Town of Brookline

Advisory Committee Minutes

April 14, 2020


Also present: Justin Casanova-Davis (Assistant Town Administrator), Andrew Pappastergion (Public Works Commissioner), Kevin Johnson (Director of Highway & Sanitation), Jared Duval (DPW Engineering & Transportation Division), Ed DiSalvio (Senior Project Manager & Lead Structural Engineer, LiRO, Boston Office), Jonathan Simpson (Associate Town Counsel), Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert (Law Offices of Robert Allen), Pam McKinney (Byrne McKinney & Associates, Inc.), Alison Steinfeld (Director of Planning and Community Development), Michael Jacobs and Patrick Dober (respectively, Chair and Executive Director of the Brookline Housing Authority), Roger Blood (Housing Advisory Board), Paul Saner (Economic Development Advisory Board), Michael Schonbrun (Founder & CEO, Balfour Senior Living), Steve Heikin (Brookline Planning Board), William Madsen Hardy (New Atlantic), Ellen Anselone, Mary McCarthy (Feingold Alexander), Nicholas Rumanes (Welttower), Cheryl Fever (VP of Investments, Welltower), Steven Schwartz (Goulston & Storrs), Kea van der Ziel, Brian Goldson, Judy Allard, Susan Cohen, Robert Lepson, Connor Clark, Stanley Spiegel, Mark Gray, Mark Levy, and various other members of the public.

Announcements: Pursuant to this Board’s Authority under 940 CMR 29.10 (8), all Advisory Committee Members will be participating remotely via telephone or video conferencing due to emergency regulations regarding the Coronavirus. The Chair has reviewed the requirements of the regulations. There is a quorum physically present and all votes taken will be recorded by roll call so all above listed Advisory Committee members will be allowed to vote.

AGENDA

7:30 PM Reserve Fund Transfer Request: $500,000 for emergency demolition of the Davis Path Footbridge

Jared Duval of the Engineering Department offered the following timeline of events related to Davis Path Footbridge Feasibility from inception to current date.

- Development of RFP in March ‘19
- RFP advertised and issued in April ‘19
- 2 proposals received
- After review of technical and price proposals for each firm, LiRo Engineers proposal was deemed most advantageous to the Town
- Contract with LiRo executed June 11, 2019
- LiRo conducted preliminary assessment of bridge from outside the T’s ROW (Right of Way) end of June
  - Led to early action plan to repair deteriorated stair treads, install new safety fencing along bridge
- LiRo submitted MBTA license application for ROW access in July 2019
- License for Entry executed by MBTA on October 15, 2019
  - Per Brian Clarizia license issuance takes at least 3 months
• Town “piggy backed” on MBTA shutdown scheduled for November 23, 2019 to perform structural investigation from within T ROW
• Letter from LiRo dated December 2, 2019 detailing their findings
  o Recommendation to perform material sampling and petrographic analysis to further examine structural integrity of the bridge prior to initiating alternatives analysis phase of feasibility study
• LiRo also charged with interior inspection of each abutment
• During the winter DPW forces worked to open up previously sealed doorways in each abutment to facilitate interior inspection
  o Required hiring a saw cutting contractor to gain entry
• LiRo performed interior inspections in February 2020
• Following inspection and LiRo’s additional findings the Town opted to perform material sampling and testing – petrographic analysis recommended in earlier LiRo letter
• LiRo Scope and fee proposal for this extra work received March 13th
  o Contract amendment executed March 31st
• Scope under contract amendment, including material inspection and additional observations performed on April 10, 2020
• LiRo contacted Jared Duval the next morning and explained concern over deterioration witnessed on girder facing the park
  o Recommended closing the bridge immediately until they received second opinion from lead engineer in LiRo’s NYC headquarters and structural calculations could be performed to confirm need to close bridge
  o DPW closed bridge that same day April 11
  o Structural calculations performed by LiRo week of April 12 confirmed bridge should remain closed
  o LiRo April 27th letter detailing their findings and recommendations for immediate action.

Ed Disalvio, Senior Project Manager & Lead Structural Engineer, LiRO, Boston Office offered a detailed technical overview and analysis of the construction and observed deterioration of the footbridge. Test results show poor quality of concrete, salt content, rebar damage – wouldn’t be worth the cost to repair the bridge. Photos of the damage were shared with the committee.

Questions

Q: What is the process for taking the bridge down?

A: Phase 1: Installation of emergency netting to encapsulate the bridge and protect trains for falling concrete. RFT will satisfy this phase. Make the site safe for abutters and Green Line trains.
Phase 2: The engineering work leading up to construction of a temporary span would require another RFT.
Phase 3: Long Term CIP for a permanent replacement bridge for all design, engineering and construction of that.

Design details going to MBTA. Drawings have design to protect wires (catenary) – frame, plates to protect wires during demolition. It will be likely staged from Boylston Street Playground, temporary supports in place, saw cut and remove from abutment to abutment and repair the park. This will be done by late May.

Q: Estimate when whole project will be completed? How does the age compare to Carlton Street footbridge and which will be finished first?

A: Carlton Street is made out of steel; Davis made out of reinforced concrete built in 1911. Within next 2-3 weeks coordinate shut down of Green Line with MBTA to piggyback on shutdowns they have planned for track work. Demo will happen rapidly. Engineering up front to lay groundwork of replacement span
– 48 feet long and can be put up quickly but will hinge on funds in Reserve Fund. Can’t say exactly when. Phase 3 probably years away.

Q: April 27 letter from Ed Disalvio citing 3 options: installing temporary supports and shoring up; another kind of temporary support replacing support steel; or demolition. Given our economic climate, why first option was discarded? A: The recommendations were made prior to getting the test results showing no value in restoration and public safety issues; the recommendation was subsequently changed. The bridge is beyond the ability to support a dead or live load and not worth a risk. Also, the cost to build the temporary support is upwards of $600K. Money wasted for a short amount of time.

Q: What happens if we lose abutments while we are demolishing the bridge? A: The design will support full load of the span, saw cut from where bridge deck meets the abutment – not anticipating a problem with them because of their structure.

Q: Will abutments be in good condition to hold temporary bridge? A: We would anticipate that abutments would need to be reinforced – supports against face of abutments to carry load of temporary bridge.

Q: Who built the bridge? Why is the MBTA not paying for this? A: Think it was Town of Brookline. MBTA doesn’t own the bridge; that is why they aren’t paying for it. We have weekly meetings with them and they have been very cooperative in the process and have recommended we piggy back on their planned shutdown of the line for us to do what we need. Liability is totally on us and we need to move with haste to get it done.

Q: Cost of shutting down D Line for one day? A: $19,000 for one night. Weekend is $200K.

Q: Will we have to replace with an ADA compliant bridge? A: Most likely unless we get a waiver for an elevator or mechanical lift. Not sure at this time.

Q: Will $500K be sufficient? What kind of contingency do you have in your budget? Are you sure the T will not impose additional requirements? A: Based on current relationship and if we can do this during a planned shutdown of their own, we can save costs. This is a tight budget and the initial request was higher. Under there is a great deal of stress on the Reserves so trying to minimize the costs in this first phase. Hopeful demo bids come in low enough to give us a contingency.

Follow up: Does it make sense for Advisory to specify a higher number? Don’t want to have bids come back higher then you need to come back to us and that will eat up time. Given current state of construction we can hope maybe they will be low. A: One of the contractors we are asking to do this is current under contract to the T so they have all the rights and certifications to work in that area.

Q: What suggests the temporary bridge would qualify for 2021 Reserve Fund dollars since it won’t qualify as unforeseen in 2021. Money for the temporary span can be voted in November under a budget adjustment.

Comment: People in Precinct 6 are very concerned about this.

A MOTION was made and seconded to approve a Reserve Fund Transfer request $500,000 to be used for emergency demolition of Davis Path Footbridge. By a unanimous roll-call VOTE of 28 in favor, none opposed and no abstentions, the RFT is approved.

7:50 PM Reserve Fund Transfer Request: $236,024 for resolution of the FY 20 Snow and Ice deficit
7:55 PM Appropriation Transfer Request: $120,000 from DPW Salaries Account to Snow and Ice Overtime Account for the resolution of the FY 20 Snow and Ice deficit
A MOTION was made and seconded to approve a Reserve Fund Transfer request of $236,024 to be used for resolution of the FY 20 Snow and Ice deficit AND an Appropriation Transfer Request of $120,000 from DPW Salaries Account to Snow and Ice Overtime Account for the resolution of the FY 20 Snow and Ice deficit.

By a unanimous roll-call VOTE of 28 in favor, none opposed and no abstentions, the RFT is approved.

8:00 PM Discussion and Possible Vote on Warrant Articles 9-15 (see attached PowerPoint Presentation for additional detail)

Decision PART 1
Warrant Article 9 – Newbury College - Fisher Hill Special Overlay District Zoning (“East Side” Zoning, for the proposed Welltower Development Project) (Newbury Zoning Committee)
Warrant Article 10 – Newbury College - Acceptance of Restrictive Covenant/Tax Certainty Agreement (Newbury Zoning Committee)
Warrant Article 11 – Newbury College - Authorize Select Board to enter into Memorandum of Agreement and attendant agreements (Newbury Zoning Committee)
Warrant Article 12 – Newbury College – Acceptance of an easement protecting trees along Fisher Avenue (Newbury Zoning Committee)

Neil Wishinsky provided a summary of the Planning and Regulation Subcommittee hearing and deliberations on these warrant articles, the detailed substance of which and presentation shared, are contained in the report and PowerPoint Presentation following these minutes. If Articles 9-12 fail at Town Meeting, Articles 13-15 will not be considered.

Welltower, Inc. purchased the Property in September 2019 for $34 Million. After the purchase, Welltower approached the Town to propose a Senior Living Community and a possible Town acquisition of the former West Campus. Newbury Zoning Committee (NCZ) consisting of real estate professionals, many neighbors, and 2 Select Board Members was created. They held 10 public meetings of the NCZ itself, 7 of the Architectural Subcommittee and 8 of the Negotiations Subcommittee. The “Package” of articles was unanimously voted by the NCZ on March 4th and was the result of over 8 months of negotiations between the Town and Welltower. It stipulates Welltower will build a high-end senior living community which requires a zoning change, inclusionary zoning (affordable housing) alternatives, and extracting value from the West Campus either in the form of a discounted purchase price for the Town or revenue sharing when sold to a third party.

Option 1 Senior Living Community
• Zoning needs to be changed to allow all aspects of the proposal -Present zoning permits single-family residential (S-15 and S-25)
• Welltower as developer, Balfour as operator

It would include approximately 193,000 square foot senior living community. – 1.15 FAR - about 2x existing buildings. 160 luxury market rate senior rental units, with approximately 80 independent living, 40 assisted living, and 40 memory care units; 98 parking spaces, 43 of which will be sheltered. This is a major impact project requiring a Design Advisory Team (DAT). Design guidelines to inform the DAT have already been reviewed by the Planning Board.

In this negotiation process the Town consulted with real estate advisors McCall & Almy, a Boston-based commercial real estate brokerage and advisory firm with a 30-year track record of providing strategic advisory services to institutional, public and mission-driven non-profit clients. They advised on highest and best use for the East side property and how that compares to both the land value attributable to the senior living proposal as
well as to what is allowed under zoning. They were asked to address the question of whether the Town got as much from the developer as it could.

The Town also consulted with Byrne McKinney & Associates, a nationally recognized commercial real estate consulting and appraisal firm with offices in Boston. Ms. Pamela McKinney is a licensed appraiser and Member of the Appraisal Institute. Her 45-year career includes financial underwriting and development counseling for over $5.0B in senior housing product, nationally. She supported the Town on a number of negotiated overlay zones and in this case, did financial feasibility analyses – a market and development review and an analysis of the effects of COVID-19 on market and financial performance. She reviewed Welltower’s development pro forma per an NDA and considered if the proposed unit mix and project scale could enable operational efficiency and financial feasibility.

The financial benefits to the Town highlighted were:
- Conservative estimate of Real Estate taxes at stabilization: $800,000/year
- Translates to an NPV of $40m to 60m (2.5% yearly growth, 92 years, 3-4% discount rate)
- Tax Certainty agreement
- Fiscal costs to town not expected to be significant

If the Overlay District zoning is not approved by Town Meeting remaining articles are moot:
- New tax growth and negotiated benefits not achieved
- Missed affordable housing opportunity
- Missed opportunity to acquire West Campus (or share in the profits of a sale to an entity other than the Town)

Decision PART 2
Warrant Article 13 – Newbury College – 125 Holland Road Mixed Income Overlay Zoning (Newbury Zoning Committee)

Neil continued his presentation focusing on the Affordable Housing Component and outlined the various options under consideration.

Option A: Inclusionary Zoning requires 15% affordable units. Welltower project = 120 units. Minimum affordable units = 18; 18 onsite affordable units is not financially feasible. Inclusionary Bylaw alternatives to onsite affordable units include in order of preference:
- Offsite affordable units located as near as possible to proposed project
- Cash payment to Affordable Housing Trust

HAB has developed two recommended affordable housing options for Town Meeting consideration 18 affordable mixed-income housing condominium units, located on Holland Road directly across from the main project. Renovate existing “Holland Hall” with new addition. Welltower contribution includes land and building valued at $3.027 million, $3.123 million cash, and $650,000 contingent backup.

Welltower will contract with New Atlantic Development to design and produce the 18 affordable unit Holland Road project. This option requires a zoning change, Town Meeting approval of a Zoning Overlay.

Option B: $6.525 million Welltower cash payment to Affordable Housing Trust earmarked for Brookline Housing Authority to rebuild and expand Col. Floyd Apartments located on Marion Street near Coolidge Corner. Funds will be used to demolish 60 senior walk up apartments and build 100+ new affordable units in multistory elevator buildings. The Trust Funds will augment substantial other BHA subsidy sources to:
- Demolish 60 obsolete senior walk-up apartments
- Build 100+ new affordable units in multistory elevator building(s)
- 40+ net new affordable senior housing units
- No re-zoning required

**Decision PART 3**

Warrant Article 14 – Newbury College – Fisher Avenue and Hyslop Road Municipal Uses Overlay Zoning (Newbury Zoning Committee), and Warrant Article 15 – Newbury College – Authorization to acquire former Newbury College West Campus (Newbury Zoning Committee)

Neil completed the presentation explaining the third decision being offered to Town Meeting – acquisition of West Campus and zoning overlay for municipal uses.

Article 15 authorizes the acquisition of the West Campus and associated bonding with an amendment to make it contingent on a successful debt exclusion vote.

The purchase price of $14.8 million would be funded via debt exclusion of $14.9 million with extra $100k – for minor capital improvements and closing costs. Town Meeting votes with contingency for a Debt Exclusion ballot; If the debt exclusion election is held after September 15, the bonding authorization will need to be voted again by Town Meeting in November. If not approved by voters, Welltower sells, and shares profits with Town.

The purchase would include
- 3.13 acres, consisting of 4 parcels with 2 buildings
- Academic Center: 31,000 sf educational facility in good/move-in ready condition
- West Hall: 10,000 sf classroom and administrative facility in fair/average condition
- 3 Parking Lots, 150 Cars
- Adjacent to Fisher Hill Reservoir Park

Reasons cited for purchasing the West Campus were that it is a unique opportunity for a strategic acquisition of municipal space and it is a modest cost to meet Long and Short Term Town needs. Long and short term potential uses for the property were reviewed as were costs to taxpayers.

Article 14, creates a new overlay district that expands the allowed municipal uses of (1) Municipal offices with associated support services, (2) Educational facilities, (3) Public libraries or museums (by Special Permit) and (4) Public recreational facilities (by Special Permit). Without this zoning change, the Town wouldn’t be able to use the property after acquisition. Site Plan and Design Reviews are required and Design Guidelines established to guide Planning Board review.

**Comments**

Cheryl Fever, VP of Investments, Welltower offered remarks about impact of COVID-19 on business and operations and despite its effect they remain fully recommitment to this project. They are in a good financial situation and have many active construction projects underway.

Michael Jacobs, Chair of the Brookline Housing authority gave the Housing Authority’s view on Article 13. His memo to the Select Board outlining this view is included at the end of these minutes.

Steve Heikin, Planning Board and Housing Advisory Board member, noted the HAB voted 2-1 in favor of Holland Road option. His memo regarding the rationale for this choice is included at the end of these minutes. Believe
we can do both of these options – Holland Road with Welltower support and Col. Floyd redevelopment. With CPA or RET funds.

Neil offered that public comments and summary arguments from the public hearing are listed in the subcommittee report. The subcommittee’s recommendations are below:

**A MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on Warrant Articles 9-12 as they appear in the warrant. The Subcommittee voted unanimously 6-0 to recommend favorable action on these articles.

**A MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on Warrant Article 13. The Subcommittee voted unanimously 0-5-1 and the motion failed indicating support for the Col. Floyd project.

**A MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on Article 14 as it appears in the warrant. The Subcommittee voted unanimously 6-0 to recommend favorable action on Article 14.

**A MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on Article 15 as amended to provide that the appropriation to acquire the property be contingent on the approval by Town voters of a debt exclusion vote. The Subcommittee voted unanimously 6-0 to recommend favorable action on Article 15 as so amended.

**Questions**

Cliff Q: $6.5 million funds allocated to Col. Floyd, that money needs to be leveraged with equity or debt or tax credits. What is the current market for that and how long to put together a financing package to move forward with the project? A: Anticipate 18 months. Have to meet certain criteria in DHCD competition; BHA has been successful previously. The money comes from tax exempt financing through Mass Housing, tax credit equity, subordinate debt through Housing and Community Development.

That time frame will be required whenever the BHA gets money, still have to do an additional 18 months process since we are unlikely to get full funding of this magnitude from these sources.

We think we could get all the funding together in 18 months.

Claire Q: What is the Deadrick decision and why would it allow the construction on Holland Road of a single family home which is in excess of the allowable FAR?
Steve Heikin replied. Deadrick case a decision in state court that single or two family home can be made larger even if exceeding zoning allowance. According to figures from the Assessor’s office, which some people have questioned, Holland Hall is larger than the allowable FAR ratio because of the above-ground basement floor, and it could allow a developer to replace the house that exceeds the zoning.

Claire Q: Please explain your math (re Section 8 vouchers). I do not understand how 40 becomes 10.
Steve Heikin replied. There is the point of view that 30 of 40 new units would be built using current section 8 vouchers and those 30 would be project-basing which essentially takes them out of the current market, meaning that in effect, only 10 new affordable units are being created at Col. Floyd.

Mike Jacobs replied. The 30 units are creating new housing because you can take a mobile voucher and leave the community and that has been a problem in Brookline; this way we are creating deed restricted units that will remain in Brookline so it is new housing. This is the other point of view.
Claire Q: Why was a proposal for elderly and working family affordable housing previously rejected for the Col. Floyd site?
Mike and Steve replied. The rejected proposal submitted 4 years ago by a developer – preliminary plans that replaced the 60 units and created 85 units with underground parking – but wasn’t on front burner to proceed. BHA as a public agency, they would have had to advertise it, open it up to other developers.

Claire Q: If the CPA fails and if the statewide transfer tax is not enacted, how would Brookline obtain the needed funds to construct new buildings at Col. Floyd? How much money is in the Town's Affordable Trust Fund and how much of such a project would that amount fund?
Mike Jacobs responded. Funding from CPA or Real Estate Transfer Taxes not anticipated. Roger Blood added that there are $3.5 million of unencumbered funds in the Trust. Several project in the pipeline. The Waldo Durgin project would produce its first payment of $825,000 when the developer gets their building permit.

Chuck Q: Any feeling how likely the building at Holland Road would be preserved – if not height and floor requirements for replacement building? A: The sentiment is leaning toward preserving the building on Fisher Hill and adding a wing.

The zoning that is proposed would allow for either the replacement or the addition. Zoning doesn’t talk about new construction or preservation.

Christine Q: Where will 60 people in Col. Floyd go during renovation? A: There are 6 buildings and there are over 300 units within Coolidge Corner so we would relocate them to other senior buildings and occupancy would be reduced and demolition would be done in phases, not all at once. Everyone would have a guaranteed right to return.

Susan Q: The proposed construction at 125 Holland Road it will be for either senior or family affordable housing? Is that correct? A: Yes
Wouldn’t this potentially increase the burden on our school system potentially if constructed as a choice? A: Not expecting a lot of children in that development given that they will be mostly one bedroom units.

Comment: The Col. Floyd units are in terrible shape and there is an urgent need to do substantial renovation and don’t see that money will be available except through this process.

MOA – clarify situation should Welltower decide not to go forward and under what circumstances that would be possible. All obligations shall run with the land...if anyone took over land from Welltower would they have the same obligations – provide funds for affordable housing. Does it include tax certainty agreement?

Jonathan Simpson, from Town Counsel’s Office responded that the answer is yes. It is intended to cover standard corporate real estate shuffling that you can potentially get during these types of deal. Tax certainty agreement reinforces this further.

If Town Meeting amends any of the articles, Welltower has 7 days to notify the Town if there are conditions materially adverse – and if it doesn’t notify, the changes are acceptable.

This provision has been in every one of these types of zoning deals.

About the obligations, the bulk of them are inherent in constructing the project – if they were to transfer the land and the person who didn’t build the project there wasn’t an inclusionary zoning requirement.
Alyssa Q: 30 section 8s that would be project based, benefits to Brookline insure all units remain in Brookline and not go to Brockton but for the state as a whole results in 10 less affordable housing units. A: Both seniors and families are on the waiting list. When a senior moves into a building that is accessible – service enriched.

Q: How would Welltower feel with something in MOA that makes explicit we would want to be using permeable materials and to use solar to the extent feasible? A: Jennifer Dopazo-Gilbert replied she has had lots of back and forth on sustainability issues. She reached out to Lisa Cunningham and others pre-COVID. They have reconnected and the thing is we don’t have the zoning in place and the building is not designed. Sustainability is high on list of items but it also impacts permeability. She suggested that changing MOA now after being negotiated and approved may not be necessary or advisable. The project architects will meet with architects on Green Caucus to get into this further. The project design already includes Gold Certifiable underground water retention and landscaping is also geared toward sustainability with native species, and permeability will be part but where and how much is still being investigated. The Fire Department also has to sign off on permeability. Also solar being considered but Preservation will also have a decision. Welltower is passionate about the project and wants it to be a model for sustainability but all the pieces have to come together properly.

Comment: Think it is a good idea to purchase the other side of the property but worry about voter and override fatigue.

Janice Q: Follow up on DAT involvement in this process and these are the kinds of questions that fall to the DAT – impact on neighborhood, context and hope we would be part of that process. A: Yes absolutely.

A MOTION was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on Warrant Articles 9-12 as they appear in the warrant. By a roll-call VOTE of 27-0-1 the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on these articles.

A MOTION was made and seconded for favorable action on Warrant Article 13 as it appears in the warrant with wording of the number corrected. By a roll-call VOTE of 0-27-1, the motion failed indicating support for the Col. Floyd project.

A MOTION was made and seconded for favorable action on Article 14 as it appears in the warrant. By a roll-call VOTE of 26-0-2, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on Article 14.

A MOTION was made and seconded for favorable action on Article 15 as amended below to provide that the appropriation to acquire the property be contingent on the approval by Town voters of a debt exclusion vote. By a VOTE of 23-3-2, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on Article 15 as so amended.

"MOVED: that the Select Board is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase, gift, eminent domain or otherwise, in fee simple, the parcels of land located at 110 Fisher Avenue, 124 Fisher Avenue, 150 Fisher Avenue and 146 Hyslop Road (Tax Parcel Identification #s 255-01-01, 256-24-00, 256-21-23 and 256-20-00), which parcels of land constitute approximately 3.13 acres of land at the former Newbury College campus on the west side of Fisher Avenue, including all buildings and structures thereon and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging, as well as all trees and shrubs thereon, for general municipal purposes, and for all purposes and uses accessory thereto; that, in order to carry out this acquisition, the Town hereby appropriates Fourteen Million Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars ($14,900,000) to pay the costs of acquiring approximately 3.13 acres of land at the former Newbury College campus on the west side of Fisher Avenue for general municipal purposes, including all costs incidental and related thereto, and such amount shall be expended under the direction of the Select Board; that to meet this appropriation the Treasurer with the approval of the Select Board is
authorized to borrow said amount under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44, Section 7(1), or under any other enabling authority, and to issue bonds or notes of the Town therefor; that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44, Section 20, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount; and that the Select Board is authorized to apply for, accept and expend any grants that may be available to pay for any portion of this project, and the amount of any borrowing authorized pursuant to this vote shall be reduced by the amount of any such grants received by the Town; provided, however, that this vote is contingent upon the approval by Town voters of a ballot question to exclude the debt service on the borrowing authorized hereunder from the limits of Proposition 2 ½ pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 59, Section 21C(k).

Land Description:
PARCEL I - Tract I (124 Fisher Avenue):
A certain parcel of land situated in Brookline, Massachusetts, shown on a plan entitled "Plan of Land, Hyslop Road, Brookline, Norfolk County, Mass. Property Line Plan" by Yunits Engineering Co., Inc., Consulting Engineers, dated August 31, 1982 and recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 1057 of 1983, in Plan Book 307, bounded and described as follows:

EASTERLY  on Fisher Avenue, one hundred and fifty (150) feet;
NORTHERLY on land now or formerly of Montrose Foundation, Inc., one hundred and sixty (160) feet;
WESTERLY on lot marked "27.329 S.F." on said plan, one hundred eighty and 80/100 (180.80) feet;
SOUTHEASTERLY on land now or formerly of the Sisters of the Holy Cross Inc., seventy seven and 15/100 (77.15) feet; and
SOUTHERLY on the same, eighty-nine and 27/100 (89.27) feet. Containing twenty-five thousand and eighty-nine (25,089) square feet of land, more or less, according to said plan.

PARCEL II - Tract II (146 Hyslop Road):
A certain parcel of land situated in Brookline, Massachusetts, shown on a plan entitled "Plan of Land, Hyslop Road, Brookline, Norfolk County, Mass. Property Line Plan" by Yunits Engineering Co., Inc., Consulting Engineers, dated August 31, 1982 and recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 1057 of 1983, in Plan Book 307, bounded and described as follows:

WESTERLY on Hyslop Road by two curved lines, one measuring eighty-one and 6/100 (81.06) feet, the other measuring thirty-eight and 68/100 (38.68) feet;
NORTHERLY by two lines, one measuring thirty-five and 38/100 (35.38) feet, the other measuring one hundred (100) feet;
EASTERLY by a line, one hundred and eighty and 80/100 (180.80) feet;
SOUTHEASTERLY by a line, forty-eight and 30/100 (48.30) feet; and
SOUTHWESTERLY on land now or formerly of Judith Sprague, one hundred eighty-two and 53/100 (182.53) feet.

Containing twenty-seven thousand three hundred twenty-nine (27,329) square feet of land, more or less, according to said plan.

PARCEL III (110 Fisher Avenue):
BEGINNING at the northeasterly corner of the granted premises at a stone bound set in the southwesterly sideline of Fisher Avenue as shown on a plan hereinafter mentioned;
SOUTH 26° 17’ 50” EAST by Fisher Avenue 120.00 feet to a point at remaining land of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; thence

SOUTH 63° 42’ 10” WEST by said land of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 357.80 feet to a point at land now or formerly of Frank R. and Etta P. Pratt; thence

NORTH 39° 28’ 50” EAST by said land of Pratt 168.59 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 39° 29’ 50” EAST 86.35 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 39° 48’ 50” EAST 39.39 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 64° 02’ 30” EAST 89.29 feet to the bound first mentioned and the point of beginning.

Containing twenty-six thousand nine-hundred fifty-one (26,951) square feet and being shown on a plan entitled "Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Metropolitan District Commission, Water Division, Land in Brookline to be conveyed to Sisters of the Holy Cross of Massachusetts, The Archbishop Cushing College," dated September 16, 1958, Harold J. Toole, Director of the Water Division and Chief Water Supply Engineer, recorded with said Registry in Book 3700, Page 525.

Excluding so much of the premises that was conveyed by deed from Newbury College, Inc. to Syroos Sanicoff and Ronni M. Sanicoff dated April 28, 2003 and recorded in Book 18778, Page 143, which included the following parcel of land:

A certain parcel of land, now known as and numbered 154 Hyslop Road in said Brookline, shown as Lot A on a plan dated October 10, 2002 and entitled "Subdivision Plan of Land in Brookline, Massachusetts, Norfolk County, I. F. Hennessey Co.", recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 264 of 2003 in Plan Book 507, containing four thousand three hundred and forty-seven (4,347) square feet (+/-) of land.

PARCEL IV (150 Fisher Avenue):

Tract I:


Containing 32,625 square feet, according to said Plan.

Being and intending to convey the same premises conveyed to the Grantor by Deed dated August 27, 1984 and recorded with said Registry in Book 6483, Page 351.

Tract II:


Containing 28,510 feet, according to said Plan.
Being and intending to convey the same premises conveyed to the Grantor by Deed dated August 27, 1984 and recorded with said Registry in Book 6483, Page 351.”

**10:25 pm Other Business**
There is a Town School Partnership meeting tomorrow and we should be able to report back to Advisory Committee soon. Boston College has acquired Pine Manor College. Students have 2 years to complete their studies. Keep your schedules open as you can anticipate more meetings in the rest of this month.

**A MOTION** to adjourn was made, seconded and voted unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 pm.

**Documents Presented:**
- Planning and Regulation Subcommittee Report on WA 9-15
- Welltower-Newbury College Campus Warrant Articles PowerPoint Presentation
- Memo from Steve Heikin, HAB/Planning Board dated May 12, 2020 regarding The Holland Road Affordable Housing Option
- Memo to the Select Board and Planning Board from Brookline Housing Authority Chair Michael Jacobs, Executive Director Patrick Dober dated May 11, 2020 regarding Housing Authority Alternative for Warrant Article 13 Inclusionary Zoning
- Email from Frank Caro, Co-Chair BrooklineCAN dated May 13, 2020 supporting the Housing Authority’s Col Floyd affordable housing option
- DAVIS PATH FOOTBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATE dated May 13, 2020 to neighborhoods directly impacted by the closing of the Davis Path Footbridge
- Memo from Commissioner of Public Works Andrew Pappastergion to the Select Board for Reserve Fund Transfer Request for Emergency Demolition of David Path Footbridge
- Memo from Commissioner of Public Works Andrew Pappastergion to the Select Board for Reserve Fund Transfer Request and Appropriation Request for resolution of the FY 20 Snow and Ice deficit
- Warrant Article 15 June 23, 2020 Annual Town Meeting final language to be voted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Vote 1</th>
<th>Vote 2</th>
<th>Vote 3</th>
<th>Vote 4</th>
<th>Vote 5</th>
<th>Vote 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Votes Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Votes No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Votes Abstain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vote Description:**
- **RFT Footbridge**
- **RFT Snow and Ice & Allocation Transfer**
- **WA 9-12**
- **WA 13**
- **WA 15**
- **WA 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enter P for Present</th>
<th>Enter Y, N or A</th>
<th>Enter Y, N or A</th>
<th>Enter Y, N or A</th>
<th>Enter Y, N or A</th>
<th>Enter Y, N or A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carla Benka</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Birnbaum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Bohrs</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Brown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Caro</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Doggett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Doughty</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Friedman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Gelbart</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David-Marc Goldstein</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Gordon</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Granoff</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Hummel</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Jonas</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Kahn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kanes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lescohier</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Levin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Levitan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Lodish</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Ridruejo</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Selwyn</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Smith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Stampfer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Swartz</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Warren</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Westphal</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Wishinsky</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sandman</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Select Board
From: Andrew M. Pappasergion, Commissioner of Public Works
Date: May 6, 2020
Re: Reserve Fund Transfer Request
Emergency Demolition - Davis Path Footbridge
Cc: Melvin Kleckner, Town Administrator
Melissa Goff, Deputy Town Administrator
Peter Ditto, P.E., P.L.S., Director of Engineering & Transportation
Jared Duval, P.E., Project Manager

The DPW respectfully requests a reserve fund transfer of $500,000 to fund the emergency demolition of the Davis Path Footbridge. Based on reports by the Town’s structural engineering consultant, LiRo Engineers, Inc., one of the two main support beams is structurally deficient and has no calculated capacity to support its own weight. The footbridge poses a risk to MBTA operations below and immediate action is required by the Town to restore safety to the site. As reported earlier, the bridge was closed to all pedestrian access on April 13, 2020.

The requested transfer amount is based on cost estimates provided by LiRo that include the installation of protective netting beneath the bridge to catch potential spalling concrete and the complete demolition of the main span of the bridge over the MBTA Right-of-Way. The existing bridge abutments will remain in place.

At this time, MBTA related fees are not included in the cost estimates as they are currently unknown. The DPW is working with LiRo and the MBTA to coordinate the shutdown of the “D” line with other ongoing projects to minimize costs and will have a more detailed estimate of MBTA related fees as we proceed through the MBTA Right-of-Way licensing review process.

LiRo is currently preparing contract documents to facilitate an emergency procurement for demolition services. The project must be fast tracked to take advantage of scheduled shutdowns that will occur at the end of May.

We understand the timing of this request is unfortunate given the challenges the Town faces amid the COVID-19 pandemic but respectfully seek the Board’s approval to immediately address this urgent public safety issue. We will present the reserve fund transfer to the Advisory Committee following your approval.
TOWN OF BROOKLINE

REQUEST FOR RESERVE FUND TRANSFER

DATE: May 6, 2020

To the Select Board:

It is hereby requested that you approve and transmit to the Advisory Committee the following Reserve Fund Transfer:

DEPARTMENT: Department of Public Works

AMOUNT: $500,000.00

ORG. #: 4918K150

ACCT. #: 6H0031

DESCRIPTION (or attach memorandum):

Emergency safety netting and demolition of the main span of the Davis Path Footbridge

including related engineering services for design and construction supervision.

(See attached Memorandum dated May 6, 2020)

APPROVED:

_________________________  _________________________

_________________________  _________________________

_________________________

_________________________

SELECT BOARD
DAVIS PATH FOOTBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD UPDATE
May 13, 2020

The Town continues to work diligently with LiRo Engineers and the MBTA to plan the emergency demolition of the Davis Path Footbridge. The Town’s last correspondence presented a three-phase approach for the ultimate replacement of the Davis Path Footbridge:

*Phase 1* – Immediate demolition of the bridge span maintaining the existing bridge abutments in-place.
*Phase 2* – Design and construction of a temporary bridge supported on the existing bridge abutments to restore pedestrian access.
*Phase 3* – Design and construction of a permanent replacement bridge.

The Town’s highest priority is the completion of Phase 1 in a coordinated and timely manner to restore safety to the site. The first step is the installation of protective netting wrapped around the underside of the bridge to capture potential spalling concrete. The Town anticipates receiving price quotations for the netting work from qualified contractors by the close of the week. The intent is for this work to take place within a week’s time of receiving pricing, subject to MBTA’s approval of the Town’s schedule. The netting and demolition work will likely need to be completed at night during an early access and/or weekend shutdown. The Town still aims to complete the demolition work at the end of May/early June.

Our consultant structural engineer, LiRo, continues to develop the contract documents for the emergency demolition. Since our last correspondence LiRo refined their conceptual design and approach to the demolition work and prepared preliminary plans and specifications for Town and MBTA review. LiRo and the Town will continue to coordinate the review of the documents with the MBTA to secure their approval as swiftly as possible.

The Town’s HazMat vendor extracted samples of key bridge components this week to test for the presence of Asbestos before we proceed with the demolition. If asbestos is present in any of the bridge components, the demolition contractor will abate said materials safely and in accordance with all pertinent local, state, and federal requirements.

Considering the unforeseen nature of this emergency intervention, the Town must request a reserve fund transfer to fund the Phase 1 demolition work. The Town will seek approval of the reserve fund transfer from the Select Board and Advisory Committee this week.

Once the bridge span is demolished and the risk to MBTA operations below is eliminated, the Town will focus efforts on Phase 2 including the design and construction of a temporary bridge to restore pedestrian access. We cannot commit to a timeline for Phase 2 completion at this time.

Once again, we appreciate your attention to these matters as well as your patience while the Town works to develop an immediate and long-term plan for this critical pedestrian link. We will continue to keep the neighborhood apprised of all developments, including schedule, as we refine our timelines.
May 6, 2020

Select Board
Town Hall
Brookline, MA 02445

Dear Select Board Members:

The Department of Public Works has completed a review of all snow and ice control expenditures for the 2019 – 2020 winter season. The Department responded to 24 inches of total snowfall over 13 events, most of which occurred in December and early January. As you may recall, the Town Administrator authorized the expenditure for snow and ice control in excess of the FY2020 available appropriation pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 44, section 31d on December 16, 2019. The completed review has indicated that the total deficit for employee overtime, equipment maintenance, equipment rental services, snow and ice supplies and motor vehicle supplies is $356,024.

A further review of all Department accounts (excluding the Water & Sewer Enterprise) has also indicated that a surplus of $120,000 exists within the wages and salaries accounts. Application of these funds by internal transfer to the snow and ice overtime account as detailed on the attached Appropriation Transfer Request will leave a deficit balance of $236,024.

The Department of Public Works respectfully requests your consideration and approval of the attached Request for Appropriation Transfer in the amount of $120,000 and the attached Reserve Fund Transfer in the amount of $236,024 for transmittal to the Advisory Committee for further approval as required.

Sincerely,

Andrew M. Pappastergion
Commissioner of Public Works

Cc: Melvin Kleckner, Town Administrator
    Melissa Goff, Deputy Town Administrator
    Advisory Committee
TOWN OF BROOKLINE

REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATION TRANSFER

To the Select Board:  

Authority is hereby requested for permission to make the following transfer(s) within the appropriation for the Department of Public Works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG #</th>
<th>ORG NAME</th>
<th>OBJECT #</th>
<th>OBJ NAME</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM: 42004220</td>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>510101</td>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO:    42004230</td>
<td>Snow &amp; Ice</td>
<td>510341</td>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REASON: To fund a portion of the Snow &amp; Ice Deficit for FY2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FROM: 46004650 | Public Grounds | 510101 | Salaries | 80,000.00 |
| TO: 42004230   | Snow & Ice     | 510341 | Overtime | 80,000.00 |
| REASON: To fund a portion of the Snow & Ice Deficit for FY2020 |

NOTE: IN ADDITION TO SELECTMEN APPROVAL, THE FOLLOWING TRANSFERS REQUIRE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

1. From Capital (5A);
2. To Personnel (51);
3. Building Dept Transfers of more than $10,000 to or from Repairs to Public Buildings (522400), unless coming from or going to Public Building Maintenance Supplies (532030);
4. From the Parks & Open Space Division to any other division of DPW; and
5. From the Snow & Ice budget to any other division of DPW.

___________________________
DEPARTMENT HEAD

___________________________
SELECT BOARD
TOWN OF BROOKLINE

REQUEST FOR RESERVE FUND TRANSFER

To the Select Board:                                          DATE: May 6, 2020

It is hereby requested that you approve and transmit to the Advisory Committee the following Reserve Fund Transfer:

DEPARTMENT: Department of Public Works

TOTAL TRANSFER REQUESTED: $236,024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORG. #:</th>
<th>ACCT. #:</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>510341</td>
<td>12,116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>522070</td>
<td>42,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>523070</td>
<td>16,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>534110</td>
<td>58,885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>534220</td>
<td>12,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42004230</td>
<td>534230</td>
<td>92,584.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTION (or attach memorandum):

Pursuant to the adoption of Chapter 44, section 31d of Massachusetts General Law by the Town Administrator, the Department of Public Works has incurred additional budget expenses of $356,023.00 for snow and ice control for the winter of 2019 – 2020. Internal DPW transfers of $120,000.00 from surplus salaries have reduced the Reserve Fund Transfer request to $236,024.00.

(See attached memorandum to Select Board)

Andrew M. Papantonio
DEPARTMENT HEAD

APPROVED:

________________________  __________________________

________________________  __________________________

________________________  __________________________

SELECT BOARD
Welltower-Newbury College Campus Warrant Articles
Advisory Committee
5/14/2020

Newbury Warrant Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARRANT ARTICLES FOR DECISION ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA 9  Fisher Hill Special Overlay District Zoning (&quot;East Side&quot; Zoning for the proposed Welltower Development Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 10  Acceptance of Restrictive Covenant/Tax Certainty Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 11  Authorize Select Board to enter into Memorandum of Agreement and attendant agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 12  Acceptance of an easement protecting trees along Fisher Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARRANT ARTICLES FOR DECISION TWO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA 13  25 Holland Road Mixed Income Overlay Zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARRANT ARTICLES FOR DECISION THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA 14  Fisher Avenue and Mytop Road Municipal Uses Overlay Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA 15  Authorization to acquire former Newbury College West Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newbury Warrant Article Decision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of East Side Welltower Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF WA 10 PASSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF WA 10 FAILS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION TWO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welltower Provides for 16 Affordable Units on Fisher Hill adjacent to Development Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welltower Contributes $6.5M to enable Brookline Housing Authority to add 40+ Affordable Units in Coolidge Corner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of West Side Campus Zoning and Acquisition* by Town for $14.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acquisition contingent upon Townwide Override Vote
Sept./Nov 2010
Overview

• Welltower, Inc purchased the Property in September 2019 for $34 Million.
• After the purchase, Welltower approached the Town to propose a Senior Living Community and a possible Town acquisition of the former West Campus

Overview (Continued)

• Newbury Zoning Committee (NCZ) consisting of real estate professionals, many neighbors, and 2 Select Board Members.
• 10 public meetings of the NZC, 7 of the Architectural Subcommittee and 8 of the Negotiations Subcommittee.
• “Package” of articles was unanimously voted by the NCZ on March 4th. Result of over 8 months of negotiations between the Town and Welltower.

“Package” Negotiated with Welltower

• Welltower will build a high-end senior living community which requires a zoning change
• Inclusionary zoning (affordable housing) alternatives, and
• Extracting value from the West Campus either in the form of a discounted purchase price for the Town or revenue sharing when sold.
DECISION 1
Senior Living Community

• Zoning needs to be changed to allow all aspects of the proposal
• Present zoning permits single-family residential (S-15 and S-25)
• Welltower as developer
• Balfour as operator

DEAdaptive Reuse of Mitton House

DEcISION 1
Senior Living Community

• Approximately 193,000 square foot senior living community. – 1.15 FAR. About 2x existing buildings
• 160 luxury market rate senior rental units, with approx. 80 independent living, 40 assisted living and 40 memory care units
• 98 parking spaces, 43 of which will be sheltered.
DECISION 1
Senior Living Community

• Welltower Update and Outlook

DECISION 1
Town’s Real Estate Advisor

• McCall & Almy directly participated in the negotiations with Welltower.
• Advised on
  – Highest and best use for the East side property and how does that compare to both the land value attributable to the senior living proposal as well as to what is allowed under zoning.
  – Did we get as much from the developer as we could?

DECISION 1
Financial Feasibility Analyses

• Pam McKinney - the Town’s independent real estate financial consultant for a number of negotiated overlay zones.
• Reviewed Welltower’s development pro forma per an NDA.
• Is the proposed unit mix and project scale necessary to enable operational efficiency and financial feasibility?

Conclusions
Market & Development Review

Key Market/Financial Take-Aways

Project Size – The unit counts, unit sizes and proposed amenity spaces are essential to the project’s ability to attract the market and to its operational feasibility.

The proposed project is a small as it can be and still be viable.

Public Concessions: The project returns were below accepted market minimums prior to the Town negotiations and now, with additional agreements achieved with respect to affordable housing, RE taxes and the price of the West Side land, the expected project returns are even lower – razor thin.

The proposed project cannot support addition public costs and still be viable.
Impacts of COVID-19
Expected Effects on Market and Financial Performance

General Market Observations
❖ The senior housing markets are more sensitive to the recent COVID-19 pandemic than most, as the population is inherently more vulnerable and the recent news of outbreaks in senior living facilities has been both frightening and widely reported.
❖ While the need-based demand for and relative under-supply of this product (especially locally) provides optimism for the long-term, the senior living market is expected to be among the slowest to recover from COVID-19...second only to the hospitality/resort markets.

Impacts of COVID-19
Expected Effects on Market and Financial Performance

General Financial Observations
❖ Revenues and occupancy for existing projects are sure to decline, especially in the short-run as facilities have stopped taking in new residents and performance is likely to be affected the mid-term as facilities are forced to offer marketing inducements to regain stabilized occupancy.
❖ Operating costs are sure to increase as protocols for ensuring resident health and safety produce both higher absolute costs and lower operating efficiencies – these changes are expected to be enduring.
❖ Development costs, especially the cost of labor and local materials may be lower in the short-term, offset by new construction site safety protocols, disruptions in overseas supply chains and much higher costs of capital and insurance. Mid- to long-term, cost impacts are uncertain, as it is unclear how quickly the new development markets will rebound and how new operating/safety protocols will impact on construction schedules and end-user space.

Specific Comments About the Welltower Development
❖ Market Potentials/Revenues – Demand continues to trend higher for need-based senior living product, and for the Welltower project the anticipated 3 to 5-year delivery/stabilization period is long enough to buoy optimism that the markets will have recovered sufficiently by then to generate a strong rent and occupancy response. Note that a well capitalized development sponsor and a superior facility manager will be essential to engendering necessary consumer confidence in the project.
❖ Operating expenses are likely to reset at higher levels in response to sustained changes to the senior living operating protocols as a result of COVID-19 and will necessitate even more attention to the achievement of operational efficiencies at the project. Note that the talent and creativity of an established operator like Balfour is essential to the success of the project.
❖ Development costs – Hopefully, when construction contracts are ultimately bid, the costs will be a bit lower than pre-Coronavirus conditions – providing an offset to the increased market risks and higher operating and capital costs resulting from COVID-19 referenced above. A deep-pocketed and experienced development sponsor like Welltower will be essential to the success of the project.
Lower costs (hoped for) are estimated to equilibrate higher market and operating risks.
**DECISION 1**  
**Fiscal Benefits to Town**

- Conservative estimate of Real Estate taxes at stabilization: $800,000/year
- Translates to an NPV of $40m to 60m (2.5% yearly growth, 92 years, 3-4% discount rate)
- Tax Certainty agreement
- Fiscal costs to town not expected to be significant

**Zoning: Fisher Hill Special Overlay District**

- Establish an overlay district on the east side that allows for a Life Care Facility (Use 6A) that:
  - Contains a maximum of 160 units (all market-rate)
  - Provides 98 parking spaces, 43 of which are concealed
  - Does not exceed a 1.15 FAR
  - Provides 40% of lot area as open space
- Site Plan Review and Design Review required
- Design Guidelines established to guide Planning Board review
Zoning: Fisher Hill Special Overlay District

Setbacks
- Setback requirements vary:
  - 35 ft. from Fisher Ave, Holland Rd, and east-side property line
  - 50 ft. and 60 ft. from the southern property lines.

Height
- Height requirements vary, ranging from 70 ft. to 100 ft. above District Record Grade (the midpoint of the Holland Road property line) depending on distance from Fisher Ave or Holland Rd

Inclusionary Zoning
- Inclusionary zoning requirements from Section 4.08 will be satisfied.

DEcision 1
Senior Living Community

- If the Overlay District zoning is not approved by Town Meeting remaining articles are moot
  - New tax growth and negotiated benefits not achieved
  - Missed affordable housing opportunity
  - Missed opportunity to acquire West Campus (or share in the profits of a sale to a new entity other than the Town)
Inclusionary Zoning requires 15% affordable units
Welltower project = 120 units. Minimum affordable units = 18
18 onsite affordable units is not financially feasible
Inclusionary Bylaw alternatives to onsite affordable units include in order of preference:
Offsite affordable units located as near as possible to proposed project
Cash payment to Affordable Housing Trust
HAB has developed two recommended affordable housing options for Town Meeting consideration

Two Affordable Housing Component

Two Affordable Housing Choices
Option A: Holland Road Zoning Overlay

18 affordable mixed-income condominium units
Located on Holland Road directly across from main project
Renovation of existing "Holland Hall" with new addition
Welltower contribution includes
  — Land and building valued at $3.027 million
  — $3.123 million cash
  — $650,000 contingent backup
Welltower will contract with New Atlantic Development to design and produce the 18 affordable unit Holland Road project
Requires Town Meeting approval of a Zoning Overlay

Option B: BHA Contribution

$6.525 million Welltower cash payment to Affordable Housing Trust
Earmarked to Brookline Housing Authority (BHA)
All proceeds will be used to rebuild and expand BHA’s Col. Floyd Apts.
  — Located on Marion Street near Coolidge Corner
  — All units are low-income senior rental housing
Trust Funds will augment substantial other BHA subsidy sources to:
  — Demolish 60 obsolete senior walk-up apartments
  — Build 100+ new affordable units in multistory elevator building(s)
  — 40+ net new affordable senior housing units
No re-zoning required

Decision 2
Affordable Housing Component
Option B
BHA Col. Floyd Senior Housing Project

Zoning: Holland Road Mixed Income Housing Overlay District-Article 13

- Establish an overlay district on the property at 125 Holland Road that would allow for an 18-unit mixed-income housing development providing:
  - 6 affordable units at 80% of AMI* (Min of 4 by Special Permit with HAB support)
  - 6 affordable units at 100% of AMI (Min of 4 by Special Permit with HAB support)
  - 6 affordable units at 150% of AMI (Max of 10 by Special Permit with HAB support)

**Dimensional requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Existing (S-25)</th>
<th>New (HRMIHOD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size (min)</td>
<td>25,000 sf</td>
<td>35,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (max)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (max)</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>40 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks (front/side/rear)</td>
<td>40/30/60</td>
<td>30/40/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>80%/none</td>
<td>40%/10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (per unit)</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit</td>
<td>3 spaces per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AMI: Area Median Income
**Article 15**
Option to Purchase West Campus

Purchase price of $14.8 Million, to be funded via debt exclusion of 14.9 million

- Extra 100k – Minor capital improvements and closing costs
- TM votes w/ contingency for a Debt Exclusion ballot
- Debt Exclusion postponed to Sept or possibly Nov due to Covid
- If not approved by voters, Welltower sells, shares profits with Town

**Acquisition of West Campus**

- **What would we be purchasing?**
  - 3.13 acres, consisting of 4 parcels with 2 buildings
  - Academic Center: 31,000 sf educational facility in good/move-in ready condition
  - West Hall: 10,000 sf classroom and administrative facility in fair/average condition
  - 3 Parking Lots, 150 Cars
  - Adjacent to Fisher Hill Reservoir Park

---

**NEWBURY COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT**

**DECISION 2**
Proposed Affordable Housing

1. 125 Holland Rd – 18 unit affordable housing condominium project

**DECISION 1**
Welltower “East Campus”

1. 124 Holland Rd – 160 unit senior housing project

**DECISION 3**
Academic Center

1. 150 Fisher Ave. – 0.50 acres
2. 124 Fisher Ave. – 0.98 acres
3. 138 Hyslop Rd. – 0.62 acres
4. 123 Fisher Ave. – 0.69 acres
5. Total – 2.89 acres

Proposed interim municipal use during comprehensive public work and use planning processes.
Reasons to Purchase West Campus

• Unique opportunity for a strategic acquisition of municipal space
• Modest cost to meet Long and Short Term Town needs

Long Term Use

• No permanent use of the West Campus has been determined
• Select Board will initiate a comprehensive planning process likely to span multiple years

A Range of Potential Uses (listed alphabetically)

• Affordable Housing
• Athletic Fields or Expanded Park Use
• Building Dept. Workshop/Storage and Offices
• Municipal/School Office Spaces and Training Center
• Recreational Facilities (Pool, Rink, Gym)
• Satellite Senior Citizen Space
• School Classrooms or Educational Spaces

Elements of Long Term Use Process

• Creation of a Land Use Committee—Town Officials and Agencies, Neighbors and Residents. Supported by Experts
• Public Input/Community Engagement—(Public Hearings, Surveys, Possible Charrette)
• Identification of Options
• Public Dissemination and Input
• Select Board Recommendation
• Town Meeting Approval
Short Term Uses

• Short Term Plans for Academic Building
• Utilize all floors of building to address different needs across Town
• Short Term period is estimated to last between 2 and 5 years.

Short Term Use
Academic Building 1st Floor

• Problem: Town Hall meeting/conference rooms as well as meeting spaces in other buildings are not sufficient for Town needs.
• Solution: Use 1st Floor for Municipal training/conference facility – Several departments of town believe such space would be a relief to the pressures of finding adequate space in other town buildings.

Short Term Use
Academic Building 2nd Floor

• Problem: Office space throughout the Town is insufficient
• Solution: Convert former classroom space to offices for Town employees

Short Term Use
West Hall

• West Hall is only in fair condition
• No short term use
• Use and upgrades will be determined during the long term planning process.
### Annual Cost Impact to Taxpayer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Taxpayer Type</th>
<th>3% Bond</th>
<th>4% Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profit Sharing if Town Does not Acquire the West Campus

- Revenue Sharing for sale price above $14.8 million
  - Sharing scale set to provide incentive for as high a sale price as possible.
- No proceeds to Town for sale under $14.8 million

### Article 14: Zoning overlay for municipal uses

- Establish an overlay district on the west side that expands the allowed municipal uses on the site:
  - Municipal offices with associated support services
  - Educational facilities
  - Public libraries or museums (by Special Permit)
  - Public recreational facilities (by Special Permit)
- Site Plan Review and Design Review required
- Design Guidelines established to guide Planning Board review

### Newbury Warrant Article Decision Process

- Decision One: Approval of East Side Welltower Development Project
  - If Wa-t 9-12 PASS
  - WA-t 9-12 Fails are not considered
- Decision Two: Welltower Provides for 18 Affordable Units on Fisher Hill adjacent to Development Project
- Decision Three: Approval of West Side Campus Zoning and Acquisition by Town for $14.8m
  - Acquisition contingent upon Town vote
  - Override Vote
  - Sept-Nov 2010
**Newbury Warrant Article Decision Process**

**Decision One**
- Approval of East Side Welltower Development Project

**Decision Two**
- **If WA 13 Passes**
  - Welltower Provides for 18 Affordable Units on Fisher Hill adjacent to Development Project
- **Or**
  - **If WA 13 Fails**
    - Welltower Contributes $6.5m to enable Brookline Housing Authority to add 40+ Affordable Units in Coolidge Corner

**Decision Three**
- Approval of West Side Campus Zoning and Acquisition* by Town for $14.8m

---

**Newbury Warrant Articles**

**Warrant Articles for Decision One**
- WA 9 Fisher Hill Special Overlay District Zoning (*East Side* Zoning, for the proposed Welltower Development Project)
- WA 10 Acceptance of Restrictive Covenant/Tax Certainty Agreement
- WA 11 Authorizes Select Board to enter into Memorandum of Agreement and attendant agreements
- WA 12 Acceptance of an easement protecting trees along Fisher Avenue

**Warrant Articles for Decision Two**
- WA 13 25 Holland Road Mixed Income Overlay Zoning

**Warrant Articles for Decision Three**
- WA 14 Fisher Avenue and Hyde Park Municipal Uses Overlay Zoning
- WA 15 Authorization to acquire former Newbury College West Campus

---

WA 13-19 ARE NOT CONSIDERED
The Holland Road Affordable Housing Option

From: Steve Heikin, HAB/Planning Board
Date: May 12, 2020

1. **This is not an either-or decision, and it is not a no-brainer.**
   If we select the Holland Road option, it does not preclude the Housing Authority (BHA) from redeveloping Colonel Floyd. However, if the BHA option is selected, it is very likely that the opportunity to create affordable housing (mixed-income homeownership) on Holland Road will be lost. The site will very likely be sold by Welltower and redeveloped as a large single-family McMansion, very possibly using the Deadrick decision to build something that exceeds the current FAR on the site. The Assessors database indicates the current structure GSF is 9552, an FAR of 0.25; allowable FAR is 0.20.

2. **Redevelopment of Colonel Floyd was in the BHA’s plans prior to Welltower, and will be several years away in any case.**
   The BHA is in the process of renovating or redeveloping all six of its Federal developments under HUD’s RAD program. Redevelopment of Colonel Floyd had been proposed as part of the third and last phase of redevelopment, after the in-place rehabs of O’Shea, Morse, Sussman, and Kickham. The O’Shea project is now nearly complete, and the Morse project at 86 Longwood is just getting underway. Under BHA’s previous plan, redevelopment of Col. Floyd would be several more years off. While the cash influx from the Welltower project might enable the BHA to move the project forward in its schedule, BHA would still need to acquire additional funding from numerous other sources, including 4% LIHTC tax credits, and several DHCD programs. For many of these funding sources, especially 4% tax credits, only one project at a time per developer is typically funded. So the Col. Floyd project may still need to wait several years before proceeding. Meanwhile, under the Holland Road option, the grant of the property and cash from Welltower would enable development to proceed without any additional public funding.

3. **The Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw favors the creation of on-site development of affordable housing.**
   Where this is not feasible, as is the case here, the second preference is the creation of off-site units, preferably in the same neighborhood as the on-site development. The Holland Road site is a preferred option from this perspective, as it is in fact part of the overall Welltower site. The IZ guidelines also note that meeting the requirements through alternative means, such as off-site development or cash contribution, shall “not result in the undue concentration of affordable units.”
4. **Comparison of the number of new affordable units to be created is not as simple as 18 vs. 40.**

The BHA’s plans for the redevelopment of Col. Floyd include “project-basing” 30 existing family-based (or “portable”) Section 8 vouchers, out of the 40 total Section 8 vouchers used to support the new units in the redevelopment. Arguably, project-basing these 30 vouchers takes them out of the current market, meaning that in effect, only 10 new affordable units are being created – versus 18 at Holland Road.

5. **By selecting the current BHA option, we are losing two opportunities.**

First, it would preclude development of additional affordable housing on Fisher Hill – in this case affordable homeownership – in an area of town with little such housing. Second, the current BHA option does not take full advantage of the opportunities at the Col. Floyd site. By proposing to stay within the current zoning, the BHA underutilizes the opportunity to create even more affordable and mixed-income housing than they currently propose – including both replacing the existing senior housing, and adding more senior and/or family workforce housing in an extremely desirable location.

In my former life as a Principal of ICON Architecture, I was directly involved in a proposal to the BHA to do exactly that 4 years ago, when Trinity Financial submitted a concept plan to replace the existing 60 senior public housing units and create 85 new mixed-income affordable family units, in a public-private development partnership. It would have required zoning relief, but the BHA is entitled to such relief, and still would be, as a “friendly 40B.” Public-private mixed-finance development partnerships between public housing authorities and private developers are still viable redevelopment strategies, and are being used throughout the region.

Three other current examples:

**Clarendon Hill, Somerville -- Somerville Housing Authority/POAH/Redgate**
Currently in pre-construction.
Existing: 216 Public Housing units
Planned: 216 PH units (30% AMI); 80 Affordable/Workforce units (50-60% AMI); 295 market units (80-100% AMI).
Total: 591 units.

**Washington Village, Norwalk, CT -- Norwalk Housing Authority/Trinity Financial**
Phase 1 complete; Phase 2 finishing construction; Phase 3 pending
Existing: 136 Public Housing units
Planned: 136 PH units (30% AMI); 67 Workforce units (50-60% AMI); 70 Market units (>80% AMI)
Total: 273 units
125 Amory Street, Jamaica Plain – Boston Housing Authority/Jackson Square Partners (Community Builders, JPNDC, and Urban Edge)
Currently in pre-construction
Existing: 212 senior Public Housing units
Planned: 200 PH units (30% AMI); 118 Workforce units (50-60% AMI); 231 Market units (80-100% AMI)
Total: 549 units

For further information on the 125 Amory Street project, and other public-private partnerships as they are working in Boston, see this report by WBUR from last October:

https://www.wbur.org/bostonomix/2019/10/08/public-housing-private-developers

(Search public-housing-private-developers on WBUR website if this link does not work)

6. The Bottom Line: We Can Do Both!!
There is not only the opportunity for the BHA to consider the option of a mixed-finance public/private partnership at Col. Floyd; there are potential new sources of funding as well -- including passage of the CPA in Brookline; a statewide move to enable a transfer tax to generate funding for affordable housing; and potential enhanced support for affordable and public housing with a change of administration in Washington this fall. And there is still the Town’s Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which has supported the BHA’s efforts in the past, is currently supporting the RAD redevelopment program, and will continue to support the BHA.
To: Select Board and Planning Board

Fm: Brookline Housing Authority
Michael Jacobs, Chair, and Patrick Dober, Executive Director

Re: Housing Authority Alternative for Warrant Article 13 Inclusionary Zoning

Dt: May 11, 2020

As one component of the draft MOU between the Town of Brookline and Welltower Inc., 18 housing units would be built by a third-party private real estate developer at the former Newbury College property on a parcel of land at 125 Holland Rd. donated by Welltower. The donation of land would meet Welltower’s affordable housing obligation under the Town’s Inclusionary Zoning By-law.

Warrant Article 13 would re-zone 125 Holland Rd. to allow the housing to be built. Zoning district changes require a two-thirds vote by Town Meeting. If Town Meeting does not achieve the two-thirds vote, the MOU provides an alternative: A cash payment of $6.5 million to the Town to support the Brookline Housing Authority’s (BHA) proposal to create 40 new seniors housing apartments. Under this plan, the BHA would raze its existing 60-unit Col. Floyd property in Coolidge Corner and rebuild on the site. The BHA would replace the 60 units and create an additional 40, for a total of 100 senior apartments. The Housing Advisory Board unanimously approved this option as an acceptable alternative.

Col. Floyd is located at Marion and Foster Streets in Coolidge Corner and was built in 1959. As a two-story, six-building seniors property without elevators, it is now obsolete. The apartments are undersized, lack aging-in-place features, and there is insufficient space for service programs and community engagement. The utility systems are costly and beyond their useful lives. Further, the Col. Floyd site is underutilized. It can accommodate greater density under current zoning. Exhibit A. shows the existing Col. Floyd property and representative surrounding properties. Several of the neighboring properties are apartment buildings of 4 to ten stories.

The Housing Authority proposal would create more than twice as much affordable housing as the 125 Holland Rd. option. Creating new, service-enriched seniors housing will only be possible with Inclusionary Zoning funds from the Wellbridge transaction. Available federal, state, and local affordable housing subsidy would be insufficient if the Welltower funds are not made available. This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity for the Town of Brookline.

The BHA’s proposal would address the greatest need identified in the Town’s 2016 Housing Production Plan: Seniors housing with supportive services. BHA provides a rich variety of supports to its seniors including service coordination, ESOL and computer literacy classes, free tax preparation, home-delivered meals, no-cost computer access, and more. Coolidge Corner is an ideal location for aging-in-place with excellent access to shopping, medical and social services, and the Elder Bus and the Green Line.
When redeveloped, Col. Floyd would continue to house people over 62 years old along with a 20% set-aside for younger disabled individuals. Income limits would remain below 60% of Area Median Income (AMI), in perpetuity, for all 100 apartments. (Greater Boston 60% AMI for single person households is $49,800). The 40 new units would be widely advertised and filled by lottery. State law allows a portion of the units to be set-aside for people who live or work in the Town of Brookline. Existing Col. Floyd residents would be relocated to other BHA seniors properties during construction of the new property. The BHA owns four seniors properties totaling 338 units within a one-half mile radius.

The financial projections in Exhibit B illustrate that the BHA anticipates raising $43.7 million in non-Town funds, from federal and state subsidies and bank loans for the project. These funds would leverage the $6.5 million from Welltower by a ratio of almost seven to one. The BHA would go through a competitive process to apply for subsidy funds and we are confident of receiving awards given the highly attractive features of the proposal. BHA’s real estate team would conduct much of the planning and design while awaiting the funding. In fact, the BHA already has retained a very well-qualified architecture firm for preliminary planning.

In order to bring this opportunity to fruition, the Housing Authority would “project-base” Sec 8 vouchers at the rebuilt Col. Floyd, to support the 40 new apartments. The BHA administers approximately 1,000 Sec. 8 vouchers. The vast majority of BHA vouchers would remain “resident-based” assistance, which allows recipients to rent an apartment of their choice on the open market within certain cost limit.

The BHA has the capacity and track record to assure the successful redevelopment of this exceedingly valuable property. Its recent projects include the 2015 new construction of 86 Dummer St., the total rehabilitation of 61 Park St that is currently underway, and the total rehabilitation of 90 Longwood Ave. expected to commence construction soon.
Exhibit A
Col. Floyd Maps and Photos
Location and Surrounding Uses
May, 2020
Col. Floyd Apartments 32-40 Marion St.
Brookline Assessor's Tax Lot View

Map view of BHA’s Col. Floyd property and surrounding buildings.
A. Col. Floyd Apartments – Marion and Foster Streets
B. & C. Col. Floyd – Existing Conditions
D. BHA’s Kickham Apartments – senior housing at 190 Harvard St. – abutting Col. Floyd
E. 25 & 41 Marion St. – Verizon building and 5-story apartments
F. 45 Marion St. – new construction 6-story apartment building completed 2016 – 40B project
G. 49 Marion St. – 9-story brick apartment building

A. Col. Floyd Apartments – street view of 32 Marion St.
B. & C. Col. Floyd – Existing Conditions

D. BHA’s Kickham Apartments – senior housing at 190 Harvard St – abutting Col. Floyd
E. 25 & 41 Marion Street – Verizon building and 5-story apartments

F. 45 Marion Street – new construction 6-story apartment building completed 2016 – 40B Project
G. 49 Marion Street – 9-story brick apartment building
Exhibit B
Col. Floyd Financial Projections

Rebuild 60 Unit Obsolete Property
and Create 40 Additional New Units

Total 100 New Construction Seniors Apartments
100% Affordable

May, 2020
## Construction Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>100 Units</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
<th>Per GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan</td>
<td>35,498,000</td>
<td>354,980</td>
<td>384.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Proceeds (4%, $1.00)</td>
<td>3,669,712</td>
<td>36,697</td>
<td>39.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brookline Trust</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCD HOME, HSF, HIF and/or CATNHP</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCD AHTF and/or AHPD</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLBB AHP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap / (Surplus)</td>
<td>(626)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION SOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,067,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>500,671</strong></td>
<td><strong>542.39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Permanent Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>100 Units</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
<th>Per GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Loan</td>
<td>16,820,000</td>
<td>168,200</td>
<td>182.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHTC Proceeds (4%, $1.00)</td>
<td>18,348,559</td>
<td>183,486</td>
<td>198.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA LIHTC ($.80)</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Brookline Trust</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCD HOME, HSF, HIF and/or CATNHP</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>27.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCD AHTF and/or AHPD</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLBB AHP</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap / (Surplus)</td>
<td>(1,473)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERMANENT SOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,067,086</strong></td>
<td><strong>500,671</strong></td>
<td><strong>542.39</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USES</td>
<td>100 Units</td>
<td>Per Unit</td>
<td>Per GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Square Footage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACQUISITION</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIRECT CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>34,205,000</td>
<td>342,050</td>
<td>370.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Contingency</td>
<td>3,420,500</td>
<td>34,205</td>
<td>37.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL DIRECT CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
<td>37,625,500</td>
<td>376,255</td>
<td>407.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>2,247,300</td>
<td>22,473</td>
<td>24.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey &amp; Permits</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Representative</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineers</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspecting Engineers</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Premium</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Fees</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title &amp; Recording</td>
<td>60,900</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting &amp; Cost Certification</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Rent-up</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Back Charges</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal &amp; Market Studies</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan Interest</td>
<td>1,513,800</td>
<td>15,138</td>
<td>16.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Consultants</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndication Due Diligence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Fees</td>
<td>635,055</td>
<td>6,351</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture, Fixtures, &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Contingency</td>
<td>167,801</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL GENERAL DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td>6,879,856</td>
<td>68,799</td>
<td>74.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized Reserves</td>
<td>1,061,730</td>
<td>10,617</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Overhead</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Fee</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST</strong></td>
<td>50,067,086</td>
<td>500,671</td>
<td>542.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Colonel Floyd Apartments

**Brookline, MA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100 Units</th>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>Gross Rent</th>
<th>Utility Allowance</th>
<th>Net Rent</th>
<th>Rent Limits</th>
<th>% of Limits</th>
<th>Income Limits</th>
<th>Monthly Gross</th>
<th>Annual Gross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHA Section 8 PBV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>314%</td>
<td>30% AMI</td>
<td>26,675</td>
<td>62,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 18 Section 8 TPV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>314%</td>
<td>30% AMI</td>
<td>26,675</td>
<td>125,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RAD Section 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>142%</td>
<td>30% AMI</td>
<td>26,675</td>
<td>9,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-dwelling

| 1 BR | 100 | 60,000 | NSF | 32,308 | SF | 92,308 | GSF | 65% |

**Total Gross Income**: 72,170

**Vacancy**: 3% (5,927) (71,125)

**Total Effective Income**: 191,643

**Annual Gross**: 2,299,715
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERMANENT LOAN</th>
<th>100 Units</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
<th>Per GSF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFFECTIVE INCOME</td>
<td>2,299,715</td>
<td>22,997</td>
<td>24.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fee (4%)</td>
<td>91,989</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Administrative</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasing &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHCD Monitoring Fee</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Administrative</td>
<td>147,600</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Maintenance</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Taxes &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial Materials</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Line &amp; Contract Costs</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorating (Interior Only)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs (Interior &amp; Exterior)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator Maintenance</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC Maintenance</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash Removal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Removal</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extermination</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Maintenance</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Services</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Utilities</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>3,050</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes &amp; Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Taxes</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Taxes &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</td>
<td>972,589</td>
<td>9,726</td>
<td>48.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET OPERATING INCOME</td>
<td>1,327,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,150,871</td>
<td>0.068423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET CASH FLOW</td>
<td>176,255</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>30 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Coverage</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHFA PERMANENT LOAN</td>
<td>16,820,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FW: Message for Advisory Committee from BrooklineCAN concerning Welltower proposal

Lisa Portscher

Subject: FW: Message for Advisory Committee from BrooklineCAN concerning Welltower proposal

From: Frank Caro [mailto:frank.g.caro@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 13, 2020 5:35 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Message for Advisory Committee from BrooklineCAN concerning Welltower proposal

Lisa,
Please forward the following message to Advisory Committee members prior to the discussion of the Welltower/Newbury warrant articles. Thanks!
Frank Caro

Advisory Committee Members,

BrooklineCAN urges the Advisory Committee to recommend favorable action on the Welltower proposal for the Newbury College site. BrooklineCAN also urges the Advisory Committee to support the Housing Authority's Col Floyd affordable housing option.

Welltower will provide an attractive residential option for seniors that is currently not available in Brookline. Currently, Brookline seniors who want and can afford the attractive housing and rich services that Welltower will offer have to move elsewhere to find it. The development will also be welcome by some Brookline families who are seeking a comprehensive housing and service package in town for an aging parent. BrooklineCAN will welcome Welltower residents and encourage them to be active contributors to Brookline's community life.

The Col Floyd option is highly attractive because of Brookline's enormous need for additional affordable senior housing units. Because the existing Col. Floyd units do not meet contemporary accessibility standards, replacement of the existing units with new fully accessible units will be a major gain for residents. The Col. Floyd option is also attractive because the property's location is excellent. The development is in a quiet neighborhood on the edge of Coolidge Corner. Current zoning would permit the elevator building that the Housing Authority envisions. Use of the Welltower's cash payment to help finance the Col. Floyd redevelopment and expansion is an exceptional opportunity for the Town.

Frank Caro, Co-chair
May 13, 2020
FIFTEENTH ARTICLE

MOVED: that the Select Board is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase, gift, eminent domain or otherwise, in fee simple, the parcels of land located at 110 Fisher Avenue, 124 Fisher Avenue, 150 Fisher Avenue and 146 Hyslop Road (Tax Parcel Identification #s 255-01-01, 256-24-00, 256-21-23 and 256-20-00), which parcels of land constitute approximately 3.13 acres of land at the former Newbury College campus on the west side of Fisher Avenue, including all buildings and structures thereon and all privileges and appurtenances thereto belonging, as well as all trees and shrubs thereon, for general municipal purposes, and for all purposes and uses accessory thereto; that, in order to carry out this acquisition, the Town hereby appropriates Fourteen Million Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars ($14,900,000) to pay the costs of acquiring approximately 3.13 acres of land at the former Newbury College campus on the west side of Fisher Avenue for general municipal purposes, including all costs incidental and related thereto, and such amount shall be expended under the direction of the Select Board; that to meet this appropriation the Treasurer with the approval of the Select Board is authorized to borrow said amount under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44, Section 7(1), or under any other enabling authority, and to issue bonds or notes of the Town therefor; that any premium received by the Town upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44, Section 20, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount; and that the Select Board is authorized to apply for, accept and expend any grants that may be available to pay for any portion of this project, and the amount of any borrowing authorized pursuant to this vote shall be reduced by the amount of any such grants received by the Town; provided, however, that this vote is contingent upon the approval by Town voters of a ballot question to exclude the debt service on the borrowing authorized hereunder from the limits of Proposition 2 1/2 pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 59, Section 21C(k).

Land Description:

PARCEL I - Tract I (124 Fisher Avenue):

A certain parcel of land situated in Brookline, Massachusetts, shown on a plan entitled "Plan of Land, Hyslop Road, Brookline, Norfolk County, Mass. Property Line Plan" by Yunits Engineering Co., Inc., Consulting Engineers, dated August 31, 1982 and recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 1057 of 1983, in Plan Book 307, bounded and described as follows:

EASTERLY on Fisher Avenue, one hundred and fifty (150) feet;
NORTHERLY on land now or formerly of Montrose Foundation, Inc., one hundred and sixty (160) feet;

WESTERLY on lot marked "27,329 S.F." on said plan, one hundred eighty and 80/100 (180.80) feet;

SOUTHEASTERLY on land now or formerly of the Sisters of the Holy Cross Inc., seventy seven and 15/100 (77.15) feet; and

SOUTHERLY on the same, eighty-nine and 27/100 (89.27) feet.

Containing twenty-five thousand and eighty-nine (25,089) square feet of land, more or less, according to said plan.

PARCEL II - Tract II (146 Hyslop Road):

A certain parcel of land situated in Brookline, Massachusetts, shown on a plan entitled "Plan of Land, Hyslop Road, Brookline, Norfolk County, Mass. Property Line Plan" by Yunits Engineering Co., Inc., Consulting Engineers, dated August 31, 1982 and recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 1057 of 1983, in Plan Book 307, bounded and described as follows:

WESTERLY on Hyslop Road by two curved lines, one measuring eighty-one and 6/100 (81.06) feet, the other measuring thirty-eight and 68/100 (38.68) feet;

NORTHERLY by two lines, one measuring thirty-five and 38/100 (35.38) feet, the other measuring one hundred (100) feet;

EASTERLY by a line, one hundred and eighty and 80/100 (180.80) feet;

SOUTHEASTERLY by a line, forty-eight and 30/100 (48.30) feet; and

SOUTHWESTERLY on land now or formerly of Judith Sprague, one hundred eighty-two and 53/100 (182.53) feet.

Containing twenty-seven thousand three hundred twenty-nine (27,329) square feet of land, more or less, according to said plan.

PARCEL III (110 Fisher Avenue):

BEGINNING at the northeasterly corner of the granted premises at a stone bound set in the southwesterly sideline of Fisher Avenue as shown on a plan hereinafter mentioned;
SOUTH 26° 17' 50" EAST by Fisher Avenue 120.00 feet to a point at remaining land of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; thence

SOUTH 63° 42' 10" WEST by said land of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 357.80 feet to a point at land now or formerly of Frank R. and Etta P. Pratt; thence

NORTH 39° 28' 50" EAST by said land of Pratt 168.59 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 39° 29' 50" EAST 86.35 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 39° 48' 50" EAST 39.39 feet to a stone bound; thence

NORTH 64° 02' 30" EAST 89.29 feet to the bound first mentioned and the point of beginning.

Containing twenty-six thousand nine-hundred fifty-one (26,951) square feet and being shown on a plan entitled "Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Metropolitan District Commission, Water Division, Land in Brookline to be conveyed to Sisters of the Holy Cross of Massachusetts, The Archbishop Cushing College," dated September 16, 1958, Harold J. Toole, Director of the Water Division and Chief Water Supply Engineer, recorded with said Registry in Book 3700, Page 525.

Excluding so much of the premises that was conveyed by deed from Newbury College, Inc. to Syroos Sanicoff and Ronni M. Sanicoff dated April 28, 2003 and recorded in Book 18778, Page 143, which included the following parcel of land:

A certain parcel of land, now known as and numbered 154 Hyslop Road in said Brookline, shown as Lot A on a plan dated October 10, 2002 and entitled "Subdivision Plan of Land in Brookline, Massachusetts, Norfolk County, I. F. Hennessey Co.", recorded with said Registry as Plan No. 264 of 2003 in Plan Book 507, containing four thousand three hundred and forty-seven (4,347) square feet(+-) of land.

PARCEL IV (150 Fisher Avenue):

Tract I:


Containing 32,625 square feet, according to said Plan.

Being and intending to convey the same premises conveyed to the Grantor by Deed dated August 27, 1984 and recorded with said Registry in Book 6483, Page 351.
May 19, 2020 Annual Town Meeting
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Tract II:


Containing 28,510 feet, according to said Plan.

Being and intending to convey the same premises conveyed to the Grantor by Deed dated August 27, 1984 and recorded with said Registry in Book 6483, Page 351.