



# TOWN of BROOKLINE

## *Massachusetts*

### SELECT BOARD

BERNARD W. GREENE, Chair  
BENJAMIN J. FRANCO  
NANCY S. HELLER  
HEATHER A. HAMILTON  
RAUL A. FERNANDEZ

333 WASHINGTON STREET  
BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS 02445

(617) 730-2200  
FAX: (617) 730-2054  
[www.BrooklineMA.gov](http://www.BrooklineMA.gov)

MELVIN A. KLECKNER  
Town Administrator  
December 2, 2019

Katherine Miller  
Planning and Programs  
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency  
One Beacon Street  
Boston, MA 02108

RE: Application for 40B Project Eligibility Letter  
217 Kent Street, Brookline

Dear Ms. Miller:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the application for Site Approval submitted by NEW KENT STREET LLC to renovate an existing building and construct a new adjoining building to create a 90-unit housing development under GL Chapter 40B at 217 Kent Street in Brookline. In addition to the Board's statement provided below, I am attaching herewith written comments from the public for your consideration.

The Select Board acknowledges that the proposal for 217 Kent Street could potentially be a well-designed residential development that expands the Town's supply of both affordable and market rate housing close to public transportation. The Board does, however, have the following concerns that should be addressed by the developer:

- The proposed building is too big for its surroundings and lacks reasonable setbacks.
- The height of the new building should be modified significantly to avoid overwhelming the site from a pedestrian perspective.
- Even though the trees abutting the MBTA tracks are not on the subject property, there is a risk that they will not survive construction since they are so close to the proposed new building. The developer should have a plan to protect the trees during construction.
- While the Board appreciates the fact that the proposal will result in a net increase of 67 units including 23 subsidized units for families earning up to 80% of area median income, it laments the fact that the existing 23 units may be replaced with higher priced units.
- The Board is also concerned about the future of the current tenants. We urge MassHousing to explore the applicability of residential relocation requirements. If not applicable, then the Select Board urges the developer to respect the current tenants and provide opportunities for them to avoid displacement or assist in relocating them to at least

- comparable units in Brookline. Providing "adequate" notice to the tenants is not sufficient.
- The Board is concerned about the proposed width of driveways and questions whether or not the access drive to the parking lot is wide enough to allow two vehicles to safely pass each other or to turn around on the site, especially because it is our understanding that delivery vehicles might park on the driveway, further restricting the passageway. Moreover, the site design should accommodate safe pathways for pedestrians. The Board defers to the ZBA, staff, and peer reviewers to ensure that the site design accommodates safe vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian circulation.
  - The Board is relying on the ZBA to insure that operational plans and site circulation relating to trash, recycling, moving and deliveries are designed to function smoothly, safely and with minimal impact on the neighborhood.
  - There is essentially no open space to buffer the project from the MBTA tracks at the rear. In addition, the space between the existing structure and the new structure could be improved to provide usable open space and more adequate access to light and open air to the residents of the project. Because of the minimal setbacks, the Town expects information relative to the impact on The Boston House, the abutter to the east, which provides temporary housing to families of children receiving medical treatment in Boston. The developer should incorporate usable open space for all residents and introduce landscaping to improve the visual appearance of the property and its relationship to the surrounding residential area.
  - The Board acknowledges that the property is within close proximity to both the MBTA Green Line and bus service. The Board further acknowledges that there may be some self-selection of prospective tenants who will rent space understanding and accepting that parking is not available. The Select Board fully anticipates that the issues regarding parking will be vetted by the ZBA to insure that the developer provides the appropriate amount of parking for the development. Naturally, the Town will require that viable accommodations are made for handicap parking including access to the garage by vans and by people with mobility impairments.
  - Tenants of affordable units should have the same access to parking as the tenants of market rate units; the former should not be charged for parking.
  - Because of the site's proximity to an elementary school, the Board will expect that both construction activities and the project itself will have minimal impact on the functioning of the school and the safety of its students, their parents and school staff and that the developer provide appropriate mitigation
  - Given that the site is within a Flood Plain, the applicant must work with all relevant federal and state agencies that may have jurisdiction over the site as well as the Town's Conservation Commission to ensure that potential water runoff and flood mitigation measures are adequately and completely addressed. The ZBA should be advised by technical peer review, obviously paid for by the applicant, of the adequacy of potential mitigation measures, as they might impact the site design and project feasibility.
  - The developer must be committed to working with the ZBA, its peer reviewers and municipal staff to make significant improvements to the design of the building.
  - The developer must work with the Fire and Building Departments to ensure that all relevant codes and fire apparatus access requirements are strictly adhered to—particularly in light of the fact that the developer is proposing to essentially build up to the Green Line tracks.
  - Most importantly, the applicant must meet with the neighborhood residents—individually and/or in groups—to engage in a genuine dialogue to identify and mitigate their concerns.

We also suggest that if the petitioner secures a PEL and applies for a Comprehensive Permit, the applicant should submit the following information prior to or as part of an application to the Town's Board of Appeals:

- an actual or virtual 3D model of the proposed project showing abutting and nearby buildings

- an atlas map with an overlay of the proposed site plan showing abutting buildings with setbacks of the proposed building from its property lines
- site sections through the building across Kent Street, the train tracks and abutting properties
- a noise study
- a comprehensive shadow study prepared for four times during the day and at equinoxes and solstices
- a traffic and parking circulation study to show how site activities (deliveries, two-way traffic, etc.) will be integrated on the site
- a parking demand study that will identify the impact that this project might have on the availability of existing on-street parking in the immediate area
- flood zone information
- a waiver list in tabular form

To reiterate, the Select Board maintains that this project presents the potential to increase the supply of housing if and only if the developer is willing to mitigate concerns expressed by the neighborhood and Town.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

BROOKLINE SELECT BOARD



By Bernard Greene, Chair

Attachments

## **Alison Steinfeld**

---

**From:** partan1@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 03, 2019 1:24 PM  
**To:** Polly Selkoe; Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** Proposed Construction at 217 Kent Street

Dear Alison Steinfeld and Polly Selkoe -

I just received the Notice of Hearing about the 217 Kent Street proposed project, am contacting you with some questions about the notice of hearing for the proposed construction of a 90-unit building at 217 Kent Street. I am a Brookline property-owner, and live at 200 Kent St / 10 Kent Square, which is across the street from the proposed project site.

My first question - when is the meeting of the Select Board planned for on Nov 12th? I looked at the Town Calendar, on the website, but do not see a meeting of the Select Board listed for Nov 12th. I see items for meetings of the Board of Assessors and the Preservation Commission on Tuesday Nov 12th, but those meetings do not show anything about 217 Kent St.

Second, is it possible to get a copy of the plans that were apparently submitted with the Site Eligibility Application for this project? I went to the Brookline Town website link noted in the Notice of Hearing, and see a copy of the Site Eligibility Application to Masshousing for the project, but do not see a copy of the Existing Conditions Plan or the Preliminary Site Layout Plan or the Preliminary Architectural Plans/Drawings that are referenced as being attached to that Site Eligibility Application.

Folks in the neighborhood have not been aware of this proposed project, and there are some initial questions being voiced:

Traffic - there are concerns that it may add to the already-significant traffic congestion on Kent Street by Francis Street, which is both a heavily-used pedestrian crossing where schoolchildren walk to Lawrence School and a location where there is already frequent morning congestion of cars. There has already been concern that the extensive new construction along Brookline Ave & Washington Street (near Brookline Village) will add to the cut-through commuter traffic along Kent Street, and adding yet another major building to the neighborhood would just add to the traffic flows.

Parking - the plans appear to note that the proposed site would have 90 units, including many multiple-bedroom units, yet only have 44 parking spaces? That may add to the already-challenging parking situation in the neighborhood.

Scale - there is concern about the size of the proposed building or buildings (it sounds like perhaps two buildings will exist), as one of the buildings may be an 8-story building on a site where there is now only a 3-story building. Seeing the site plans will help explain the proposed layout on the site, as it is on a downhill slope that may mitigate some of this concern.

Thank you - Matthew

Matthew Partan  
10 Kent Square  
Brookline, MA 02446

## Alison Steinfeld

---

**From:** Hildebrandt, Godfrey <godfrey.hildebrandt@sap.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 13, 2019 10:18 AM  
**To:** Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** Comments re: 217 Kent Street Project

I attended the meeting re: 217 Kent Street on 11/12/19 and reviewed the plans as posted at <https://www.brooklinema.gov/1722/217-Kent-St>. While I understand that the proposal is in preliminary stages I have a number of immediate concerns and believe that the addition to/renovation of the building at 217 Kent Street as currently configured/planned is not in the best interests of the Town and its immediate and future potential residents for reasons as listed below. Moreover, I have a number of items which I believe both the Town and the developer needs to address in the context of any plan to develop the property (also listed below).

- **Transportation/Traffic:** Kent Street has no scope for expansion to accommodate additional traffic. In this context a few immediate issues are of concern as follows:
  - **Parking/Resident Traffic:** What is the net increase in parking spaces and therefore cars in circulation on Kent that is currently envisaged for the property? Is the increase in traffic manageable?
  - **Equivalence/Extensibility:** If other property owners on the east side of Kent build on this scale, is this in any way sustainable from a traffic perspective? If it is not, is this fair to other property owners that one property owner absorbs an unequal share of development value realization?
  - **Ride-Hailing Traffic:** Regardless of what may be positioned as “car-free living” given changes in recent lifestyle patterns we can project more use of ride hailing service use on Kent. This should be factored into any traffic study/plan.
- **Context/Plan/Height:** The current plan fails to provide a full context of the impact of what is effectively a doubling of the height (setback notwithstanding) of the building relative to Kent Street level on neighbors on either side, across the street and impact on the experience of individuals on the historic “Emerald Necklace”. Specific concerns I have include:
  - **Sunlight/West Kent Street:** Kent Street basically has a North/South orientation which means that the sun rises over the back side of Kent Street. The new building would material block AM sun for West side Kent street residents raising issues of devaluation of living experience and properties. In principal I am concerned about developers “realizing value” at what appears to be the expense of others.
  - **Emerald Necklace:** As far as I can tell there are no buildings of a similar height abutting the combination of MBTA D-Line tracks and the Emerald Necklace. Nor do they build as close to the D-Line/Necklace properties as others have built. Given the historic nature of the park, I think it is reasonable for the property developers to actively solicit input from the Emerald Necklace Conservancy or other representative of the Park system on impact to the Park and visitor experience.
  - **Further Development:** It’s fair to assume that if the current proposal is accepted that other owners with similar properties would/should be allowed to build to a similar scale. What analysis has the Town done to impact on residents if this were to occur on a broad scale? Is there a strategic plan that encompasses Kent Street and how does the current project fit into the latter?
- **217 Resident Experience:** It is important to take into account the living experience not only of current residents but future residents to ensure a high/comparable life experience. In this context I have some concerns that the currently presented plans do not seem to address:
  - **Noise/D-Line Management:** What if any plans do the developers have to ensure that noise from the MBTA D-Line does not materially reduce quality of life for future residents? What noise and vibration levels can residents expect both during hours of operation and late-night repairs on the line? Specifically I believe that there are windows planned on all sides of the building – what noise cancelling windows if any are planned for the East-facing side in particular?

- **Development Scalability:** With respect to the North and South-facing Windows – assuming other Kent Street property owners eventually build on a similar scale does the building conform to set-backs and a high quality of living – or would an approval set in motion a series of developments that de facto create a “people warehousing” situation which ultimately discourages residency and devalues properties?
- **Micro Homes:** I understand from the discussion that a material number of the studios as designed do not meet conventional standards for minimum housing size and can only be provided in the context of 40B building. What is the reasonable likely impact of the latter in terms of future resident experience? What percent of the “micro-homes” are listed as subsidized vs market rate housing and is the percentage tilted in favor of one over the other?

There are of course more “usual” concerns such as management of construction and related traffic as raised at the meeting. I hope the above is useful and ultimately reflected in the submission to Masshousing due on Dec 2 as outlined at the meeting – and that in fact you are the right contact for submission of the above comments (a confirmation would be appreciated).

GH

**Godfrey Hildebrandt**  
64 Perry Street  
Brookline, MA 02109  
T: (617) 277-0148  
F: (610) 492-4748  
E: [godfrey.hildebrandt@sap.com](mailto:godfrey.hildebrandt@sap.com)

Steve Talaroski  
205 Kent Street #16  
Brookline, MA 02446

11/14/19

To: Board of Selectmen  
Brookline, MA

Re: 217 Kent Street Building Proposal

Dear Board of Selectmen,

I have lived at neighboring 205 Kent Street, a 35 unit condo, since 1995. The side of this building is approximately 10 feet from the one lane driveway that is the access to the 217 site. The side of the existing 217 building runs about 30 feet along the side of 205 Kent. The site of the proposed 217 building will be about 40 feet from 205 Kent. Gas lines run under the 217 driveway. 205 Kent is heated by gas.

I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons.

- 1) Risk of deaths from gas explosion during excavation, especially if pile driving is used, causing shock waves and earth displacement. For this reason alone the Selectmen in good conscience should recommend that MHFA vote against this proposal.
- 2) Neighbors will be subjected to unhealthy levels of noise stress for many weeks. I have enclosed part of an article from a medical review, citing many medical and psychological problems due to chronic unhealthy noise stress. Neighbors will lose the peaceful enjoyment of their homes for eight hours a day and their quality of life will profoundly suffer. My girlfriend is 66, has a mental illness, and I do not want her exposed to this severe stress. I work second shift and sleep till late morning. I worry that I will not be able to sleep and that my job performance will suffer. I am a social worker at a counseling agency.
- 3) The excavation may affect the structural integrity of neighboring buildings, including 205 Kent, resulting in masonry and foundation cracks, leaking pipes, etc., resulting in significant expense and nuisance to residents. I am also concerned that this construction will affect sewage and water backups. The muddy river area has in the past been declared a flood zone.
- 4) North Brookline is over-crowded enough. There are too many projects targeting this area. South Brookline is preferable. When I bought my home the appraisal noted the pleasant suburban view of trees and sky. This will be changed by the new buildings into a gloomy city canyon.

I hope this project is not recommended. If MHFA tries to force this project, there should first be a careful study to address the risks and negative effects. Also, the owners and investors need to sign an

agreement to compensate neighbors for any damage occurring due to construction, and should compensate significantly the neighbors for the profound disruption and unhealthy quality of life they will be subjected to. People have the moral right to be compensated when victimized.

Sincerely,

Steve Talaroski

Pile Driving: It's Impact on Community Health,  
Well-being and Productivity  
by Patrice Hanson

**Noise Pollution: A Modern Plague**

Lisa Goines, RN, Louis Hagler, MD  
South Med J. 2007;100(3):287-294.

"Domestic tranquility is one of the six guarantees in the United States Constitution, a guarantee that is echoed in some form or other in every state Constitution. In 1972, the Noise Control Act was passed by Congress, declaring, ...it is the policy of the United States to promote an environment for all Americans free from noise that jeopardizes health and welfare."

"In residential populations, combined sources of noise pollution will lead to a combination of adverse effects such as impaired hearing; sleep disturbances; cardiovascular disturbances; interference at work, school, and home; and annoyance, among others. These effects are the result of stress from noise, stress that has been increasingly linked to illness.

Vulnerable groups, generally underrepresented in study populations, include patients with various diseases, patients in hospitals or those who are rehabilitating from injury or disease, the blind, the hearing impaired, fetuses, infants and young children, and the elderly. Because children are particularly vulnerable to noise induced abnormalities, they need special protection."

\*\*\*\*

Noise pollution: non-auditory effects on health  
Stephen A Stansfeld and Mark P Matheson

"It is likely that children represent a group which is particularly vulnerable to the non-auditory health effects of noise. They have less cognitive capacity to understand and anticipate stressors and lack well-developed coping strategies<sup>54,55</sup>. Moreover, in view of the fact that children are still developing both physically and cognitively, there is a possible risk that exposure to an environmental stressor such as noise may have irreversible negative consequences for this group."

\*\*\*\*

## Alison Steinfeld

---

**From:** Sadaf Kazmi <sadaf.k.kazmi@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 10:15 PM  
**To:** Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** Proposed development on 217 Kent St.

Hi Alison,

I hope you are well. My husband and I recently moved to Brookline and purchased the property at 252 Kent St.

I recently learned that a large development at 217 Kent St. has been proposed to the Town. I have several concerns about this project, which I've summarized below.

1. Traffic - the intersection at Kent and Longwood is already very busy and is often in a state of gridlock during rush hour traffic. The addition of 70+ units at 2017 Kent can only have a negative impact on this already-difficult situation. Is there a plan to address this and other traffic issues created by more cars in this neighborhood?

2. Historic District - the property at 217 Kent abuts the Lawrence Historic District, which our home is also within. Such a large and tall development here would change the characteristics of the neighborhood, which the Preservation Commission has already recognized is worth preserving. How does the town hope to manage the preservation of the neighborhood?

3. Green space - the size of the proposed development risks the integrity of the Muddy River and Emerald Necklace - is there a plan to ensure this park is not affected by the new structure and the work required to construct it?

4. Schools - our schools are already overcrowded and this is obviously a much-discussed topic town-wide. The addition of so many units in this neighborhood will have a significant impact on Lawrence School and eventually Brookline High School enrollment. What is being done to address this?

Overall, I'm not in favor of the 217 Kent St. development as it is currently proposed. I will also be writing to my town meeting members to make sure that they are aware of my concerns on this topic.

Best,  
Sadaf

## Alison Steinfeld

---

**From:** Nira Pollock <nirapollock@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 6:04 PM  
**To:** Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** Concerns re: proposed new building on Kent Street

Dear Ms. Steinfeld,

I am writing to express some concerns about a proposed housing construction project at 217 Kent, with addition of a very large number of units. We live on Aspinwall Avenue and are parents of children at Lawrence School, as well as BHS. I work in the Longwood Medical Area and walk to work.

First: concerns about traffic. The traffic on Kent Street south of Longwood is already horrendous, and I have great concern that this new building will further exacerbate the unsafe conditions.

A few weeks ago, two Lawrence parents were hit by a car in a crosswalk at the intersection of Kent St. and Longwood Ave, just after dropping their children at school. Traffic at this intersection is notoriously congested and chaotic, and the walk signs and traffic lights do not sufficiently protect pedestrians from moving cars. Thankfully, both parents were not seriously injured; however, had children been the ones hit, we expect that injuries could have been devastating.

These concerns were submitted to the Safe Routes to School Committee on October 29th, 2019. However, we recently learned that virtually identical concerns about this intersection were formally voiced to the town in 2013, and it isn't clear that anything was done about the issue. Not only should this already dangerous situation be addressed without further delay, adding additional traffic at this particular location seems like a very bad idea. I witness frequent near misses (cars almost hitting pedestrians) while walking to and from work. It is just a matter of time before someone is severely injured.

Second, I'll add that Lawrence School is, as I'm sure you know, extremely overcrowded. One of our girls eats lunch at 10:30, and the other at 1:30, because there are too many kids to fit into the cafeteria. Every resource at the school is overstretched already. Our school mirrors the overcrowding at all the Brookline schools, but again, adding to the overcrowding through this new construction seems imprudent at this time.

Thanks so much for making yourself available to hear concerns.

Nira Pollock (162 Aspinwall Ave)

## Alison Steinfeld

---

**From:** Sarah Boehs <sarahboehs@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 20, 2019 1:55 PM  
**To:** Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** Kent Street - proposed 40B

Hi Alison.

I understand that a new 40B project is proposed on Kent Street near the intersection with Longwood.

I want to urge the town to please ensure that significant, permanent improvements are made at the Kent/Longwood intersection in connection with this project. As it is, this intersection is extremely dangerous. During rush hour, drivers are extremely impatient and routinely run red lights, turn through crosswalks when there are pedestrians legally crossing with Walk signals, etc. I have nearly been hit there myself on at least 2 occasions while I was following the rules, and I have heard (but do not have direct confirmation) that two Lawrence School mothers were recently hit there (but thankfully, if i understand correctly, were not grievously injured). I know there was at least one very serious vehicular accident there within the last few years, and I wouldn't be surprised if there are many more I am not aware of.

I do not know how the intersection could be improved, as that is not my area of expertise, but I hope that whoever does have such expertise will take a hard look at whether and how much this large new development will add congestion to this already very scary intersection and that the town will provide for any appropriate mitigation measures.

Thank you,

Sarah Boehs  
TMM, P4  
179 Aspinwall Ave.  
Lawrence Parent

## Alison Steinfeld

---

**From:** Brian Shaughnessy <bfshaughnessy@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 22, 2019 10:31 AM  
**To:** Alison Steinfeld  
**Subject:** 217 Kent Street

I recently attended the planning meeting at Town hall. Few people spoke out about their concerns regarding this project. Most attendees that night were more concerned about NETA and the Driscoll school design which ran well past the allotted time, thus truncating the 217 Kent discussion. It felt as if the board rushed us along as it was getting late. The developer (represented by his two young sons as apparently the father was not feeling well) presented their case with more explicit details about the building presented by the architect. While it is interesting that they had a video which unfortunately did not work well to demonstrate the "street view" of the project, there were no such views accounted for from the abutting neighbors, both of which would lose light, air quality and visibility of the Muddy river/emerald necklace, not to forget the view from the muddy river into Brookline. They are legally represented by attorney Bobby Allen who gracefully swept in at the end to pay his utmost gratitude to the board members before debunking a lot of the issues the speakers from the audience brought up. From the meeting it appears as if there is no plan to change/modernize the exterior of the front building other than adding an elevator and dormers on the roof so they can expand the space to add more units or space to the existing ones. As far as quality of life for the existing tenants and neighbors, they did not appear to have a plan for the current tenants that occupy 217 Kent when construction begins but did state that they owned other properties that they could move them to as available. On a positive note, they do plan to make 23 of the 90 units subsidized housing (although I don't recall the proposed rents though below market rate it still seemed quite expensive). Someone from the audience did bring up their concern that any of the subsidized units would be in the new building, to which the owners seemed taken aback and did not guarantee that it would not be the case. As we all know about the existing traffic issues, congestion, and proximity to a public k-8 school, the fact that this property is adjacent to both the Lawrence Historic district and on land that is part of the National Historic Registry (Olmsted's "Emerald Necklace" is particularly concerning. is there a plan to address the current traffic issues? Speed bumps, lights, etc.? Living on the street for over 10 years i have only seen traffic worsen and if there is no traffic, people regularly speed on Kent Street. lastly, the public parking is also an issue as additional cars take up space (people going to Longwood Medical, Fenway park etc. it would be great to have "resident only" parking on Kent Street to mitigate this issue. Also, the fact that there will be a 6-8 story facade that will be less than 20 feet from the playground to the "Boston House" blocking natural light and privacy for patients and families seems to be of major concern. A building of that magnitude will also take time and heavy-duty construction-trucks, builders, steelworkers, which would take months at the least and will affect the quality of life of all surrounding residents during and after the project is complete. Do they have plans to mitigate the noise pollution during construction? The flood plain issue was also brought up and was going to be addressed in the future. Lastly, there is some land that abutts the property that is apparently "unclaimed", the town of Brookline, MBTA, adjacent property owners, or City of Boston seem to have rights to it. Who has the rights to that?

Thankyou in advance for listening to a "concerned neighbor" who never has any intention to sell/move,

Brian Shaughnessy  
247 Kent Street  
617-834-4573

To: Brookline Select Board

Re: 217 Kent St Project

Date: December 1, 2019

Dear Select Board,

We are writing this letter to voice our concerns with a large real estate development proposal being discussed for 217 Kent Street, which is directly across from our home at 212 Kent St. For the reasons outlined below, we strongly urge you to oppose this development and to write to MassHousing requesting that they deny this 40b project.

1. **Traffic will increase significantly, burdening families and children.** Traffic is already bad on Kent St. and the surrounding side streets. We already have significant issues backing out of our driveway with our 2 children (both under 3). Having more cars and significant construction directly across the street from us would make things for us and our neighbors even more difficult.
2. **The new construction would significantly disturb our neighboring homes for sick children and their families.** We love all our neighbors, especially the Yawkey House and Boston House, which both support the families of sick children during their time of need. Construction of this magnitude and duration would create a lot of unneeded noise, debris, and obstructions affecting the residents of these homes and, notably, their badly needed peace and quiet.
3. **The new construction would create danger for our neighborhood's children.** A lot of children (and their families) use the sidewalk in front of 217 Kent Street to walk to Lawrence Elementary school and would be significantly burdened with massive construction and, ultimately, increased traffic.
4. **The new construction will block Riverway views, diminishing the value of our properties.** Please see attached photos taken from our home. In these pictures, you can see that the new building would disrupt our view and would also block sunlight to our property. The developers presented only pictures from the street view but are not accounting for alternate views and perspectives of their neighbors.

In addition to the above, we are concerned about additional costs to the Town of Brookline of yet another large-scale residence, as it is unclear that the associated taxes to be paid by the building developers will offset additional costs to the town.

We were extremely upset to hear the news of this proposed development and request that you, on behalf of your resident supporters, voice concerns regarding this project. We do not think it will add any incremental value to our neighborhood or town and, for the reasons outlined above, think it would actually hurt both.

Sincerely,