

Brookline Place Advisory Committee

Meeting Notes

February 14, 2014

Committee Members Present: Co-Chair Neil Wishinsky, Co-Chair Ken Goldstein, Edie Brickman, Arlene Mattison, John Bassett, Ken Lewis, Linda Olson Pehlke, Mark Zarrillo, Cynthia Gunadi, Linda Hamlin, Steve Lacker.

Committee Members not able to attend: Guus Driessen, Ali Mahajer, Debbie Anderson.

Staff & Town Consultants: Kara Brewton, Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert

Guests: George Cole (Stantec), Tim Talun (Elkus-Manfredi), Darren Baird (Goulston & Storrs), Paul Saner (EDAB Co-Chair), Hugh Mattison

At 8:20 am, Ken Goldstein called the meeting to order.

1. Meeting minutes from 2/12/14 were approved as amended – adding that a fourth note should be added to the site plan attached to the MoA to “design curbing at Pearl Street so that pedestrian flow is more predominant than vehicular travel and pedestrian flow is level (e.g., tabletop crossing or removing longer length of curbing and having plaza at pavement level)
2. Review of Nelson Nygaard TDM memo – Action items in **bold underline; Nelson-Nygaard questions in yellow**. Jason Schrieber from Nelson-Nygaard will join the BPLAC meeting on 2/25 via telephone.

TDM MEMO

The memo states on the first page that TDM is “for redevelopment of 2-4 Brookline Place”, but when permitted, will need to include TDM measures for 1 Brookline Place as well. **George noted that his team will need to think about how BCH commitment to implement these TDM measures for 1 BP, because many of their 1 Brookline Place leases include a number of spaces that they are allowed to use, and some of those leases are for the next 15 years.**

Hugh recalled previous BCH permitting stated that a certain percentage of employees are assumed to come within a certain distance, which allowed the parking to be reduced. **Kara will include BCH’s commitment for Employee Residency program is included in any documents related to TDM and Acceptable Special Conditions. Are efforts to seek local employees an effective TDM measure, and if so, how would it further affect recommended parking numbers?**

On the last page, Ken Goldstein asked that the monitoring begin six months after fully stabilized (75% occupancy rate) rather than within one year of the receipt of the final Certificate of Occupancy. Kara will make sure this change is reflected in relevant documents moving forward.

SHARED PARKING ANALYSIS

Linda Olson Pehlke walked the Committee through the memo, noting that the method of combining the ULI method with ITE rates was done because there is more data (large samples) using ITE numbers. Linda noted that an article written by Walker Associates, “Parking Structures” implies that the ULI parking numbers include operational reserve, and therefore questions why operational reserves are added at the end of the ULI methodology. Some members noted that if Nelson Nygaard used ITE numbers, there may or may not be double-counting. **Do ITE numbers have already built in operational reserves?**

The memo states that some credit factors (Figures 1-9) are counted towards some types of parking demands; **the Committee would like to see the spreadsheet that shows how these various credits are mapped onto the various parking demands. Does the Figure 5 credit for bike lanes or alternatives (10%) include taking into account the Gateway East improvements? The Committee was also curious why the impact of transit pass was so small (0.32%).**

Neil Wishinsky asked whether further credit factors would result if the Gateway East plans had any feasible changes at this point, for example, not having the exclusive right turn lane all the way from Brookline Avenue, wrapping around Washington Street back towards the heart of Brookline Village.

Hugh Mattison noted that the Brook House charges \$20/day for visitor or employee parking; this memo assumes \$20-25; and the LMA charges \$35. George noted that 1 BP currently charges \$22/day for visitor parking.

Regarding Figure 9, Neil wondered whether if bike-sharing stations were added as a separate line item, there would be a further credit.

Hugh Mattison’s inquiries to Phil Kenney, manager for the Brook House revealed that 72 parking spaces at the Brook House are managed for non-residential needs, by Atlantic Management of Framingham. Of these, 32 spaces are leased to three medical back-office condos affiliated with Boston Children’s Hospital and another 40 are available to the general public. Hugh noted that when he did a parking survey back in November, 40 spaces were empty. **George is inquiring about the square footage of these three condos and will report back.** George’s conversation with Phil added that sometimes the spaces to the general public are empty, and sometimes are full – George has a call into Atlantic Management to see whether any of the 40 spaces currently open to the general public might be available for exclusive lease. Hugh corrected a statement made at the last meeting – the Brook House has only one level of below grade parking, not multiple levels. This one level does not have trouble with flooding from high groundwater issues. George explained that regulations were different when the Brook House was built several decades ago for environmental standards, and did not know whether the Brook House had at that time the same groundwater contamination issues that this site has currently. Either way, as stated at the last meeting, even one level of below-ground parking would require a complete sealing of groundwater using the “bathtub” method.

Other specific questions for Jason:

- 1. Is the recommended “right” number of parking spaces 683 plus a 5% operational reserve, to get to 717 spaces (the sentence says 10%, but the math doesn’t add up).**
- 2. Several people questioned the reason to predict such a drop around lunch time for the shared parking model – many thought employees might not drive for lunch hour, and there was disagreement about to what extent medical offices schedule appointments around noon.** This is important, as Linda Olson Pehlke was noting that perhaps the Committee should be recommending the provision of on-site parking less than the peak shared demand of 683, since the peak graph is steep at 10 and 2, rather than a smooth bell curve hovering close to 683 most of the day. Linda noted that we know BP visitors are already somewhat parking on-street; this existing behavior should be accounted for.
- 3. Committee members would like a description of what “surrounding on-street spaces” means in the last sentence.** There was some appetite for use of on-street spaces on Pearl and lower Brookline Avenue for the project’s peak demands times. **Linda Hamlin asked we request from Todd Kirrane a map of where the commercial parking permits are already in place in the Village.**

Linda Olson Pehlke noted that Nelson-Nygaard did not include separate demand for retail or daycare uses, and thinks this is a good idea. Linda stated that if the existing zoning remained the same (with the 25% credit), only 606 spaces would be required.

The BCH team then showed slides of a 6.5-story parking garage scenario, stepping back the top floor away from Village Way; this would accommodate 700 parking spaces, and ranges in height from 55’ nearest the 70’ Village Way building. George also noted that 10 Brookline Place closest to the proposed garage was 65’ tall. When asked about stackers, BCH said they would not gain any measurable advantage in overall bulk: a 2-car stacker takes up 13’6-“ of floor-floor height. However, George conceded that valet parking could provide room for approximately 25 spaces per level, no more than 3 levels (some levels need to remain self-parked operationally).

Neil Wishinsky and Ken Goldstein then led a discussion about pressure points for both BCH and the Committee related to parking, and asked **BCH to return with a scenario showing a shorter garage, accommodating 600 striped parking spaces. Views should be from Station Street at the MBTA station, as well as up higher on Station Street near the condos looking across the tracks, and from Village Way. The Committee would also like to see compared shadow impacts to Village Way.** There was general agreement that because the current proposed footprint was already 20’ longer than the existing garage footprint, they did not want to see any scheme that increases the footprint/reduces the proposed largest area of open space.

George noted that his team still includes brokers recommending over 800 spaces, so he is not sure his team could even consider a structure below 700 striped parking spaces. George noted that the proposal is to triple the amount of building space (leaving existing 2 Brookline Place

out) and only doubling the number of parking spaces. Linda Olson Pehlke countered that right now we know 1 Brookline Place includes 220 leased spaces to employees, and yet the shared parking models show that most of the parking should be the result of visitors, NOT employees using TDM measures.

Next Steps:

Kara to ask Nelson-Nygaard to participate in the 25th meeting at 8:30 EST via phone with questions raised here.

With the Committee's agreement, Kara will ask Pam McKinney finalize her financial study assuming a reduced parking of 650 and 683 parking spaces.

George will ask his LSP/geotech consultant to attend the meeting on the 27th.

The Committee finished slightly early, at 9:50 am, perhaps because they were well fed with fresh fruit and small chocolates.

.....
Handouts: 1-page Agenda with notes from 2/12/14 meeting; Nelson Nygaard TDM (2/11/14) & Shared parking memo (2/12/14)

Presentation slides: BCH 7-story parking garage scenario (2/14/14).