

Brookline Community Workshop #3: Site Selection Summary of Results

Prepared by JM Goldson 6/5/16

Summary

The purpose of the Community Workshop on June 1st in Brookline was to solicit community feedback on the site selection analysis and to refine the analysis. The analysis was performed by RKG Associates to identify suitable sites for multi-unit housing development using site selection criteria developed in the April 25th community workshop as well as working group and focus group discussions. Through this process, the community participants identified nine site selection criteria in three categories-- Proximity, Neighborhood Characteristics, and Site Characteristics. Criteria that were quantifiable applied through a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis to map the highest ranking sites (see appendix for description of criteria). Workshop participants reviewed the general locations and distribution of these sites.

The following themes emerged from the discussions:

Corridors: Identify sites with single-story commercial buildings where mixed-use corridors can be developed—Beacon St, Harvard Ave, Commonwealth Ave, and Route 9.

Density: There was conflicting feedback about whether development should be targeted to already dense areas or to areas with low density like single-family and two-family areas.

Preserve parking: Town owned lots are prime sites for development and “low hanging fruit” but preserve parking if developed.

Refine criteria: The transit criterion in particular restricts most of the highly ranked sites to North Brookline and posed a challenge to participants to work around this when working on Map Zone 4 (South Brookline). In addition, condo buildings pose significant re-development challenges – therefore, condo buildings should be eliminated from the suitable sites. And finally, there were many properties that should be added to the suitable sites.

Workshop Design

The workshop took place on Wednesday June 1, 2016 in the Brookline Town Hall meeting rooms. Fifty-six people attended. The purpose of the workshop was to engage Brookline community members in an interactive process that both informs and solicits feedback. The main objectives of the forum were the following:

- Information: The consultant team reviewed the purpose of the Housing Production Plan process and presented their method for developing the site selection criteria.
- Feedback: Participants worked in small groups to consider the sites that surfaced across the map of Brookline through site selection.

Methods

The workshop began with a presentation by the consultant team. To start, the presentation described the Housing Production Plan process and its purpose. Next, the consultant team described the process for developing site selection criteria. This included a review of the previous community workshop and an explanation of the three categories of site selection, Proximity, Neighborhood Characteristics, and Site Characteristics. Finally, participants received instructions about the small group discussion portion of the evening. Participants also answered three digital polling questions.

After the presentation, participants split into two groups with half staying in the presentation room and the other half moving to a room across the hall. The consultant team divided the map of Brookline into four zones to allow participants to spend time assessing each area of the town in some depth. Both rooms contained four tables, each with a large map of one of the four town sections or Map Zones. A member of the Housing Advisory Board, the Planning Department, or a consultant team member facilitated each discussion. First, participants shared their initial observations about the map and then discussed which of the highly ranked sites were most appropriate for multi-family/mixed-use development, which were the least appropriate, and what appropriate sites should be added. Participants spent twenty minutes at each table. After twenty minutes, participants moved to the next table and map zone, staying with the same group throughout the exercise. Finally, table facilitators presented a brief summary to the entire group of the discussions they had at their tables.

Digital Group Polling

The consultants use digital group polling to get a picture of who workshop participants are and what brought them to the workshop. Are participants Brookline residents? Do they work in Brookline? Are they members of Brookline boards and committees, or town meeting members? What is their interest in affordable housing development? Digital group polling consisted of three questions.

- Ninety-one percent of participants live in Brookline
- Forty-percent are town meeting members and an additional twenty-one percent are members of town boards or committees
- Most participants, forty-five percent, attended in order to advocate for affordable housing production
- Twenty-seven percent are concerned with the protection of neighborhood integrity and twenty percent attended in order to learn more about the project

Small Group Discussions

Results

While examining the maps, participants had questions and comments about the site selection criteria. Overall, many people were dismayed by the inclusion of some sites and the exclusion of others. For example, 1129 Beacon St was highly ranked though it is currently condominiums and the none of the surrounding single story commercial buildings were ranked. Some critiques of the site selection criteria are explored below.

Proximity: Transit’s prominence in the site selection criteria meant that few highly ranked sites were identified in South Brookline (Map Zone 4). The transit concept should expand to include bus routes, and bike access. People with different income levels and different activity levels (seniors vs. families) may have different transit needs regardless of car ownership.

Participants also wondered what qualifies as a commercial node—How many shops or businesses? What types? A grocery store? Also, commercial districts should be pinpointed on the map.

Neighborhood Characteristics: Participants identified corridors like Beacon Street, Harvard Avenue, Commonwealth Avenue, and Route 9 as areas that should support mixed-use development. In addition, areas that transition from residential to commercial are prime areas for housing or mixed-use development, like 21 Crowninshield Road, for example. Participants noted the lack of highly ranked sites within single-family neighborhoods and while some participants supported this, others thought the town was missing opportunities for smaller developments like Pine Street Inn’s Beal St development. It would have been helpful to have identified density, building heights, and commercial areas on the map. Even though it was not identified as an important criterion at the previous workshops, participants would have liked to see existing affordable housing identified on the map.

Site Characteristics: Participants expressed concern over the number of highly-ranked sites that are condominiums and the difficulty in acquiring those sites for re-development and also commented that it would be useful to know which sites are rental and therefore prime targets for developers and condo conversion. Participants thought that underdeveloped sites should be more highly ranked than re-development sites.

It was noted that some highly ranked sites abut uses that might lend themselves to a larger development or mixed use, 16 Kent St. for instance, where a town owned parking lot abuts low-rise commercial. Some highly ranked parcels are not developable because of the current use (condos, brand new development, Brookline Arts Center). Perhaps eliminate sites that have new construction (less than 10 years) in addition to condos?

Also, participants were wary of the difficulty in developing in historic districts or historic buildings and would have liked those called out on the map though there was widespread interest in redevelopment or in-fill development on religious properties.

Most appropriate highly-ranked sites for multifamily development

Map Zone 1

- *Sites with marginal uses or underutilized*
- *Auto-oriented businesses on Commonwealth Ave.*

Map Zone 2

- *Stop N Shop/Rub a Dub complex*

- *Town-owned parking lots, particularly 16 Kent St.*
- *Northeastern Fields*
- *287 Longwood Ave*
- *300 Kent St*
- *Lot at 50 St. Paul*
- *Any buildings that are rental*

Map Zone 3

- *Cleveland Circle T*
- *Single story commercial*
- *Any buildings that are rental*
- *10 Webster*
- *45 Bartlett*
- *70/80 Park St*
- *399-439 Washington St*
- *198 Marion*

Map Zone 4

- *Lower Route 9*
- *Upper Route 9*

Least appropriate high-ranked sites for multifamily development

Map Zone 1

- *Parcels close to single family neighborhoods*
- *Those where multifamily development will disrupt the character of the neighborhood*
- *Already developed sites*

Map Zone 2

- *Existing condos*
- *Longwood Towers*
- *Existing uses that will cause opposition (Brookline Arts Center)*
- *Single family and two family neighborhoods*
- *Historic buildings*

Map Zone 3

- *Existing condos*
- *Centre St lot*
- *Riverside MBTA parcels*
- *Historic neighborhoods*
- *73 Willard*
- *25 Marion*
- *2 Washington*

Map Zone 4

- *Existing condos*
- *Brook House*

- *No historic buildings*

Appropriate sites not identified in analysis

Map Zone 1

- *TJ Maxx*
- *Holiday Inn*
- *Waldo/Durgin*
- *Single story commercial along Beacon, Harvard and St. Mary's streets*
- *Babcock St parking lot*

Map Zone 2

- *Beacon St. commercial corridor*
- *St. Mary's*
- *Emerald Island*
- *Netherlands Rd-Brookline Water Department*
- *Church on Colchester*
- *The neighborhood bordered by Aspinwall-Kent-Linden*

Map Zone 3

- *TJ Maxx*
- *Star Market*
- *BHA property on Marion-rehab and increase density*
- *Single story commercial on Beacon and Harvard*
- *Large single family parcels eg., Tappan, Beaconsfield, Washington and Bartlett/University*

Map Zone 4

- *In-fill near Brookhaven and High St*
- *Putterham Circle*
- *Old Mormon site*
- *Clancy site*
- *Benevolent Society*
- *Allandale Farm*
- *Dexter School excess*
- *Pine Manor*
- *Low density areas off of Route 9-low rise development will fit with neighborhood character*
- *Explore using green/open space*

Appendix 1: Small Group Discussion

MAP ZONE 1

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 1
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi unit buildings 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger sites 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clusters 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest density 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 1
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town-owned 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On main streets 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking lots 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right next to schools 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing single family 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not historic districts 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holiday Inn • TJ Maxx 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All along Harvard • Waldo/Durgin • Babcock/St. John parking lot • Babcock mental health (behind 21 Crowninshield) • Amory 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentrated-large parcels • Multi unit already • On major roadways • Near Transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing development • On major development corridor • Near public transit
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dense • On major roadways • Are already multi-unit • Near transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is housing where it makes sense to have it • Along major thoroughfares

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empty • Marginal use, could be mixed use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comm Ave-auto-oriented sites may be mixed use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Beacon, mixed use could be built next to comparable low-rise sites • Parcels that can buffer neighborhood from more scale/height 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites near parks/amenities

Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the T 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auto-oriented uses along Comm Ave
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near the T 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On underutilized sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near town parking lot
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkable 	

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcel located near single family zoning districts 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing use precludes re-development 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing use fits character of neighborhood 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcels that have significant development already
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitivity to existing BHA and other neighbors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcels that would affect single family neighborhoods

MAP ZONE 1	ROOM 2
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School that is a garage on Lawson 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babcock St town owned lot
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TJ Maxx 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walnut/Durgin
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holiday Inn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TJ Maxx
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waldo/Durgin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden apartments that provide a unique housing type (good mix of housing that steps down from larger)
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holiday Inn 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TJ Maxx-mixed income to replace suburban use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TJ Maxx site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waldo/Durgin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waldo/Durgin

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single story buildings along Harvard and Beacon should be looked at for mixed income 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Mary's one story parcels on Beacon, could be mixed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Babcock St lot
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single story commercial uses in major thoroughfares-Harvard, Beacon, St. Mary's

MAP ZONE 2

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 1
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood historic districts-will be difficult to develop • Condo buildings are too complicated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So many good parcels that aren't identified
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space values • So much housing already-dense 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has the most red • Rental developments are vulnerable targets for developers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underdeveloped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is 57 Francis St? 22 Alton Ct?

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 1
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town owned lots-however can be no net loss of parking • Stop n Shop/Rub a Dub area good for mixed use • The lot 50 St Paul 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northeastern playing fields • Stop N Shop/Rub a dub • 287 Longwood Ave
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town-owned land (parking lots) • Stop N Shop/Rub a Dub for mixed use • 300 Marshall & 287 Longwood develop on land, protect from demolition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back of 169 Kent St • 169/197 Kent St • Northeastern fields
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 Kent St • 16 Kent/25 Webster can build tall there without bothering neighbors-commercial area

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 1
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longwood Towers-condos • Condos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 33/51/53 Saint Paul St.-already condos

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing uses that will cause opposition-Brookline arts Old homes-opposition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16 Kent St-abutting neighbors have parking and pass thru rights
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single/two family neighborhoods Protect 300 Kent/287 Longwood as historic Northeastern playing fields-protect as open space Between Perry/Toxteth/Francis St-not good-already dense housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longwood Towers Northeastern fields 123/131 Sewall St Historic buildings are complicated

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 1
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beacon St. Areas around 16 Kent and 30 Webster St. Mary's has potential At corner of Station and Kent-along T Netherlands Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align siting of AH with affordability levels-higher % AMI in S. Brookline with cars, lower % AMI in N. Brookline with transit Aspinwall to Linden to Kent-why no housing here? Why aren't buses considered transit? Beacon St commercial corridor for mixed use Church land on Chapel St
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What about bus lines? Where are the commercial areas? Why not along Beacon St? Single story commercial-housing above Area behind 191 Longwood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monmouth Ct/Chapel St. Kent/Longwood parcels Transit is less important-too much housing/siting in N. Brookline Parking lot behind Henry Bear's Park Parsonage on Aspinwall Area around Aspinwall/Perry

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 2
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	

Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lot are already housing 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NU site is low-hanging fruit 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NU site might not be buildable-stream underneath 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Churches: historical significance? 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 2
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong site: Town-owned parking lots in Brookline Village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1129 Beacon St.-rental
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1129 Beacon, 169/197 Kent underdeveloped 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 98 Sewall if rental
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18-20 St. Paul if rental (also other rental prop. older, less intensely developed) 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16 Kent (Town lot + adjacent low rise office on large site) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town owned lots in Brookline Village-Station St lot
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 137/143/149-car wash, gas station Stop N Shop, if not a school, rear area 	

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 2
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any property that is condo vs. rental 	N/A
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multifamily that are already condos 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20/36/47 St Paul-condos? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many sites on Sewall are condos 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15 Francis/ 300 Kent-condo 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 86 Monmouth-arts center 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50-60 Longwood -condo 	

MAP ZONE 2	ROOM 2
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Island 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low rise office @ 16 Webster
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stop N Shop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low rise social service center on Webster
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religious properties-St. Mary's, Episcopal church on Colchester 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Mary's property other than church
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are 287/300 Kent appropriate? Vulnerable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Episcopal church on Colchester
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Island
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More coordinated plan for Center St parking lot to facilitate adjacent development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pincus building
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zip ctr 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Island
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Island 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Sear's church
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 137/147/149 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Mary's ancillary properties
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town water department? Netherlands Rd.

MAP ZONE 3

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 1
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentration around Coolidge Corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disruptive when sites abut single family
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grouping around T stations-proximity to transit may skew quantitative results 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stress placed on already dense areas 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other communities may not use proximity to transit as a criterion for AH dev't 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concentrated around Coolidge Corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed use
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draw more towards south/west along Beacon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing sites

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 1
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas that are not already dense 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two stories above existing commercial (Beacon/Harvard)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transition areas from commercial to residential like 21 Crowninshield 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70/80 Park St
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid concentration of large scale residential developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already dense commercial/residential areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 563 Griggs Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Close to amenities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 Bartlett St. 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking lots, but spaces should be replaced 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T-site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TJ Maxx site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 story commercial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gas stations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beacon +Harvard + Washington
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Star Market Beacon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Washington Square
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beacon St/Harvard St-1 story buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Star Market above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intersection of Beacon/Washington Sts 	

• Williams St potential	
• Current rental ownership-multi-family	

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 1
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
• Continued development in already dense areas (Coolidge Corner)	• Reservoir T stop
• Centre St parking lot	• Condos w multiple owners
• Existing multi family residential	• Pure residential areas
	• Sporadic distribution
Round 2	Round 4
• Existing condo multi-family	• Centre St lot-east
• Centre St lot	• Existing parcels
• Historic or neighborhood conservation districts	
• T sites along Riverside	
• Above Coolidge Corner commercial	

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 1
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
• Single family and zoning boundaries with commercial/business	• Low line commercial along Beacon
• No bus routes identified-impact on results?	• large single family properties Washington + University, Washington + Bartlett
	• TJ Maxx
	• Star Market
Round 2	Round 4
• Washington Square	• School St, public parking lot
• Large single family parcels (Tappan St-Beaconsfield Rd)	• Corridor planning
• 45 Marion St	• Lower parking requirements
• Star Market-renovate with residential above	• Height impact along topography (Winchester)
	• Star Market

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 2
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge other dev't in surrounding towns Condo conversion protection, or how to protect moderate rent units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harvard and Beacon routes Around the T
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should show existing 40Bs and AH dev'ts on the map Density of existing Density in this area is already very high Centre St-lots of competition for town lots 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look into 16 Coburn Crescent

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 2
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cleveland Circle T Transit proximity is important How does town incentivize redevelopment of existing M.F property? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19 Englewood Ave-what are these? Lots of space around buildings
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beaconsfield Rd parcels Cleveland Circle area 10 Webster St. 399-439 Washington Could maybe see some support in SF neighborhoods but topography of hill area can be challenging 198 Marion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70-80 Park St green space 50 Winchester St but could be challenging b/c of new condos Centre St lot-could be ripe but in future

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 2
------------	--------

3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condo projects may be hard to get agreement from all owners to redevelop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condo buildings could be challenging, owners may not sell
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centre St lot, may not be feasible, don't want dev't to change the character of the area, losing parking may hurt businesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70-80 Park St-don't lose green space
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MBTA parcels at Reservoir Station-challenging
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 563 Griggs condo
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 54 Auburn St-what's proposed isn't appropriate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100 Harvard St-brand new
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep remaining gas stations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 216-227 Summit-high end condos
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caution of converting commercial to residential use, would like to see mixed use when possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hills neighborhood-challenging topography and parcel size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hill above the school neighborhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 73 Willard
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Washington
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 Marion utility

MAP ZONE 3	ROOM 2
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BHA property on Marion St, rehab and densify
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed use needed along Beacon St- now single story commercial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One story commercial along Harvard St.

MAP ZONE 4

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 1
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half of this zone-no AH sites 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many 40B residents have cars 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large owners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Didn't consider all bus routes – look at full Bus Route 51
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some new 40Bs should go into lower density neighborhoods
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40B density in low-density n'hood must be suitable to surroundings

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 1
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town owned land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near Rte 9 & D line T corridor, all of both, mixing w/ retail/commercial would make them more suitable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Rte 9 corridor-make it red 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK to use certain pieces of existing greenspace for AH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Rte 9 mixed use OK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway East project, good for AH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bike access to T 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCV OK – but not so many units 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisher Hill Estates on Rte 9 – good model 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More Rte 9 corridor transit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Rte 9 corridor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rte 9, Chestnut Hill as well, including upper Heath St 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upper Rte 9 corridor
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Put mixed use/retail on Rte 9 where not currently available 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCV should be developed but age-restricted units 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No greenspace taken for AH 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THs in estate areas? Maybe, but there's no public transit 	
---	--

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 1
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take out the Brook House – large condo complex – not good for more development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If not readily accessible, don't build for low income
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take out other properties that are existing condos 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Brook House 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No historic district, no national register properties for AH 	

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 1
4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One story retail along upper Rte 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate income have cars, they can live in lower density areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Brookline needs more density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower income – should live in higher density areas, nearer to services
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add more dense housing to combine with commercial eg. Around Putterham Circle 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic diversity in one project is good
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use small edges of existing green space for AH
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert some open space to AH 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land around Skyline Park-re-zone for more housing 	
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Manor – a large senior housing project here could be self-contained, provide its own transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low density areas off Rte 9-low rise still fit neighborhood character—for example, townhouses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't require public transit for moderate income housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build more near T stops
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior housing with transit provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like Fisher Hill Estates

• Add in-fill near Brookhaven/High St	• Site near High St. firehouse
---------------------------------------	--------------------------------

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 2
1. Observations: What do you notice about the highly-ranked sites? How would you describe their distribution across this section of town? Do you see any patterns emerging?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In lower density neighborhood, pattern of development should reflect the neighborhood 	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scattered sites in S. Brookline 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why are parks excluded? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation difficulties 	
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 2
2. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the most appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tire store (?) now off Rte 9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old Mormon site-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benevolent Society
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pine Manor land
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allandale Farm
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clancy site
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dexter School excess?
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 2
3. What types of highly-ranked sites are <i>the least appropriate</i> for multi-family/mixed use development? Why?	
Round 1	Round 3
N/A	N/A
Round 2	Round 4
N/A	N/A

MAP ZONE 4	ROOM 2
------------	--------

4. Are there any other sites that should be highly-ranked that were not captured in the consultant's analysis?	
Round 1	Round 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Manor? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heath St School now used for daycare, who owns?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation overemphasized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can Med School shuttles be used for housing in S Brookline?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed use on library combines with Putterham Circle
Round 2	Round 4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Millennial Park? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goddard House-trouble?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active seniors with cars, developing alternative housing types 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ace **** accumulation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Manor 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is strempo development on CC property? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allandale Farm 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there sites that might have Right of First Refusal by town 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clancy site 	

Appendix 2: Site Selection Criteria

CRITERIA USED TO SCORE POTENTIAL SITES THAT COULD SUPPORT HOUSING

PROXIMITY CRITERIA:

1. **Proximity to Public Transit** – sites within a 10 minute walk from a transit stop scored higher than those not within a 10 minute walk
2. **Proximity to Commercial Areas** - sites within a 10 minute walk from a commercial area scored higher than those not within a 10 minute walk
3. **Proximity to Open Space** - sites within a 10 minute walk from a park, playground, or other public open space scored higher than those not within a 10 minute walk

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTERISTICS CRITERIA:

1. **Comparable Use** – removed single-, two-, and three-family parcels in residential zoning districts to protect the character of existing residential neighborhoods

SITE CHARACTERISTICS CRITERIA:

1. **Parcel Size** – removed parcels that were less than 10,000 square feet in size
2. **Underutilized Sites** – removed parcels that had an existing Floor Area Ratio (FAR) that would likely prohibit a cost-effective redevelopment effort
3. **Protected Open Space** – removed any parcels that are protected open spaces
4. **Wetlands** – removed any parcel that contained known wetlands
5. **Surface Parking** – parcels with a surface parking lot larger than 5,000 square feet scored higher than those with a parking lot smaller than 5,000 square feet