

Polly Selkoe

From: Katherine Gerzon <lviv1991@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 10:58 PM
To: Polly Selkoe
Subject: 1180 Boylston Street Comments

Hello Ms. Selkoe,

Thank you for speaking with our son Yuriy yesterday. Per our conversation, I am sharing some of the feedback gathered from the residents of 1162 and 1164 Boylston Street regarding current ZBA proceedings for the proposed 40B development at 1180 Boylston Street.

- Access will be substantially hindered to entrance to 1162-1164. Majority of residents are over 60 already - by creating a situation where no parking is likely to be available at all in front of 1162-1164, residents in the area would need to walk distances just to get home, not to mention complications of simple tasks like bringing in groceries. How about during snowy weather? *Current proposal must address creation of parking for 1162-1164 residents, or create permit-only parking in front of 1162-1164 to avoid removal of access for existing residents.* This is all not helped by removing the two parking spots currently present in front of 1180 (as proposed at June 9th meeting).
- Noise is a concern. Current proposal puts all heavy machinery in the basement bordering 1162-1164. Vibration and noise will be substantial. Entry and exit ramp for 1180 is currently directly next to 1162-1164 - directly under the windows of three of the six units. This noise and air pollution will be noteworthy, especially since there is proposed retail, which will include retail traffic. *Current proposal should create a buffer between 1180 and 1162-1164 (perhaps greenery as currently exists on site) so that ramp is not directly under windows of units.*
- Proposed construction includes two ground floors - the excavation work for these is extremely risky. During the geological studies done by developer, cracks in foundation already developed in 1162-1164 - what can we expect to have happen during actual construction? It is clear *the proposed construction must be distanced from 1162-1164 and must scale back how deep the excavation work is, to perhaps one underground story.* We would hold the town and all related associations responsible for any issues that arise as a result of construction and expect that such a liability would be accepted with any work that is approved.
- Light study shown during presentation on 6/9 was missing simple facts. The proposed 74 feet building would tower over everything else near it - this means that it blocks light ALL DAY on one side of 1162-1164 (as it similarly does to other buildings in the area). The prior structure was a one-story building that did not impact lighting for anyone, even during peak times shown in the 'light study'. *Height of the structure must be lower to avoid blocking views and subsequently lowering values for adjacent properties.*
- Structure is EXTREMELY non-conforming. A 74 feet structure (where the zoning is 40 feet) and all surrounding buildings are at a maximum of 45 feet means that this proposal is NOT a fit for this area. It must be scaled back to match the area it is being built in. *The structure must fit within current zoning to match the height of all other buildings in the area.*
- As a matter of principal, the residents have voiced outrage that a proposal to create affordable housing while clearly impacting **existing** affordable housing so aversely would even be considered without major changes. We hope that Zoning Board of Appeals takes this into consideration. Not a single model, photo, or plan clearly shows how the proposed development will look next to 1162-1164 (or the building adjacent on Hammond St at that) - the developer has taken great efforts to avoid these type of views, because they would truly reflect the small size of the lot and just how out of place such a development would be for the area and the existing structures. *The scale of the structure should conform and match*

structures in the area and plans should show board EXACTLY how these two buildings would look next to each other. The developer didn't even acknowledge 1162-1164 in his Mass Housing application, listing the nearest residences as 400 feet away. We exist and the ZBA should be aware that this developer has not properly accounted for residents who live a mere 4 feet away.

Unbeknownst to the ZBA, the developer has continually had commercial vehicles parking on site overnight, which park on Route 9 in front of 1162-1164 from about 5:30 AM and create parking/access/noise problems already. The developer has not shown good faith (towards the residents and businesses in the area) in any step of the way with this proposal. Same goes for a tent sale, which generated parking traffic in the area as well. We hope the ZBA takes this into account.

Finally, the overall sentiment the residents wanted to share was that they are all immigrants who are low income and do not have teams of lawyers or friends in high places. We do not have a team of 10 people to bring to a 20 person meeting. We are counting on the ZBA to represent our interests and to stop a developer who comes armed with all of the above from taking blatant advantage of the 40B statutes to create a huge non-conforming structure literally next door. There are clear compromises (highlighted above in italics) that can be made to make this proposal palatable to the residents while still filling the 40B need as the developer claims to be concerned about.

General feedback from the presentation on 6/9/16:

- Traffic study was extremely flawed - used statistics for retirees when building is for residents who have one family member who is 55+ - these are working residents who go to work every day. Study clearly did not include retail traffic either. Contradictory, since words such as "gateway" and "vibrancy" were used to describe 1180 development, but those don't happen without people, and people use vehicles. The main consultant for the developer used the term "small project" to describe this development - sadly, we, as next-door residents, do not view this scale in the same way and hope the ZBA agrees. *Traffic study must reflect working families and must include planned retail traffic as well. Parking needs of said families and said retail must also be addressed and said customers should not be allowed to overflow to any other (already meager) parking in the area. Another option is removal of retail from this plan - this should reduce traffic (and parking needs) while leaving more room for affordable housing units.*
- Images showing heights of nearby buildings in the area showed very special-use buildings (three large corporate buildings and an assisted living residence) as examples of similar buildings - all of which were still smaller than 74 feet. *This clearly shows that the developer must lower the height of any proposed development to conform to the area.*
- Developer has not been genuine - discussing the 'needs' of the community as his reason for said proposal while conveniently avoiding that his original plan was a commercially zoned (G3) structure that he could not get approval for from the town - 40B was proposed only after the last plan fell through. This is nothing more than someone trying to figure out how to make money from the purchased land. *The lives of the existing community, however, are going to be made much more difficult (due to parking, traffic, and size of structure) all around - these concerns must be assuaged before any 'improvements' to the area by the developer can move forward, otherwise this is subtraction by addition.*

We look forward to sharing this feedback with you in person as well on Thursday. Thank you in advance for passing this feedback on to the ZBA.

Regards,
Residents of 1162-1164 Boylston Street

Alexander & Katherine Gerzon
Sergei & Nataliya Shafranskiy
Marina Calderon
Chen Family
Wong Family