

PLAN: Charlestown Survey Responses 7/28/23 - 9/6/23

Date	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?
7/29/23 0:19	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>Readability and thoroughness --- but Don't want streets reconfigured to intersect perpendicularly -- this is part of the charm of old Charlestown and seems to be a re-introduction of "Edward Logue" mentality. No household should be allowed more than one residential parking permit, and each permit should require a significant fee to support the installation of EV charging on streets. Plans for bikers and private car drivers should not be given priority over walkers, as walkers predominantly use the MBTA public transportation. Recommending more study of the Gilmore bridge seems insulting --- what is needed is a construction plan implemented in less than 5 years. The State needs to get behind this.</p>	
7/31/23 14:53	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>I like that electric charging was addressed but it was stated that most people are less than a ten min walk to a charger. That is not true</p>	<p>More electric vehicle only curbside charging spots with plugs in the overhead lights.</p>
8/3/23 18:40	I_live_in_Charlestown	N/a	<p>All of the high rises along Rutherford shouldn't be allowed. The ones on the Cambridge side, already block a portion of our view. Can we keep what we have left of the view from this neighborhood please? This proposition almost doubles the population of this neighborhood. We have a transit infrastructure that cannot support this level of growth. There is no parking in this neighborhood to support this many people moving into the area. Even with the proposal to not provide them parking, most people own cars in 2023. This proposal wants to change the zoning in the Navy Yard to allow almost any type of business. Why? The Navy Yard is a historic neighborhood, and allowing any type of business will denigrate the historic nature of the area. Who does this proposal cater to? Certainly is not the current residents of this neighborhood.</p>
8/3/23 21:18	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>Excellent work- takes into account the need for housing, tree cover, parks and transportation while trying to preserve the historic nature of the neighborhood.</p>	<p>While tall buildings along the highway (93) makes sense I would like to see lower buildings - it seems to high and dense. I worry that the park land or open space will be minimized when actually build (look at the absurdity of the water walk in the Seaport-and the lack of green space and views of the harbor)</p>
8/4/23 13:51	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>I'm impressed at the thoroughness of the excellent design guidelines- they capture what is significant about the architectural history here. I appreciate the amount of work done to get here.</p>	<p>This document lets developers dictate the quality of life; building height guides are WAY too high. This is a quiet refuge in the city with a walkable human scale. People will leave.</p> <p>The vision statement is a set of things to do, without any meaning. Generally, the doc lacks commentary about the quality of life it intends. Example: it notes the historical nature of the neighborhood, but there's nothing to indicate how the future CONNECTS to that, nothing about how bike paths, mobility, or tall buildings support its history.</p> <p>Finally, assumptions throughout justify choices. One example: suggesting why 65+ move in while younger adults don't: "could be due to the lack of affordable housing stock, a lack of certain amenities appealing to younger adults, or other neighborhood characteristics which are either failing to attract this very important demographic or making the neighborhood less accessible to them." Young adults want the Seaport District and it's more \$\$\$\$. Consider meaning.</p>

8/4/23 16:11	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	I appreciate the importance of having a plan in place for development, as it provides structure. However, the current plan seems to contain numerous instances of "encouraged/avoid" aspects. To ensure the effectiveness of the plan, I suggest it be revised to say "Required" (or other similar language). This would not only garner more support from the community but ensure that initial plans are not value-engineered to remove these details during the final stages of the development process.	Unfortunately, the document is 222 pages, and the comment period closes on September 1st. This is an inadequate amount of time, especially during the height of summer when many are traveling. The comment period should be extended.
8/4/23 16:39	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Thank you and the team for completing this very comprehensive Plan. It came out really well. Proposed heights and density look great, especially along the highway. Though I would have liked to see more, 280 is a good compromise.	Greater density and height limits in the Lost Village area and the area north of Alford. I know the MBTA owns a lot of this land, so height and density may not be much of an issue here, but it is an post-industrial area with zero residential neighbors near them. Heights could go 300 and 5.0 FAR for everything north of Alford.
8/4/23 18:24	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>There is a lot of good stuff, but it's all small! The major pieces are still missing! While the inner streets is not bad, the failures to address how people leave and enter the community via foot, bike comm based transit and the MBTA services is lacking! And that still doesn't address Everett issues.</p> <p>There is a need to have aspirational goal that also sets these in stone! Adding new transit corridors for foot, bike and Intra-community transit which is isolated from the rest of the vehicle traffic, walkways which are wide enough to walk, protected bike lanes and independent MicroBus transit pathways.</p> <p>Shuttle buses which run along congested pathways won't work! There are not designed for short hops and can't be isolated onto independent paths with high priority crossings.</p> <p>The MBTA bus network within C-Town is highly flawed! While I would love to have 10 min heads, the routes can't offer that and the R-Ave pathway doesn't offer the community anything, only hurt us! It isolates us!</p>	<p>Falls short! Population values undersized the residential number need to be 2.1 per housing unit. And you don't even have a work-force value. Treat these numbers at the max the community can grow to based on our current transit.</p> <p>Now with that calculate what is added to move this new population (in & out) based on how many s/ft of housing space divided into the unit sizes you are expecting to build a mix of studio, one, two & three bed rooms. Figuring a bit of bias to two and three bedrooms for families and room mate occupied units again using 2.1. Now what is the added pop and how you move this new population.</p> <p>Hint it's not personal cars! And second hint we don't have the needed access across R-Ave to even build new ways into Boston or Cambridge for cars! Only walking, biking and MicroBus can do it. And that's only with new cross overs one at Austin St a second in between the T stations and access to Cambridge St.</p>
8/6/23 21:32	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>The height of the buildings. Particularly on the Austin St parking lots. But broadly this is all too tall. Instead of addressing the number 1 comment from the community (a desire for shorter buildings), you made a reduction to the max height at the periphery (which many would argue was preposterous in the first place) and then crammed buildings 3X+ the size of the residences across the street right in the heart of the historic core.</p> <p>This was a middle finger to the community. The creation of the hybrid plan added the Bunker Hill Mall to scope, and now, in the face of all of the community concern on height and protecting the core, you pull this radical rezoning right into the core - along Main Street and Austin Street - the main entrance to town.</p> <p>I question our civic process broadly. I've lost faith in city government as a result of this exercise. It is very disappointing and the late changes just rub salt in the wounds of the community.</p>
8/9/23 13:37	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like the approach to green areas, bike routes, and walk-bike-transit approach to developing the area around Sullivan square and along the 93.	It is not OK that the BPDA is pushing to maximize development within the historic peninsula and along the Mystic River. There is no place on the neighborhood side of Rutherford Ave for 70' / 90' / 150' and 180' buildings. Infill buildings in a historic neighborhood must blend into the environment both in design details, scale and height.
8/10/23 17:13	I_live_in_Charlestown	Have not been able to view it online, so have no opinion. Please send me a link siegelman@msn.com	There is no one on the Advisory Group representing the Navy Yard. I am President of the Friends of the Charlestown Navy Yard. I was not aware that the Navy Yard was being included in PLAN:Charlestown until reading the Patriot Bridge today. I was not able to access the actual plan when I tried to use the link provided in the article. I am particularly interested in the Navy Yard chapter.

8/11/23 0:59	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	I appreciate the emphasis on increasing housing, transportation (including safer bike lanes), and traffic/pedestrian safety. We should be doing everything we can to welcome new residents and make it easier for new and existing residents to live and get around here. I also found the report very interesting and learned a lot I didn't know about the neighborhood. It is one of the most informative and well-written government documents I have seen.	<p>-I am concerned that increasing demolition delay will make it more difficult to build new housing.</p> <p>-There should be fewer restrictions on building regarding lot usage, stepbacks, design requirements, etc. Building in Boston is too expensive and difficult, contributes to the housing crisis and is a drag on our economy.</p> <p>-Two additional ideas for traffic/bike/pedestrian safety: 1. In line with the suggestion to reduce street parking, cars are currently allowed to park too close to corners, or rules against it aren't enforced, making it very difficult to see approaching traffic when crossing an intersection by vehicle. 2. Currently, red light, stop sign, and speeding violations simply aren't enforced. If there were cooperation with BPD to enforce those laws, pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers would be safer.</p>
8/11/23 21:33	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Not much.	<p>Charlestown alone cannot solve the city's housing crisis -- it's time the Mayor realized that. There is too much focus on density and increasing the population of the neighborhood substantially over the next 20-30 years. If all of the areas are fully built out, Charlestown will lose its historic character -- one of the reasons people choose to live here. Unlike E. Boston, Back Bay and Beacon Hill, we still have many single family homes, which makes it an ideal neighborhood for families. Hundreds or thousands of units of multi-family housing will fundamentally alter the neighborhood and put a significant strain on services and amenities that draw people to Charlestown. Our youth sports programs are already fighting for field space and 10,000 more residents will only increase demand on the limited space we have. And despite the city's assurances, these new residents will bring cars and more traffic to a neighborhood that already feels cut off from the surrounding communities.</p>
8/18/23 15:44	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like the support for the development and preservation of ground floor retail. I appreciate the allowance of density in the currently industrial part of Charlestown, where it doesn't take away from any neighborhood character and it expands and improves housing opportunity.	<p>I would like to see the zoning recommendations actually be even more mindful and supportive of residents making best use of their properties - in particular where setbacks aren't required for safety on roofs, I think setbacks should be kept to a minimum to allow for the largest outdoor space enjoyment possible. I would also like to see more bike storage opportunities throughout the neighborhood that are available to residents of any building (not just people moving in to new buildings). I would also like to see improvement for EV car charging throughout the historic core of Charlestown where people are currently charging cars by unsafely running cables.</p> <p>Most of all, I'd like to see expanded affordable housing opportunities. I hope the City considers an affordable housing overlay (similar to Cambridge) that allows for higher density / rewards developers for the inclusion or focus on affordable housing options (beyond IDP).</p>
8/22/23 17:21	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing, to be honest. You have taken years of study and thrown it out the window to address your OWN goals, not those of the city or the neighborhood of Charlestown.	<p>This is far too aggressive and does NOT take into consideration the years of actual planning that occurred or the feedback received.</p> <p>This is a greedy takeover by the BPDA which does not reflect the needs or desires of the neighborhood or the city. Building heights are out of control, density is far too great, open space is lacking, traffic patterns are extreme and overall this does NOT work for Charlestown.</p> <p>Shame on you Mayor Wu and the city too.</p>

8/22/23 21:58	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like investing in Charlestown and expanding access to a fantastic neighborhood.	<p>There is zero option to reduce vehicle access / parking in Charlestown. It is already congested. How can you add housing without taking that into account?</p> <p>Additionally, the bunker hill mall should not become a tower, that is a place that locals gather and utilize extensively. Going beyond what was proposed is not only wrong it's poor planning.</p> <p>Charlestown infrastructure is completely lacking. Already there are 2 ways in and out. THAT IS NOT ENOUGH to expand population growth or workplace growth this extensively. This is lacking logistical thoughtfulness.</p>
8/22/23 22:02	I_live_in_Charlestown	The initial plans in theory supported sustaining the historic and family nature of where we live.	<p>Not increasing the building heights.</p> <p>Want to see parking addressed - by increasing the amount of housing by so much, nothing is being done to truly address the massive parking challenges we already face in Charlestown with the existing population.</p> <p>Additionally, nothing is being done to address the increased traffic, when getting in and out of Charlestown is already bad during peak hours.</p> <p>The 2019 Lower Mystic Regional Planning Study indicated that Charlestown could add eight million square feet, this plan greatly exceeds that.</p>
8/22/23 22:07	I_live_in_Charlestown	I don't like anything.	<p>Building sizes need to be decreased to meet the historic requirements. I don't want any parking spaces eliminated. Please do not put any apartment complex in the Bunker Hill Mall area.</p>
8/22/23 22:09	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	Nothing.	<p>Clear and thoughtful plan with the primary goal of preserving, growing and enhancing the neighborhood.</p>
8/22/23 22:13	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	It is phenomenally well detailed	<p>Charlestown deserves a thoughtful, well considered plan that seeks to preserve and enhance this wonderful historic neighborhood. This plan allows for too much additional development. I know everyone seems to want to live in Charlestown but this plan shows a lack of understanding of Charlestown's size. A more modest approach to new development is what is called for.</p>
8/22/23 22:18	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	The update Plan Charlestown is way larger than originally proposed. There is not much to like in this proposal. In addition, the few meetings I attended produced opposite results. For example the parking lots by the community college. A community center, fields and etc were all recommended but BPDA issued an RFP for mixed used housing a few months later. There were huge concerns about the air quality.	<p>The scale. All the building heights are greatly increased in scale compared to the original proposal. On Medford St no buildings should be taller than the Schrafts Tower. And I believe we need to be included because of the public by right has access to the water. In addition Main Street height requirements are supposed to be 50' not the proposed 70'. My biggest concern is infrastructure which is not here to support this growth. Both the city and representatives know this. Cars, roads, water and sewer, police, fire fighters and etc. This plan over exceeds all these resources with no good planning from the City. Honestly this is a bait and switch. The BPDA should be ashamed of themselves for putting this plan in front of us.</p>
8/22/23 22:19	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much. Keep the building lower.	
8/22/23 22:20	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing! We were lied to by the BPDA and its employees on numerous occasions. The whole PLAN is about the almighty dollar and nothing else. Where is the zoning commission? Where are the City lawyers? Why are we paying taxes to a City that can't provide basic infrastructure to support our current population. None of the residents concerns have been addressed, yet out of town Developers will make a fortune and leave us to deal with all the problems.	<p>Keep with current zoning height and density restrictions! Money and greed does not justify a change to the current zoning.</p>
8/22/23 22:21	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not a lot, it's hard to keep up with the changes, non of which are any benefit to the community and people who live her. Why do the buildings need to be so tall? Why so many? Why does every deficit the city has need to be rectified with Charlestown. None of this sounds reasonable or beneficial to the city or the residents. It's literally a blueprint of how to ruin a city.	<p>Building heights, building density. Focus on the community that is already here. Fix the rotary.</p>

8/22/23 22:27	I_live_in_Charlestown	I like that we are planning for some improvements to Charlestown however not to the extent written in the PLAN and not when it hasn't taken our residents into consideration. There is certainly growth opportunity but we don't want to look like Boylston or Newbury streets.	Charlestown has 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. Changes need to reflect the thoughtful values of our residents and young families. Keep the building heights at the limit proposed by Charlestown residents.
8/22/23 22:32	I_live_in_Charlestown	Absolutely nothing	I'd like to see all building ceased in the town, how many more people, cars, animals are you going to jam into one square mile?
8/22/23 22:40	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Less density. Less height. More attention to the historical significance of the neighborhood and architecture that is in sync with that. More attention to the future infrastructure needs of the neighborhood once all of this development is done.
8/22/23 22:41	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Green spaces, tree protection, bike lanes, and traffic damping measures on Rutherford	<p>**Excessive Building Expansion**: The proposal to add over 10 million more square feet, greatly exceeding regional planning recommendations, threatens to create unbearable traffic congestion, especially on Austin Street, where backups are already a daily concern.</p> <p>**Height Increases and Historic Preservation**: The doubling of existing building heights on Main Street, Austin Street, School Street, and Rutherford Ave is incompatible with our historic neighborhood. These changes would dwarf landmarks like the Phipps Burying Ground and diminish the prominence of the Battle of Bunker Hill Monument.</p> <p>**Recommendations for Consideration**: I believe that new buildings should be of the same scale as existing ones with comparable use. Thoughtful planning that respects Charlestown's historic fabric is essential.</p>
8/22/23 22:46	I_live_in_Charlestown		The building heights are all too high. And the expansion is too aggressive. Charlestown is a historic neighborhood and the draft plan does not protect the integrity of this neighborhood. Not include enough parking. Parking is already very difficult for residents.
8/22/23 23:08	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing I have read	A statement of preserving ALL historic buildings. I would like to see a promise of not over crowding our already congested community with high rise buildings
8/22/23 23:10	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing - we need a master plan, not the piecemeal overdevelopment pushed by the BPDA.	Scrap it - we need a master plan, not the piecemeal overdevelopment pushed by the BPDA.
8/22/23 23:22	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	As I understand it, very little.	<p>In a recent email to members, the CPS urged them -- us, as we're members -- to oppose this plan. After carefully reviewing their arguments, for and against, we concur. This, to be straightforward, is a mess: especially the ignoring of inputs from the CPS; and most of all, the reliance on "aspirational goals" rather than actual data. "Aspirational goals" is an empty term, allowing anyone to advocate for anything, no matter how silly, without needing to have any evidence. You can have your "aspirational goals" and I can have mine, and there's no basis for judging which is the stronger argument; instead, it's just a matter of rhetorical fashion and gross political power. Shame on the City of Boston and the MBTA for coming to such a sad outcome in this exercise!</p> <p>...</p> <p>Although we rarely write emails to our political representatives, in this case we felt we should, given the importance of the matter. We urge you to oppose this plan, and please, prevent it from passing in its present form.</p>
8/22/23 23:26	I_live_in_Charlestown		
8/22/23 23:33	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing about it !!	Cut way back on the overdevelopment. The town will lose its character

8/22/23 23:45	I_live_in_Charlestown	I initially liked that the city was working with the residents and employers in Charlestown to ensure that the PLAN was fit for purpose. However, that seems to have changed and the plans now are to 'overbuild' in Charlestown without the necessary infrastructure to support it.	I would like the heights of proposed new structures lowered in line with the existing architecture of the town. I would like there to be enough parking for the building that is taking place. I'd like to know how the issue of gridlock is going to be dealt with. You can't get in or out of Charlestown without sitting in a significant amount of traffic.
8/22/23 23:48	I_live_in_Charlestown	As a home owner not much. I suppose the waterfront development along the lower Mystic IN PRINCIPLE is an appealing idea however the reality is that this area will turn into multiple high rise buildings of 180'. Is the BPDA's plan to turn this into something similar to Seaport? In truth there is not much I like about the plan. I understand change is inevitable but I am disappointed in the BPDA's politics and what seems to be the total disregard of the residents of Charlestown.	As mentioned in previous submissions and surveys the height of the buildings. That is my biggest concern. They are not building more homes but high rise buildings. That in itself speaks volumes.
8/22/23 23:52	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not happy with it. Building height is too high and neighborhood is already too dense	Reduce proposed building height on Austin ' main. BH Mall development. Preserve historic buildings
8/22/23 23:54	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>This plan does not support the historic nature of our neighborhood. It will significantly change the appearance of our spaces. The inability to protect the historic character of our neighborhood, is tragic. Tourism here specifically is due to our charm , historic buildings and houses. Not new sky rise buildings. Your building plans have completely disregard of previous regional planning processes in historic spaces.</p> <p>Not only that, our streets and limited parking will not allow for these high rise building proposed in designated areas around town- especially around Main Street. Insufficient information has been submitted to residents on how these buildings will accommodate parking for the new residents as well as current residents that live in that area.</p> <p>I, amongst my fellow neighbors oppose these plans immensely. We ask for more consideration, time and thought be brought to the table in order to help Charlestown grow properly.</p>
8/23/23 0:01	I_live_in_Charlestown	I support the plan, it is well done, thorough, transparent and helpful to Charlestown. Without the BPDA, and predecessor BRA (since 1955), Charlestown would not be the great community it is. The Plan is a reasonable balance between outer Charlestown development and inner core protection. It supports the spirit of Charlestown.	Nothing worthy of mention. Nothing justified by data and fact.
8/23/23 0:19	I_live_in_Charlestown	Very little. Focus is on further developing structures in the neighborhood that will serve contractors well; but, will do little to actually enhance the community.	Far too much development for this very small area. Increasing the height criteria of proposed buildings will do nothing to enhance this community. We need less in the way of construction of larger buildings and more attention to the issues of infrastructure that currently exist. The type of development proposed will destroy the character of this neighborhood. It will not benefit the community.
8/23/23 0:35	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	The draft does not seem to have incorporated any community comments and the building sizes look larger. I like the idea of more trees and parks but where are the plans? Where is the data about traffic changes?	I do not like the fact the bunker hill mall is being proposed to allow up to 7 stories. That property, as part of the original peninsula is surrounded by 3 story walk ups. To put a skyscraper at the main entrance to Charlestown will destroy our small community and cast a shadow over the entire neighborhood.
8/23/23 0:37	I_live_in_Charlestown		Bunker Hill Mall needs to stay at a 35 foot height variance. I support new development but this is a historic neighborhood and new development needs to be done wisely. It is not right to treat this lot, in the center of our community the same as the large large developments at the outer edges of Charlestown.
8/23/23 0:43	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing. Lack of adequate green space ? Water access? What about the infrastructure ?	Growth is out of control. Charlestown can't handle the increase in population. Traffic in and out of Charlestown is ridiculous. Proposed reduction of automobile use is a not based on any facts.

8/23/23 0:51	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Less population and more businesses
8/23/23 0:53	I_live_in_Charlestown	I don't like it. The historic character of Charleston will not be protected. The plans for aspirational goals as opposed to data based recommendations and the MBTA's inability to plan necessary infrastructure and services. I oppose the doubling of the existing building heights on Main Street.	I want more adaptive use of buildings as opposed to demolition. Parking needs to be considered and traffic and the height of the new buildings.
8/23/23 1:06	I_live_in_Charlestown	The document is an impressive body of work with many strong ideas for the creation of affordable housing, open space and new development. We are proud to have supported and advocated for these very important needs in the community, however, the PLAN contains new concepts that contradict its original goals and intention to positively shape the future of our neighborhood, it disregards the many comments CPS and others have submitted around the protection of historic Charlestown, and discounts the need for supportive infrastructure and services to underpin growth.	Not Adding 10+ million more square feet than a 2019 regional planning study used as a basis for planning mobility in the region. A 2019 Lower Mystic Regional Planning Study indicated that Charlestown could add eight million square feet, this plan greatly exceeds that. Doubling building heights on Main Street (at the Bunker Hill Mall) from 35' (3-stories) to 70', 90' (8-stories) on Austin St and School St and 150' (14-stories) on Rutherford Ave. Previous drafts proposed 50' along Main Street and 90' on Rutherford, and the community clearly stated that the proposed heights were too tall for the abutting context of the historic neighborhood. Increasing the building heights between Medford Street and the Mystic River (below historic Doherty Park) from 55' to 180'. (Taller than the historic Schrafft's tower) Previous drafts proposed a max building height of 50-120' The final draft raised the heights despite clear planning recommendations for 120' max..
8/23/23 1:17	I_live_in_Charlestown	Adding modern affordable housing, and adding additional housing which is needed	Lower building heights and less housing units. Charlestown is only 1 square mile, very small in area, so adding this many people to such a small area will make traffic much worse than it already is.
8/23/23 1:37	I_live_in_Charlestown	As it currently stands I'm opposed to the entire thing.. This is too much, too large without the proper services and ruining a historic neighborhood in attempts to make it look as ridiculous as the Seaport. The roads, schools, fire, ambulance and police are not in place for this growth. We lack any PCP's or adequate healthcare (they aren't taking patients at any of the health centers currently in Charlestown, an affordable grocery store is in Cambridge or Somerville and you need to DRIVE to those. This is too big and too much for this small community.	Go back to the original heights that the neighborhood agreed to.
8/23/23 1:50	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	This draft plan is an abuse of the community and the people that live in it. Charlestown cannot bear the incredible amount of saturation, and monolithic buildings that this plan calls for. This neighborhood is a community, historic and rich in participating citizens. This plan absolutely cannot advance. You will destroy everything that is Charlestown.
8/23/23 2:31	I_live_in_Charlestown	More room for families	Heights are way too high

8/23/23 2:54	I_live_in_Charlestown	I strongly oppose the PLAN. The proposed developments ignore the goals to preserve historic Charlestown buildings, increases building heights and ignores traffic concerns with no improvements plans. The plan ignores community concerns NOT to change integrity of neighborhood. I do not like this plan.	<p>Removal of bikes racks as a viable PLAN to address traffic issues. Families do not use bikes-to go grocery shopping, run errands, and go on play dates and bring kids to school.</p> <p>More open space. Green space and preservation of this historic neighborhood and buildings.</p> <p>Strategy to address population growth and access to residents homes.</p> <p>Strict limit on building heights than do not exceed 3+ stories.</p> <p>Realistic approach for housing for families vs compact living spaces which does not represent a neighborhood or community.</p> <p>Developers should not be allowed to submit proposals to destroy our historic structures. It should not be allowed to go through an approval process</p> <p>Developers should not be allowed or approved to submit proposals for our waterfront that block water views from the residents and block /wall in our entrances into the town. Buildings in Cambridge have changed the skyline views and block the light in Charlestown.</p>
8/23/23 11:05	I_live_in_Charlestown	The earlier aspects that were proposed	Lack of parking and vehicle infrastructure, sudden increases of building heights in the recent version, destruction of historic buildings
8/23/23 11:54	I_live_in_Charlestown	I think the renovations will be helpful to the community	The plan is too large and Charlestown cannot accommodate so many large buildings or people or transit. They need to reduce the size of the plan.
8/23/23 12:23	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	This is not a PLAN! There is no infrastructure, schools, or transportation plans do support this many residents. The MBTA, BPS, and DOT are far too disorganized to get a support plan in place before it's too late.	The size needs to be severely reduced and appropriate school and transportation measures need to be in motion.
8/23/23 12:54	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	It's an impressive body of work, but it seems to prioritize developers best interest over citizens.	<p>The plan increases building heights and square footage -- enabling thousands more residents to join our Charlestown community (which we welcome) but WITHOUT ANY CONCRETE PLAN FOR IMPROVING THE INFRASTRUCTURE.</p> <p>Cars will NOT decrease by 50% - the number of cars and traffic will increase. Public transportation in Charlestown is terrible, which makes cars necessary (sadly). There is no concrete plan to address this.</p> <p>Local schools are already over-subscribed, how will you accommodate the hundreds of new students? Bus students further away? (see traffic comment above).</p> <p>You owe it to the citizens (current and future) to PROVIDE COMMITMENTS for improving the public infrastructure, if you're going to approve building this much capacity.</p>
8/23/23 13:21	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Developing underutilized parcels of land, bringing commerce and restaurants to a neighborhood that is so overlooked when it comes to making the city better and more vibrant	The current plan does not adequately account for the transportation needs in Charlestown. We already have insufficient MBTA access between the issues with the Orange Line and relatively limited bus service on the 92 and 93 lines. Parking can be challenging and will be more so with construction temporarily or permanently removing existing spaces and creating future demand for additional parking. Our roadways are clogged - the Sullivan Rotary, Washington St Bridge, and Gilmore Bridge are the only three ways in and out of Charlestown and they are a mess. This plan needs to address those issues. I do not think this plan is adequate without addressing the transportation needs and it will in fact harm the quality of life for Charlestown residents.
8/23/23 13:55	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing, it's turned into pack of lies intended to line the pockets of developers	Go back to the original 2019 recommendations on building heights and sizes, and actually do an infrastructure study that will reflect the increased population.

8/23/23 14:43	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much	<p>Adding 10+ ml more sq ft than 2019 Lower Mystic Regional Plng Study (used as basis for plng mobility) which indicated Ctown could add 8 MI sq ft</p> <p>Doubling bldg ht Main St (B Hill Mall) 35 to 70', 90' on Austin & School & 150' on Rutherford Prior drafts for 50'on Main & 90' on Rutherford Final draft Increasing bldg ht Mdfd St to Mystic Rvr below Doherty Pk from 55 - 180' Prior drafts for max bldg ht 50-120'</p> <p>PLAN's use of aspirational goals to reduce personal vehicle use by 50 %. That number is not based on data, planning or forecasting Planning consultants stated even if this happens, traffic & gridlock will increase & back up into neighborhood</p> <p>BPDA lack of plan to support population growth PLAN 90+ pgs says what Ctown has now vs outlining strategies to support the future - ptrnship w/ MBTA, BPS and Bos Pks & Rec. States need for support once pop grows - does not plan for it</p> <p>10 Thompson Sq project rec for approval w/o sufficient off-st pkg required of bldgs w/ over 6 units</p>
8/23/23 14:43	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>The plan will have significant impact to the neighborhood and existing infrastructure, changing from a historic community to an overpopulated and grid locked area. The size of buildings are too large, tall, and will impact the already difficult street parking and traffic flow that can take upwards of 30 minutes to get through a 1 mile radius. The school districts and pickup/drop off will also be impacted, as will services such as postal which are already overcapacity.</p>
8/23/23 14:56	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much.	<p>The plan radically changes the character of Charlestown. It would be tragic if, due to radically increasing height limitations and density, Charlestown became the next Seaport or Assembly Row. Unlike those areas Charlestown is steeped in history. Preserving its character is an imperative to acknowledge and respect the historical significance and not overshadow or obliterated by a mass of looming c towers lacking any consistency with the neighborhood.</p> <p>At a minimum, keeping the current height limitations and requiring design approval for new construction would preserve the character of Charlestown and avoid the are being overwhelmed by cars.</p>
8/23/23 15:47	I_live_in_Charlestown	Better public housing except for building heights and destruction of tree canopy.	<p>Far less population density, no destruction of heritage trees, lower building heights, lack of concrete plan to reduce personal vehicular traffic, lack of planning for population growth, and many other specific changes incorporated into the aforementioned concerns.</p>
8/23/23 16:03	I_live_in_Charlestown	I am very concerned about the plan to reduce personal vehicle use by 50 percent. That number is not based on data, planning or forecasting. The planning consultants have stated that even if this happens, traffic and gridlock will increase and back up into the neighborhood. I use a car every day to visit my customers, and I don't want to fight more traffic than we already have to get to and from my home.	<p>Our roads cannot handle the increase in traffic if the goal is to significantly increase population. Many have to drive to work and want to easily get in and out of Charlestown. We don't have the road infrastructure to support a significant population growth and many want to use there cars and cannot always get to where they want to go by public transportation. You also need to increase police staffing and EMS. As you add affordable housing and low income homes drug/crime will increase in Charlestown. When I visited the police station in Charlestown they shared that 80% of crime come the projects. I'm afraid the quality of live & safety will be impacted with the % affordable low income housing you plan to add. Perhaps some of the large low income homes can be build in towns adjacent to Boston so no one town is negatively impacted. Imposing multiple large projects is overwhelming and many are concerned Charlestown historically charm will be lost and overcrowded.</p>

8/23/23 17:00	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	I do not like the draft PLAN for Charlestown.	The height of the buildings is not acceptable - Doubling the existing building heights on Main Street (at the Bunker Hill Mall) from 35' (3-stories) to 70', 90' (8-stories) on Austin St and School St and 150' (14-stories) on Rutherford Ave.
8/23/23 17:09	I_live_in_Charlestown	I am not happy with it	
8/23/23 18:15	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Some development near 93 and along Mystic is fine - a lot of this is bonkers. You can't go up 8 stories on Main Street! The skyline of Charlestown as seen from the harbor should be preserved for the sake of the City of Boston. This history is too important to throw away.	Nothing above 3-4 floors on Main Street/Bunker Hill Street. Get the cars/resident #s under control. No large scale addition of residents to such a small area...especially when you sacrifice the historic nature of the Town. Don't sell out to the developers.
8/23/23 19:58	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	The goal of expanding affordable housing opportunities that allow existing and future residents to grow up, stay, and age within the community Preservation of historic Charlestown No resident parking sticker for new developments Allowing ground floor retail everywhere in the Study Area, while encouraging it specifically along major boulevards and main streets, and at key nodes. Advocation for new retail such as a new grocery store, pharmacy, health clinic, food and beverage establishments, gyms etc Making the Mystic River waterfront esplanade and Charlestown Green Loop Designing the facade elements, material, and color palettes of buildings near historic neighborhoods to complement the historic architecture of Charlestown The creation of more open space and sports fields The planting of trees in new development, the creation of living shoreline and sand beach The idea of rooftop gardens and green roofs Most of the urban design guidelines chapter with some exceptions	Stronger advocacy for more family owned units Advocate for units intended for families who have a vested interest in the neighborhood and city at large, such as city workers, current/past Charlestown residents, or local business owners. Create a larger assumed household size than 1.7 Remove protected bike lanes everywhere except Rutherford ave, coming from alford st and from Broadway Lower building height significantly on Flatley property and Sullivan square close to existing houses. Tall buildings should be built far enough away where they will not beset existing homes Do not allow density bonuses and do not dissuade development from including or limiting parking Create as much new parking as possible in new developments and sports fields to support local businesses, visitors, residents Do not try to attract a younger demographic. Neighborhood should not be turned into a playground for young adults No public art in original peninsula Do not remove off-street parking minimums
8/23/23 20:13	I_live_in_Charlestown		1. Adding 10+ million more square feet than a 2019 regional planning study used as a basis for planning mobility in the region. 2. Doubling the existing building heights on Main Street (at the Bunker Hill Mall) from 35' (3-stories) to 70', 90' (8-stories) on Austin St and School St and 150' (14-stories) on Rutherford Ave. 3. Increasing the building heights between Medford Street and the Mystic River (below historic Doherty Park) from what is now 55' to 180'. (Taller than the historic Schrafft's tower) 4. The PLAN's use of aspirational goals to reduce personal vehicle use by 50 percent. That number is not based on data, planning or forecasting. 5. Inconsistent recommendations for approval of proposed developments that ignore the goals and recommendations for preservation and adaptive re-use of historic buildings.
8/23/23 23:36	I_live_in_Charlestown	This plan adds too much building square feet, increases the height of buildings way beyond what should be allowed. and does not evaluate the effect on traffic and congestion.	Reduce the total square feet of building space to below 7MM, limit the height of all new buildings to 50'. provide additional studies on the effect of congestion.
8/23/23 23:50	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	At this time nothing.	This plan is poorly thought out and is destructive to the fabric of Charleston.
8/24/23 11:52	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much	No increase to building heights. Attention to traffic congestion. Attention to parking issues.

8/24/23 13:44	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown		The height restrictions and density numbers need to be brought way down. And there needs to be data and specific information about the plan to handle growth over the next 10-20 years.
8/24/23 13:51	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing!	Stop dumping on Charlestown! Way too much haphazard development. Our roads and basic infrastructure are not equipped to absorb such an increase in population!
8/24/23 20:18	I_live_in_Charlestown	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The goal of expanding affordable housing that will allow existing and future residents to live here and raise their families. 2. Preserving historic Charlestown 3. No Resident parking stickers for new developments 4. Allowing Ground floor retail per the study, while encouraging it specifically along major boulevards and main streets. 5. Making the Mystic River waterfront esplanade and Charlestown Green Loop 6. The creation of more open and sports fields 7. The planting of trees in new developments, the creation of living shoreline and sand beach 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stronger advocacy for more family-owned units w/parking 2. Advocate for units intended for families who have vested interest Charlestown: i.e., city workers, current/past Charlestown residents or local business owners. They can't afford to live here now. 3. REMOVE PROTECTED BIKE LANES EVERYWHERE EXCEPT RUTHERFORD AVE, COMING FROM AFORD STREET ADN FROM BROADWAY. Most bike riders are not from Charlestown they are cutting thru. 4. CREATE AS MUCH NEWE PARKING AS POSSIBLE IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS and sports fields to support residents, businesses and visitors. It's a great thought to have a bike riding, train taking city, but it is unrealistic. Most families need at least one car to take their children to school, sporting events., etc. Single residents need to go to grocery stores, home to the suburb, etc. 5. Restrict how high buildings can be (6 floor Max) This is not downtown Boston! 7. Basically, MORE FAMILIES HOUSING, MORE PARKING AND LESS ABOUT BIKE LANES!
8/25/23 12:15	I_live_in_Charlestown	Addressing issues of flooding due to climate change	<p>Has a negative impact on historical nature of many properties.</p> <p>Exceeds previously agreed on building heights.</p> <p>Will increase traffic especially in Sullivan Square.</p>
8/25/23 14:39	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>I am a proud resident of Charlestown and am writing to you today regarding the OUR plan Charlestown initiative. I came to Charlestown in 2021 after living in the Back Bay, South End, Seaport, and the West End over the last 10+ years. Throughout my life, I've also lived in four other states and various countries around the world. Charlestown is the most community-oriented neighborhood that I've ever called home. I feel lucky every day to live in Charlestown and am deeply concerned about the impact that these plans will have on this remarkable neighborhood. I firmly oppose the current plan for our neighborhood (PLAN: Charlestown). Importantly, I am an advocate of creating affordable house and open space and I, like many others in our community, stand ready to help solve these important community needs. However, the current version of the PLAN contains new concepts that contradict its original goals and intention to positively shape the future of Charlestown.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding 10+ million more sq feet vs recommended 8 million • Doubling existing building heights on Main St, Austin St, School St, and Rutherford Ave; previous drafts proposed 50' along Main and 90' on Rutherford. The community clearly stated that the proposed heights were too tall for the abutting context of the historic neighborhood. • Increasing the building heights between Medford St and the Mystic River from 55' to 180'. Previous drafts proposed a max building height of 50-120'. The final draft raises the heights despite clear planning recommendations for 120' max and community concerns. • The PLAN's use of aspirational goals to reduce personal vehicle use by 50 percent. • Lack of planning to support population growth. The PLAN summarize what Charlestown has now, rather than outlining strategies to support the future. It states the need for support once the population grows. • Ignoring the goals and recommendations for preservation and adaptive re-use of historic buildings.
8/25/23 16:40	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>I do not like this plan at all. Everything about it is too big. It would destroy our neighborhood as we know it today. There is no thought to providing utilities nor services. To think of adding 50% more people to this square mile is frightening particularly when you consider that Charlestown is the place that people from Somerville, Everett and further cities come through to get to Boston. It is building just to build without any thought to what is already here.</p>	<p>I would like it to be thrown away and redone with input from Charlestown residents.</p>

8/25/23 18:03	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	I am happy to see the plans for the open space and some of the new development plans.	I'd like to see many changes to the proposed plan. It should not pass as written. I am opposed to the plan as it does not preserve the historic value of Charlestown and we already support more affordable housing per square mile than any other community in the city of Boston. This responsibility needs to be shared with other parts of the city. We can't have city skyscrapers abutting our charming quaint streets. I oppose the over development of our town when the infrastructure is not adequately planned to support it. The orange line is slow, often shut down and unreliable. We already have a parking shortage in Charlestown and this plan will only increase the congestion and create more parking issues for the residents. I've lived in this city since 1997 and quite frankly it's a highly visited tourist attraction significant historical value and the current plan unminds the value our town brings to the greater Boston community. I think this is a poor plan and should not be passed.
8/25/23 19:04	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	I appreciate all of the time and effort that was put into getting input from the community.	I oppose entirely the elevated heights that have been assigned to buildings next to the Bunker Hill Mall and on the industrial waterfront. They are inconsistent with our history and fabric as a community. I also in no way believe that we can wish away traffic by aspiring to reduce auto traffic by 50 percent in order to accommodate the added density, especially given the city's recent record related to keeping mass transit infrastructure working for the city.
8/27/23 15:51	I_live_in_Charlestown		An actual future plan for infrastructure services including public transportation. Remove absurd assumption for the decrease in cars in Charlestown, which has not merit. Restrict Medford Street and Mystic River development height to a maximum of 120 ft. Restrict additional square ft to 8 million max. Restrict Main Street development to 35 ft tall.
8/27/23 19:56	I_live_in_Charlestown	Very little. Charlestown is currently one to the densest neighborhoods in Boston. Increasing the population by 50% does little to benefit Boston or the neighborhood. There is literally little space for more residents (or their automobiles). Public transportation options are limited to only two bus lines and one T stop that is not convenient for most residents. In addition, Charlestown already has the highest proportion of public housing of any of the neighborhoods in Boston. I am very much in favor of mixed income communities (one of the reasons I love in Charlestown), but expecting a large, dense, mixed income housing development to subsidize its low-income renters is simply not realistic.	The plan must be scaled back in terms of increasing the number of residents in Charlestown. The number of residents has increased substantially in the past decade; increasing that even more, as proposed, is unrealistic. Doing so invites social and economic disfunction. Charlestown's historic character and its tourist attractions contribute to Boston should be used to benefit Boston, not diminished by overcrowding and lack of common (public) resources. In addition, expanding the economic base, not its population, would further strengthen Charlestown's contribution to the City of Boston.
8/28/23 17:53	I_live_in_Charlestown		There is too much square footage added; the building heights proposed are too high; there are unrealistic expectations with regard to decreased personal vehicle usage in the future; there are inconsistent recommendations for 128 Cambridge Street, 40 Roland Street, 1-2 Thompson Square, and 10 Thompson Square. Please resolve these before close-out.
8/28/23 18:16	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Rutherford ave, Sullivan sq, Navy Yard, and north Washington st bridge plans.	The Austin street extension of the Bonus density area all the way to main street is a mistake in my opinion. The whole foods / 99 plaza should not be larger than 3 stories on main street. Thanks for reading.
8/28/23 18:47	I_live_in_Charlestown		Go back to the beginning and review what local groups agreed to. Respect residents' wishes to keep Charlestown's unique character and architecture. Keep building height maximum where it is - don't clutter the area with over building. It appears that the intent to plan with the community's participation has been set aside for arbitrary, outsider decision-making.

8/28/23 20:52	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	The document is an impressive body of work with many strong ideas for the creation of affordable housing, open space and new development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Doubling the existing building heights on Main Street (at the Bunker Hill Mall) from 35' (3-stories) to 70', 90' (8-stories) on Austin St and School St and 150' (14-stories) on Rutherford Ave. •Increasing the building heights between Medford Street and the Mystic River (below historic Doherty Park) from what is now 55' to 180'. (Taller than the historic Schrafft's tower) •The PLAN's use of aspirational goals to reduce personal vehicle use by 50 percent. That number is not based on data, planning or forecasting. •The BPDA's lack of planning to support population growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oThe PLAN spends 90+ pages summarizing what Charlestown has now, rather than outlining strategies to support the future, such as partnerships with the MBTA, Boston Public Schools and Boston Parks and Recreation. It states the need for support once the population grows, but does not plan for it.
8/29/23 12:29	I_live_in_Charlestown		Building heights reduced to original recommended heights. Preservation of all historic buildings. Approval of housing without sufficient parking is unacceptable. The idea of personal vehicle use reduction won't happen, plan for an increase in traffic.
8/29/23 13:37	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	The forethought, the desire to increase housing, and the recognition that things need to change.	<p>Don't allow buildings along Main St, Austin St, or Medford St to be so tall.</p> <p>More than anything, we need details on the infrastructure to support all this change. The Seaport proved that if you build without planning, you create traffic nightmares and sterile retail environments. It also means more space for the wealthy. Finally, where are all these new residents going to go to school, how will our two barely functioning bus lines support them, and what's going to happen when you add hundreds (or thousands) of new cars to streets that already lack adequate parking. This plan will superficially preserve much of what makes Charlestown unique. Functionally, though your plan will radically change Charlestown forever.</p>
8/29/23 20:52	I_live_in_Charlestown, I_work_in_Charlestown	Please do not approve this plan. It has been forced on us by the BPDA with no open public meetings. Everything has been scheduled on ZOOM where they control the meetings and have been able to block public dissent. Apartments at the Austin St lots will be torn down soon after they are built due to excessive noise and pollution. This is a waste of taxpayer money and a crime against the expected tenants,	Austen St apartments needs to go and building heights on Rutherford Ave at the 99 are way too high.
8/30/23 16:16	I_live_in_Charlestown	NOTHING	More consideration for the neighborhood historical value
8/31/23 1:39	I_live_in_Charlestown	Nothing	Everything.
8/31/23 10:39	I_live_in_Charlestown	Unfortunately nothing.	More focus on complimenting what already exists in Charlestown. Adding extra tall buildings does not compliment the area but rather adds more pressure to the existing infrastructure. Please reduce the height of the new buildings in half. Start there.

8/31/23 20:09	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not much	<p>I am an 11 year resident in Charlestown. I love Charlestown for its neighborhood feel, young families, strong sense of community, and its historic character & relevance to our nation's history.</p> <p>Charlestown plays an important role, not only in educating local children in our nation's history but also the many millions of visitors who visit the Freedom Trail.</p> <p>I supported aspects of PLAN Charlestown and participated in providing feedback during its information gathering process but their current proposal to add multiple buildings at heights of 8, 14 and perhaps 18 stories would absolutely destroy Charlestown's character and its neighborhood feel. The fact that the now-proposed heights are many more times than what PLAN Charlestown had originally suggested - and their plans to destroy historic buildings - gives the feeling that these developers are not partners, but financial opportunists with no regard to the local citizens.</p> <p>If the course is not corrected, there could be litigation.</p>
8/31/23 23:50	I_live_in_Charlestown	Honestly, it is overwhelming. The extremely well planned Bunker Hill Construction project with community input and thoughtful developers is a huge positive.	<p>I am concerned about the Plan as it does not seem well thought out and is not protecting the historic character of Charlestown. The building heights are high. What is the evacuation plan if there is ever a fire or crisis in this area. Also, It was just announced by the Y today that the St. Francis and the PUOA have purchased the former Consitution Inn. They approached this with complete incompetance and ignorance to our community, especially homeowners. The lans are on hold because of this project. If it happens, the NY plan will need to be rethought.</p>
9/1/23 18:02	I_live_in_Charlestown	Adding affordable housing, open space, and new development	<p>The new plan almost tripled the original plan. An 8 story complex on Austin/Main (Bunker Hill Mall) as well as the building heights proposed on School Street and Rutherford Ave. do not line up with any existing construction or historic architecture of Charlestown. It is as if they Charlestown will become another Assembly Square and lose its community feel. With additional concerns about more traffic and not enough parking with the addition of residences.</p>
9/2/23 0:46	I_live_in_Charlestown	Not too much.	<p>Lower the building heights to no more than the Shraft's building Decrease the additional square footage to the recommended amount Add public transportation Preserve the historical buildings. There is nothing wrong with minimal, incremental development over time in the oldest historical neighborhood in Massachusetts. Add an additional park</p>

9/4/23 19:35	I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>Good to see the follow through on the redevelopment plan. High density near the Sullivan Square T Station. Potential for development of high buildings to block noise from highway. Good to see some open space also.</p>	<p>Our parcel at 547 Rutherford, our adjacent parcel at 500 Main Street and the light industrial Medford Street parcels closest to Main Street I believe should be allowed more height as a way to naturally transition from the parcels across Rutherford and the Teamsters Building that have been granted much greater height. This will provide an incentive for residential development here, close to the T (including neighborhood services on the first floor). Without the allowance for greater height, these parcels may end up as something less desirable for the community. We would like to see at least some increase in the height restriction and FAR on these parcels to allow for redevelopment. Flexibility in height and FAR will allow for more desirable community open space and pedestrian connections on the ground level, while still maintaining enough density for the development economics to work in redeveloping a formerly industrial site.</p>
9/4/23 20:21	I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>The proposed open space loop, road network west of Rutherford and redevelopment of industrial underutilized, contaminated parcels. Density along 93 is great and needed to meet the state's housing crisis and sustainability goals.</p>	<p>Respectfully request that the study area include the industrial parcels that have been left out around Sullivan Square (547 Rutherford Ave and 500 Main Street.) These parcels are immediately adjacent to the Teamsters parcel w/ highest density (MU-5, PDA-9); A new transition zone would be desirable to create a more satisfying urban design next to a tall tower and incentivize housing closest to the T. (These parcels are closer to the T than the majority of parcels in the study area, and ideal mid-density infill on underutilized industrial land.) The property owners are mostly small families that have been in Charlestown a long time, not developers, and a mixed use/ housing density bonus could encourage transition from a less-desirable industrial use to a community fabric with increased pedestrian connectivity and public open space. 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.</p>
9/5/23 1:12	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>Nothing</p>	<p>Changes under the guidance of Charlestown Preservation Society</p>
9/5/23 11:43	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>Opposing PLAN Charlestown: To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>As long time residents (over 28 years) of Charlestown we are gravely concerned with the recent draft for PLAN Charlestown. Although we agree with affordable housing, open space, and new development, the new plan almost tripled the original plan (3 stories to 8).</p> <p>An 8 story complex on Austin/Main (Bunker Hill Mall) as well as the building heights proposed on School Street and Rutherford Ave. do not line up with any existing construction nor historic architecture of Charlestown. It will impact the community feel of Charlestown turning it into other neighborhoods such as Assembly Square. We bought our home in Charlestown (like others in Beacon Hill and the North End) to enjoy a neighborhood, not an industrial complex.</p> <p>Parking on Austin St is already a challenge for residents and adding several floors of workspace at the Mall will only exacerbate this problem immensely as we have seen in Assembly Square.</p>	<p>We are concerned with the traffic this PLAN will add. In particular, Austin St and Main. It currently takes 30 min via car (please read T comments before disregarding) to get to the Longwood Medical Area where I work, which is only 4 miles. As a long time dedicated T rider (Community College to Ruggles Station > 20 years) I appreciate the aspirational goals in the plan to reduce personal vehicle use. However, I now choose to drive more frequently due to ongoing T issues (safety concerns, unpredictability, communication). Therefore, I cannot support the aspirational goal of PLAN Charlestown having more people use public transportation knowing that we still struggle with confidence and problems with the T. In addition, even without these additional buildings as per PLAN Charlestown we still sit in gridlock when trying to leave Charlestown via Main St or Austin at key times during the day.</p> <p>We oppose the current plan of 8 stories at the Bunker Hill Mall for the reasons stated above.</p>

9/5/23 15:31	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>This plan does not take into account the size of Charlestown, one square mile. A neighborhood in Boston that is already congested, over crowded and in dire need of improved emergency response. A 911 call made for an ambulance last month took one hour. How can you propose increased population when you can't take care of the current population. The traffic congestion worsens by the day. Has anyone with BPDA driven in Charlestown over the past two years?</p> <p>This plan does not take into account the historical significance of Charlestown.</p> <p>This plan will destroy the current thriving neighborhoods. What about Pier 5? Instead of creating new buildings why don't you take care of current properties you own and restore them. Pier 5 is an embarrassment to Boston and the BPDA. The Pier 5 area should be the gem of Charlestown. Instead it demonstrates the complete incompetence and poor planning of the Boston City government</p>	
9/5/23 16:53	I_live_in_Charlestown	planning for the future	<p>lower building heights. this is a family neighborhood - not the financial district. Our kids deserve light! We still need cars and we don't want more traffic. Let's realistically plan for people to have cars. we need to show how we will support all these people. There needs to be plans for school, grocery shopping, medical assistance etc.</p>
9/5/23 18:30	I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>•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.</p>
9/5/23 18:31	I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>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.</p>
9/5/23 18:31	I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>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.</p>
9/5/23 18:32	I_work_in_Charlestown		<p>The Rutherford Ave corridor and Sullivan square are very wide roadway Right of Ways. The open area needs a 'backstop' along the east side of Rutherford to create an appropriately scaled open space and public street realm. 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.</p>

9/5/23 18:33	I_work_in_Charlestown	<p>The 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.</p> <p>Redevelopment of these parcels could help connect the existing community through and enhanced open space and pedestrian network alongside appropriately scaled mixed-use redevelopment.</p>
9/5/23 18:33	I_live_in_Charlestown	<p>Don't increase building heights.</p> <p>Don't increase population density.</p> <p>If Helm houses homeless people, especially those with alcohol, drug and mental problems, provide treatment and support for them.</p> <p>Bunker Hill Housing project should be demolished, but not replaced with high rises, increased population, and higher rents.</p> <p>Provide more "affordable housing" ; my rent is greater than my social security.</p> <p>Better transportation is a must, especially for elderly.</p>
9/5/23 18:33	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	<p>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.</p>
9/5/23 18:33	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	<p>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.</p>
9/5/23 18:34	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	<p>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.</p>
9/5/23 18:35	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown	<p>The Rutherford Ave corridor and Sullivan square are very wide roadway Right of Ways. The open area needs a 'backstop' along the east side of Rutherford to create an appropriately scaled open space and public street realm. 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.</p>

9/5/23 18:35	I_frequently_visit_Charlestown		<p>The 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.</p> <p>Redevelopment of these parcels could help connect the existing community through and enhanced open space and pedestrian network alongside appropriately scaled mixed-use redevelopment.</p>
n/a	I_live_in_Charlestown	the realiation that the neighborhood needs a real grocery store- that is affodable and within walking distance	<p>the planned buildings are too high and will cause horrible population density for the town. They also change the character of the neighborhood. The lack of parking space for all of the proposed new housing units is also a huge problem. There isn't enough parking now and they will all have at least I can if not more. Keep charlestown as a nieghborhood and don't make us look like the seaport district - cold and impersonal</p>
n/a	I_live_in_Charlestown		<p>commitment to develop pier 5 into a community park with water access</p>
n/a	I_live_in_Charlestown	almost nothing	<p>almost everything- preservation of history in charlestown - restrict building - especially height and use - in thompson square. Consider negative impact growth has on c'town both population and building- plant trees and create green space rather than buildings</p>
n/a	I_live_in_Charlestown	the face fo cleaning up a lot of eye sores in the nieghborhood and surrounding areas. the possibilities for more small business in the neighborhood. something besides nail salons- another grocery store?	<p>There is no plan for the increased traffic whihc is already at the breaking point. No plans for parking also at breaking point. Too many too tall buildings. Completley changing the historic feel fo the neighborhood. I could go on and on bu ive ran out of room. also don't believe you ever really care about people who live here</p>