

Testimony of Patricia Barron Worden Re;

Public hearing for Special Permit Docket #3625 to review application by 882-892 Massachusetts Ave., LLC, for 882-892 1 of 275 Massachusetts Avenue, to develop a new mixed-use building with twenty two (22) one-bedroom residential units and one (1) commercial space in a B2 Business District.

To:

Chairperson Bunnell and Members of the Arlington Redevelopment Board

*Please include the following testimony with the other materials pertaining to Special Permit Docket #3625*

Reasons that this project as it is currently described should be denied a permit include the following:

1. 882-292 Mass. Av. is in the B2 district. Arlington Zoning Bylaw specifies as the primary requirement for the B2 Neighborhood Business District that:

it is for “small retail and service establishments serving the needs of adjacent neighborhoods”

Town of Arlington Zoning Bylaw, Section 5.5.1 B

The plan to eliminate the restaurant and business uses including the Arlington Community Media Studio B and replace them with dense residences with only a tiny room-sized commercial space is clearly not in conformance with the purposes of the zoning district.

2. 5.3.8 may require that on the Lockland Avenue side the building setback be 20 feet since the property is a corner lot.

Also, the plan does not satisfy the Open Space requirement

3. 5.3.17 also requires that The Upper Story Step-back should be a minimum of 7.5 feet. That is not the case for much of the building.

5. The project is antithetical to the premise upon which Mixed Use zoning was presented to Arlington Town Meeting members to secure their approval. It was claimed to be a device for attracting business and commercial interests and having a residential component. It is instead in this case being used for the opposite purpose of eliminating thriving and taxpaying restaurants and businesses and a studio of importance to the community. It was claimed that any problems with proper adherence to the goals of increasing business and commercial interests would be prevented by the ARB in the Special Permit process. But what is taking place at the May 18, 2020 hearing is using the Mixed Use provision in a barefaced attempt to enable an apartment building very much larger than would be allowed without Mixed Use and to destroy all businesses at the site.

For this the proponent's strategy is to include one small room for commercial use. Does the ARB recognize its role in implementing honestly its assurances made of its ability to conduct satisfactory controls through the Special Permit process? If so then this Permit should reflect that or else, ideally, the permit should be denied. In this regard some early warnings indicating necessity for a more appropriate and enforceable Mixed Use provision are prescient – please see:

[https://youtu.be/AO6EYDKnL\\_o](https://youtu.be/AO6EYDKnL_o)