have invested in this neighborhood and made it a great and desirable place to live. It seems the only voices that matter in this process are the BPDA planners, developers and unions, all of whom support short-term goals, not long-term planning.

After participating in the Austin Street developer presentation meeting, I continue to have significant concerns about infrastructure improvements for these projects. Comments from the developers focused more on potential plans as opposed to concrete ones and when asked if federal or state funding had been secured for any of these projects, there was generic talk about having conversations with the MBTA, MassDOT and other agencies. The BPDA's approach continues to be aspirational – build an excessive amount of housing now and hope the recommended infrastructure improvements materialize sometime in the future. This is not the appropriate way to plan a neighborhood.

Again, as a resident of this unique, historic community, I am saddened by the BPDA process for PLAN: Charlestown and the lack of respect for the views of neighborhood residents. The use of ARPA funds to subsidize the development of affordable housing should not be the driving force in a planning document that is supposed to represent the views of the entire community. Real benchmarks and timelines for infrastructure improvements and not just development projects are also vital to ensure that the community can judge the BPDA's successes and failures in the planning process. I strongly urge the BPDA to step back, consider the legitimate concerns and recommendations of the community, make

significant, meaningful changes to the Plan, and release a new draft before bringing this document before the BPDA Board.

I would be happy to discuss my comments with the BPDA or others in City Hall. Please let me know if you would like any additional information.

Thank you,

Jon Skarin



Julia Gaynor <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:29 PM (16 hours ago)

to mayor@boston.gov, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129

Dear Mayor Wu,

I oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It focuses more on building buildings than building a community and it undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Your goal should be to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. I seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

I respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced me that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Julia Gaynor

Charlestown homeowner

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



Katie Houghtaling <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:08 PM (16 hours ago)

to Mayor, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129, info

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

New greenspace is woefully inadequately proportioned to the amount of new building allowed. We are getting small 15' strips of grass and pocket parks that are divided by streets and very tall buildings. In fact... we may be losing green space - the Community College fields will be shrunk.

We will never get that space back - and we deserve better!

We share your vision to build communities, please give us time to do that with PLAN: Charlestown.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled

feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Katie

To: Mayor@Boston.gov

cc: Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov, gabriela.coletta@boston.gov,
dan.ryan@mahouse.gov, sal.didomenico@masenate.gov,
jason.ruggiero@boston.gov, sean.breen@boston.gov, erin.murphy@boston.gov,
ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov, julia.mejia@boston.gov, michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov,
cnc02129@gmail.com, info@CharlestownPreservation.org

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

This needs to be noted in PLAN: Charlestown's final draft.

New greenspace is woefully inadequately proportioned to the amount of new building allowed. We are getting small 15' strips of grass and pocket parks that are divided by streets and very tall buildings. In fact... we may be losing green space - the Community College fields will be shrunk.

We will never get that space back - and we deserve better!

We share your vision to build communities, please give us time to do that with PLAN: Charlestown.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with

the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Kristin Johnson



What the BPDA must address BEFORE releasing a final draft of PLAN: Charlestown:

Planning for Public Safety: The zoning guidelines encourage development at a scale that increases the neighborhood's population 80% and pushes our road traffic even further above capacity. This poses a threat to our already strained emergency response systems, including egress routes, fire, police, and medical services. There is a glaring absence of a comprehensive plan to ensure our safety and well-being. Scale back building maximums to a level that our available resources can accommodate.

Planning for Climate Resiliency: PLAN: Charlestown merely references other plans which studied the impact of rising sea-levels along shorelines and flood zones, and have not been adjusted for the current reality. Reducing the amount of permeable open space and building sea walls that direct rising waters elsewhere does not encourage climate resiliency. In its current form, PLAN: Charlestown only requires 25% permeable area. Greenspace at Bunker Hill Community College is reduced in this plan, and greenspace at the Bunker Hill Housing Development was reduced. This emphasizes parcel-level open space requirements over

considering overall neighborhood spaces cohesively. This approach results in narrow, impractical patches of grass and pocket parks, broken up by new streets and intersections, that will struggle to thrive in the shadow of towering buildings. Look to Cambridge Crossing, a good example of consolidated greenspace that created a centrally located community space. New greenspace enabled by PLAN: Charlestown should be quoted in the form of “net new space.”

Planning for Traffic Congestion: There is no plan for alleviating current traffic issues, and there is no accounting for the influx of people and vehicles that will come from regional development in Somerville and Everett. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the amount of proposed new square feet of development considered in a 2019 regional transportation study, and overly relies on expanding MBTA services, a promise the BPDA cannot guarantee. The 2019 regional study, which the City of Boston cooperated in, recommended 8,000, 000 square feet of development. PLAN: Charlestown more than doubles the 8,000,000 number to 22,000,000+. BPDA members comment about our responses to their work by claiming that full buildout “won’t happen for another 30 years.” The truth is, with the Bunker Hill Housing and Hood Park in development, and another 4,512,148 square feet currently under review, roughly half of the proposed development will be complete in 10 years. PLAN: Charlestown should recommend an updated regional transportation study after Charlestown has approved 8,000,000 square feet of new growth.

Prioritizing building heights for a vibrant Charlestown. PLAN: Charlestown proposes heights that represent a staggering 160%-233% increase from current zoning limits. BDPA's rationale for noise reduction overlooks the impact on light and how it will shorten our winter days, and create irreversible changes to our microclimate. Ensure the buildings taller than 75 feet are located where they won't obstruct light from the east or west, prioritizing residents' well-being. For example, the 2013 Plan for Sullivan Square promoted varying building heights from 3-12 stories across the area, with lower buildings located closer to the Schrafft's Building and increasing heights toward the train station, using buildings located near the I-93 via-duct to block the noise and air quality impacts of the highway (12 stories max.) It required maintaining sightlines to the Schrafft's Building and recommended the building of an iconic 7-story building on the MBTA station property. Additional parcels range in building height max from 3-12 stories (5 stories on Main Street.) This plan respects the scale of the historic Sullivan Square and Lost Village neighborhood and allows more light than the new recommendations of 15-25 stories for the same parcels. The Sullivan Square planning framework should be incorporated into PLAN: Charlestown.

Including the Bunker Hill Mall in the Original Peninsula / Lost Village, where it is a critical building block of what makes Charlestown a livable, walkable neighborhood. Development in this space should align with the Urban Design Guidelines for the historic peninsula and lost village and respect the existing 35' building height zoning on Main / Austin and School Streets and the 73' Gatehouse 75 precedent on Rutherford. The original peninsula should not be allowed a planned development agreement that furthers parcel by parcel development.

Including new development at Charlestown's waterfront within the existing scale of the industrial waterfront and residential buildings. Redevelopment of this area is an excellent opportunity to add waterfront access to residents, continue the amount of green space, and extend Doherty Park to the river. We support upzoning in this area in the form of a change of use and minor height increase above 55'. Development in this space should respect the existing 3-4 story residential buildings on Medford Street with buildings that taper down in height toward Medford Street in addition to the River. The maximum building height allowed should be no taller than

what planning consultants recommended in previous PLAN scenarios (120'.) Wind tunnel impacts on Doherty Park should be studied within the planning context.

Including the Charlestown Industrial Architectural Conservation District in the Adaptive Reuse section, making preservation a priority for many reasons. Even before PLAN: Charlestown has been adopted, development is already in progress to demolish two historic buildings on Roland Street. Preserving these buildings not only aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, it also aligns with the recommendations for Adaptive reuse that the PLAN promotes, and it represents a greener, more sustainable solution that honors and aligns with the historical character of the surrounding area, instead of wastefully tearing it all down.

From: **Mallory Scholl Gonzalez** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 3:48 PM
Subject: PLAN: Charlestown
To: <Mayor@boston.gov>
CC: <Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov>, <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>, <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sal.didomenico@masenate.gov>, <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>, <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <erin.murphy@boston.gov>, <ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov>, <julia.mejia@boston.gov>, <michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov>, <cnc02129@gmail.com>

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

--

MALLORY SCHOLL GONZALEZ



Subject: BPDA's Charlestown Plan



mac <[REDACTED]>

12:22 PM (5 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school. Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Mary Ann Chase-Borden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: **McKenzie Ridings** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 3:18 PM
Subject: Horrified at PLAN: Charlestown
To: <Mayor@boston.gov>, <Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov>
Cc: <an.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sal.didomenico@masenate.go>, <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>, <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <erin.murphy@boston.gov>, <ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov>, <julia.mejia@boston.gov>, <michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov>, <cnc02129@gmail.com>, <info@charlestownpreservation.org>

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's -- including my own family that lost their home when Mishawum Park was developed. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
M. Ridings



----- Forwarded message -----

From: <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 12:30 PM
Subject: any content warranting a revision to your draft?
To: Jason Ruggiero <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>

Hi J

Do not wait for me, but please check whether anything in my draft comment makes you want to revise something in the draft you are working on:

ITEM 3 -----

Pages 108-111 Schools

The discussion of public schools understates the problem of providing seats for all school-age children now and in the future. It makes assumptions that seem wrong:

- The total population may increase 80% by 2050 but the student population will only increase by 30%
- Maintaining the status quo is sufficient. Increasing capacity to just maintain that status is sufficient.
- Everyone is content now. No need for the calculations to consider the disappointment of families having to leave Charlestown so their children can attend a public school.
- The 30-38% of school-age children who leave the BPS system do so willingly rather than because they failed to win a school seat.
- That 30-38% externalization rate will continue in the future because it is acceptable and voluntary.
- No need to consider whether a student can walk to school. Students are content traveling for a long time to get to school.

Let me ask a sensitive question about school bussing. What level of integration of residents of Charlestown would allow BPS to stop bussing. Would the PLAN eventually meet that desirable but unstated goal? I think that most students would prefer to be able to walk to the nearest school.

Also, if I am off base let me know so I don't waste the reader's time.

FYI I will send you that item and 4 more. I doubt that they will add to the list of revisions you are working on.

I presume that you would paste my comments into the set you already posted. They would get buried there so I should write a letter to the Board.

FYI. I converted the posted set of comments into a more readable version. (2 versions attached) I cropped out info in the side columns though. Never mind. I attach them in the remote chance that they might help you.

Mike Mickelson; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [REDACTED]



Nino Balduzzi <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 5:09 PM (15 hours ago)

to mayor, arthur.jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.louijeune, julia.mejia, michael.f.flaherty, cnc02129, info

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Nino Balduzzi

████████████████████ — Where traffic is already backed up over a half mile as cars attempt to get into the City Square intersection

From: **Nora Blake** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 5:32 PM

Subject: Plan Charlestown

To: <Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov>, Gabriela Coletta <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>, Dan Ryan <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sal.didomenico@masenate.gov>, Jason Ruggiero <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>, Sean Breen <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <erin.murphy@boston.gov>, <ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov>, <julia.mejia@boston.gov>, <michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov>, <cnc02129@gmail.com>

Hi,

First I appreciate all the work and planning that the team has undertaken. As with any large project there are a couple of areas that I would respectfully request be brought back for public discussion and in some cases revised.

I write to you as a cancer patient who depends on the incredible healthcare that we are so blessed to have in this City. I am terrified that an ambulance will not be able to get to me or get me out of Charlestown in an emergency. I can plan to leave 2 hours before an appointment but my fear is that in an emergency the gridlock that we already face will be insurmountable and I have attended many meetings and there seems to be a real disconnect on this. Traffic has steadily increased due to the development in Everett, Sommerville and Cambridge. Charlestown streets are backed up on a regular basis and it is getting worse. As growth in housing is needed there does not appear to be realistic plans for moving traffic in an efficient way. Charlestown is basically an island with limited options, no matter what time of the day you try and move around there is major traffic, having lived here for over 20 years I have adjusted my hours, utilized public transportation and biked. Ambulance do not have this luxury and I implore you to add more ambulances to Charlestown and continue to work on a realistic plan for emergency vehicles to enter and exit Charlestown.

Thank you for pulling back on including the Bunker Hill Mall in the Growth Area, the initial plans I have seen are too big and it was my understanding the Charlestown Peninsula would not include such large buildings as it would be very detrimental to the historic area and neighborhood.

I do not oppose larger height and development in Sullivan Square, as it is right next to the T Station and accessible to Boston and Cambridge. My concern is the neighborhoods that are already here, the Lost Village and the Peninsula. These areas should not be destroyed and rendered unrecognizable, with nothing left of the oldest neighborhood in the City of Boston. Due to neglect and piecemeal development Charlestown clearly has suffered, it is my hope that this process will take a step back and frankly fix some of the mistakes that have happened while also adding much needed new housing and commerce. I believe this can be accomplished as there are exceptionally talented people who can continue to bring innovative ideas.

My ask:

Emergency Services plan, having done disaster planning for hospitals I am confident your EMT, Fire and Police Teams know what they need, I worked side by side with them on many occasions, please listen to them.

Please do not allow the Bunker Hill Mall Project to exceed the original peninsula zoning height.

Infrastructure matters, and there are limited funds for them as they are less exciting and attention getting. This will most likely be Charlestown's chance to get it right or else it will be 30 years of work arounds and pain. Not a world class example of City Planning it could be Include historical items like retaining the brick sidewalks, rethink the lightings, rethink the entrances into Charlestown with a nod towards history and tourism (which create jobs and attracts workers to Boston), rethink the power lines that are becoming a real threat to a densely settled town with majority wood structures as the climate change continues to bring more severe weather. The good news is over half of Charlestown is already buried, finish the job and this will allow more trees to be planted.

Thank you for all your hard work, let's slow the process down and fix these issues and others that have been brought forward. Let's have this project be one that is seen as a model nationwide. Boston can do it!

Respectfully,

Nora Moynihan Blake

Rosemary Campbell <[REDACTED]>

8:44 AM (9 hours ago)

to mayor@cityofboston.gov, Ryan, Dan - Rep. (HOU), sal.didomenico@masenate.gov, jason.ruggiero@boston.gov, sean.breen@boston.gov, Erin Murphy, Ruthzee.Louijeune@boston.gov, Julia.Mejia@boston.gov, Michael.F.Flaherty@boston.gov, cnc02129@gmail.com, info@charlestownpreservation.org

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-

driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,

Rosemary Campbell



Subject: PLAN Charlestown



Shannon Lynch

to Arthur.Jemison, mayor, Michael.F.Flaherty, Ruthzee.Louijeune, cnc02129, dan.ryan, erin.murphy, info, jason.ruggiero, ju

11:41 AM (6 hours ago)

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with a broken transportation system, unsafe emergency response times, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal.

You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Shannon Lynch



Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown



Shannon Soupcoff <[REDACTED]>

Thu, Sep 21, 4:55 PM (15 hours ago)

to Mayor, Arthur.Jemison, gabriela.coletta, dan.ryan, sal.didomenico, jason.ruggiero, sean.breen, erin.murphy, ruthzee.lou

You are viewing an attached message. City of Boston Mail can't verify the authenticity of attached messages.

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Shannon Soupcoff

[REDACTED]

From: Tess O'Brien [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 3:53 PM
Subject: Please reconsider PLAN: Charlestown
To: <Mayor@boston.gov>
CC: <Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov>, Gabriela Coletta <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>, <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sal.didomenico@masenate.gov>, <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>, <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <erin.murphy@boston.gov>, <ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov>, <julia.mejia@boston.gov>, <michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov>, <cnc02129@gmail.com>, Info at CPS <info@charlestownpreservation.org>

Dear Mayor Wu,

We oppose PLAN: Charlestown's Final Draft. It falls short of our shared vision with your Office, and instead focuses more on building buildings than building a community. The PLAN undermines public safety by compounding capacity issues at neighborhood gateways, and neighborhood schools, disregards community input, and leans toward developer-driven building over community planning.

We suffer with unsafe emergency response times, we are understaffed for emergency services, have a broken transportation system, traffic gridlock that backs up into the neighborhood, high housing costs, and most of our children can not get a seat at a high-quality school.

Many of our neighborhood residents still suffer from the generational trauma caused by the BRA in the 1960's and 1970's. This feels like a second round of Urban Renewal... but without the significant City investments and benefits of Urban Renewal. You are relying on overdevelopment, increased density and very tall buildings to pay for the neighborhood infrastructure and services that should be the responsibility of the City.

Our goal is to improve our quality of life with cohesive visions for new and existing spaces, prioritizing the best of Charlestown while accommodating future and current residents. We seek development principles that enhance use and livability, where new development harmonizes with the historic neighborhood, and new green spaces encourage gatherings of neighbors while combatting our heat island effect. We need neighborhood infrastructure to improve and expand for our needs now, and for an expanded population. This vision hasn't materialized in the process.

We insist on an immediate opportunity to collaborate on the final PLAN: Charlestown before its approval and implementation. In a recent Zoom meeting on September 11th, Arthur Jemison emphasized a "PLAN guided by you" approach, noting BPDA's delay of major development to allow a community-driven vision to emerge. However, the process has involved lengthy presentations and controlled feedback sessions, consequently, PLAN: Charlestown is the BPDA's vision of City policy first, and not the community needs.

We respectfully urge the Mayor's Office and the BPDA to pause PLAN: Charlestown's adoption. Rushing its completion dismisses the lasting impact of development guidelines, risking harm to present and future residents' quality of life. 4,576,800+ square feet of planned development is

already underway, 3,887,152 is currently under review, and another 17,659,445 proposed will increase Charlestown's population by 80%.

The BPDA has not convinced us that the City can improve our quality of life and safety issues... and you may not compound them with overdevelopment.

We appreciate that the Bunker Hill Mall was removed from the proposed "Growth Area" designated in PLAN: Charlestown. That's a good start. However, we don't want New England Development to come back with a PDA that includes the same heights. 70' on Main Street, 90' on School and Austin Streets and 150' on Rutherford is unacceptable.

We ask that the BPDA remove the parcel from PDA eligibility, abide by the original peninsula's zoning height maximums of 35', 50% minimum open space requirements, and Urban Design Guidelines.

Rushing this plan to completion in order to approve development erodes our trust in city leadership.

Signed,
Tess O'Brien

A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.A solid black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

From: **Tim McKenna** [REDACTED]

Date: Thu, Sep 21, 2023 at 5:13 PM

Subject: PLAN: Charlestown and Open Space Commitments

To: Mayor <mayor@boston.gov>

CC: <Arthur.Jemison@boston.gov>, Gabriela Coletta <gabriela.coletta@boston.gov>, Ryan, Dan - Rep. (HOU) <dan.ryan@mahouse.gov>, <sal.didomenico@masenate.gov>, Jason Ruggiero <jason.ruggiero@boston.gov>, Sean Breen <sean.breen@boston.gov>, <erin.murphy@boston.gov>, <ruthzee.louijeune@boston.gov>, <julia.mejia@boston.gov>, <michael.f.flaherty@boston.gov>, <cnc02129@gmail.com>, Ryan Woods <ryan.woods@boston.gov>, Hughes, Brendan <brendan.hughes@bhcc.edu>

Mayor Wu,

It was great getting to share some thoughts with you during your listening session for Youth Soccer in the City on Sunday. During the session, I shared the concern that I had already raised with Jason and Gigi. In the needs assessment sections regarding open space, It is noted that Charlestown has a ratio of 2.5 acres of protected open space per 1000 residents, already below East Boston and other neighborhoods. The recommendation stated in the plan is to at minimum, retain that ratio of protected open space as the community increases ~50% to a target population of 30K residents. By my math, this would require a net new addition of protected open space of 41 acres. The plan highlights 20 new acres of open space, but it does not detail exactly where those acres are added and it appears (as CPA is calling out) that it is counting the reduced green space at Bunker Hill Community College as part of that net acreage. It also recommends at least two new full-size soccer fields, but the plan appears to be highlighting Bunker Hill Community College again as that location. That is not net new open space or allow for an increase in community participation. BHCC has allowed us to use their fields, but must understandably prioritize their programming first and foremost.

How does the city plan to hold itself accountable for the net new creation of 41 new acres of open space? Over what time frame, and where? There are 50 acres of land that is held by MassPort (privately held) yet those acres are not at all contemplated in this zoning initiative. The city has an appointed representative on the MassPort board, but all we hear about is the inability of the city to hold any influence over them. 14 acres at the Medford St terminals alone have little if any active waterborne industrial activity.

The point is, that the lack of detail around this one topic of creating and protecting open space as an infrastructure investment to go along with these major zoning changes is at the crux of the undercurrent of distrust that others are objecting to this close-out process, whether that be seats in schools, access to transportation, or emergency services.

My charter has always been the promotion of new open space and I asked you how you would commit to protecting these spaces when you came to the CNC meeting during your campaign. I believe that you care about these topics so I'm imploring you to help us pause this process so we can get the outcomes that protect our priorities in ensuring Boston is the best city to raise a family.

All the best,

--

Tim McKenna
CYSA Board Member - Public Relations
Charlestown Neighborhood Council Treasurer &
Basic Services Committee Chair



**Follow us @followcysa - links
below**



www.charlestownsoccer.com

