



Town of Arlington, MA Redevelopment Board

Agenda & Meeting Notice January 28, 2019

The Arlington Redevelopment Board will meet Monday, January 28, 2019 at 7:30 PM in the **Town Hall Annex, 2nd Floor Conference Room, 730 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington, MA 02476**

1. Community engagement and outreach plan for 2019 Annual Town Meeting warrant articles

7:30 p.m. - 8:30 p.m. Staff presentation and discussion with Board

2. Organizational meeting – ARB Rules and Regulations Rule 2 - Board Officers

8:30 p.m. - 8:40 p.m. Board will elect a Chairperson and a Vice Chairperson

3. Meeting schedule for March

8:40 p.m. - 8:50 p.m. Board will vote on meeting date change

4. Meeting Minutes to be distributed prior to meeting

8:50 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Board members will review and approve meeting minutes

5. Adjourn

9:00 p.m. Adjourn

6. Correspondence received

Correspondence received: From Steve Revilak re Inclusionary Zoning Warrant Article 012419



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Meeting Minutes to be distributed prior to meeting

Summary:

8:50 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Board members will review and approve meeting minutes

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▣ Reference Material	12172018_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	012172018 Draft Minutes Redevelopment Board
▣ Reference Material	01072019_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	01072019 Draft Minutes Redevelopment Board
▣ Reference Material	01162019_Draft_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	01162019 Draft Minutes Redevelopment Board

Arlington Redevelopment Board
December 17, 2018, 7:30 p.m.
Senior Center, Main Room, First Floor
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

PRESENT: Andrew Bunnell (Chair), Andrew West, David Watson, Eugene Benson, Kin Lau

STAFF: Jennifer Raitt, Director of Planning and Community Development; Erin Zwirko, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:30 pm and turned to the first item on the agenda, multifamily housing analysis and recommendations.

Ms. Raitt stated the analysis was done to analyze possible development opportunities along Arlington's main corridors, creating new businesses while preserving neighborhoods, specifically in the already zoned higher-density residential districts (R4-R7) and in the business districts.

Alexis Smith, Senior Regional Housing Planner with MAPC, reviewed the following analyses:

- * lot size/density – in the business districts, lots are largely compliant; in the residential district, many are not; and
- * buildout – impact of yards and open space; height; floor area ratios; and parking.

Ms. Smith then moved to the main points:

- * eliminate usable open space multifamily requirements and instead double the landscaped open space requirements;
- * slightly reduce front/side yard setbacks;
- * reduce minimum lot area;
- * reduce height buffer;
- * increase FAR across higher density districts;
- * change parking ratio to one space per unit; and
- * six mixed-use or multifamily units as of right.

The Chair moved to questions from the Board.

Board members asked Ms. Smith clarifying questions about setback requirements, proposed height buffer requirements, and setbacks. Board members also expressed concerns allowing buildings which are six or less units to be built as of right. Mr. Watson stated he is in favor of the special permit process, which allows for more discussion and guidance with residents and developers. The Chair agreed. Mr. Benson was concerned about reducing the number of parking spaces, as one parking space per single family does not accurately reflect the number of cars possibly in use. Mr. Benson asked if there would be no setback with three stories; Ms. Smith stated setback would be required for buildings greater than three stories. Mr. Lau supported this. The Chair referred to the Capitol Theatre block as a good model for such setbacks. Ms. Smith stated this setback would apply to both mixed use and residential districts. Mr. Benson stated he is in favor of adding some density, but suggested a combination of usable/landscaped open space. Ms. Smith stated landscape can also be usable. Mr. Benson suggested clarifying the definition, which seems exclusive. Ms. Smith stated that now open space on roofs is allowed for two-story buildings; a bylaw change would allow this requirement to be fulfilled on higher stories.

The Chair opened the floor for questions from the public.

John Gersh asked how Arlingtonians would benefit from proposed changes. The Chair replied that rules in place over the last 40 years have held back mixed use renovation and development, and prevented needed amenities as well as housing alternatives.

Carl Wagner was unhappy about the mixed use building that went up on Mass. Ave. near Stop and Shop. He stated that Arlington does not want to increase density, it's already very dense, and that greater density will not guarantee cheaper housing. He stated proposed changes would make Arlington look less like a town and more like a city, and these should come before the voters prior to Board approval.

Jo Anne Preston asked the Board to take more time to consider the impact on all of Arlington, especially increased school enrollment. She stated that according to a study, the impact of new development is that costs outweigh revenues, schooling being the major cost. She also stated she did not think there was a scarcity of rental apartments in Arlington, and this needs some research. Also, in Arlington Center, the number of residents did not prevent the three empty storefronts. She recommended a less short-sighted approach, especially as it affects the schools.

Asia Kepka, artist, stated she was lucky to be able to buy a house in Arlington 20 years ago, and she could not do so now. She was concerned because a small business near her small street of two-story homes was shut down, and the developer wants to replace it with a 5-story, 20-unit complex. She stated she would like to see the Board address needs of artists and other residents who do not want to be pushed out.

Steve Revilak supported the proposal overall -- allowing a six-unit building by-right and dimensional changes to townhouses. He stated this is a modest proposal, affecting only a small portion of the entire town and looks forward to a Town Meeting vote.

Wynelle Evans asked, of the 185,000 units required for eastern Massachusetts, how many is Arlington expected to provide; how many of those will be affordable; and will those affordable units be affordable in perpetuity? Ms. Raitt stated these are regional goals, and there are no local goals at this time; the only local goal now is to achieve ten percent of affordable 40B housing, to be affordable in perpetuity.

John Worden stated that if the Board talks to local residents they would find that, rather than density, the real concern is over teardowns that disfigure neighborhoods and limit housing affordability. He objected to building six units by-right. Ms. Raitt stated the Housing Plan Advisory Committee (HPAC) met many times. One the Housing Production Plan was adopted, the HPAC became the Housing Plan Implementation Committee; the committee has met. Mr. Worden stated that the approved Housing Production Plan was an invalid vote because one of the members was employed by the MAPC. Ms. Raitt stated that the plan is valid and was adopted by the town and approved by the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development.

Mr. Wagner asked about recusal, and Ms. Raitt and the Chair replied they would not address this.

Mr. Worden requested that the new plans be shelved until MAPC and CHAPA can say where they would put the new school that would be required, and who is going to pay for it.

Mark Rosenthal stated he is distressed that town boards such as this repeatedly make decisions without discussing it with the populace; expect busy townspeople to come to meetings, knowing full well that most won't; and then make decisions that are not known to the public until it's a fait accompli.

Chris Loreti stated the Board is taking the easy way out with the height buffers, and that many different zones near each other makes it hard for coherent planning. He liked the "rhythm of the corridors" but there is no agreement about what the appropriate rhythm is, and the Board needs to consult the zoning map more closely. He agreed about not relaxing the special permits but asked rhetorically if the Board had ever rejected a special permit application. Regarding open spaces, landscaped open space would only be increased from ten to fifteen percent, but many older structures already exceed that open space.

Pam Hallett complimented the presentation but stated a survey done a year and a half earlier showed an overabundance of parking; also, bike parking needs to be addressed regarding helping people park the bikes and keeping them safe. She took issue with audience members criticizing the Board for lack of public notice, stating there have been many public meetings, and the minutes are available to the public.

Ben Ruddick spoke in supported increased density, which would increase the tax base of the town, brings in young families like his, and result in more affordable housing because more housing would be built.

Neal Mongold, architect, supported increased density. He agreed with Board members Mr. Benson and Mr. Lau about the challenge of proximity of different districts along the slice of Mass. Ave. He favored one parking space per unit. He suggested designers be allowed to find their creative way and not everything needs to be identical. He questioned the public value of landscapes if located on a roof or balcony.

Larry Slotnick also supported increased density and hoped that relaxing some zoning requirements would make the Mass Ave strip less of a “mishmash” and increase the vibrancy of the area. He stated the tax base would increase and that new people coming into Arlington might not necessarily burden the public school system.

Charlotte Milan supported increased density, as well as less than one parking space per household.

The Chair closed public comment and moved to the next agenda item. Ms. Raitt asked if the Board wished to continue moving forward with these proposals. The Board expressed interest in continuing. A January 16 meeting was added so they could continue to review warrant articles and zoning language.

Mr. Benson requested more graphics showing proposed changes and comparisons, and requested to see the parking survey that was previously referenced. Mr. Watson approved of the evening’s proceedings but was concerned about the timing to get this to Town Meeting because of the level of public interest. Mr. Lau approved of the public feedback this evening. Mr. Benson asked what maximum buildout would look like. Ms. Raitt stated the analysis will be conducted once the warrant articles are filed and we are clear what is being proposed. Mr. Benson mentioned studies that show the types of houses where services are greater than taxes seem to be three-four bedrooms, with a lot of kids; small apartments, high end condos have taxes greater than services provided; this needs to be discussed. The Chair stated the Master Plan addresses the need for these kinds of diverse housing choices. Mr. West asked how to address the ebb and flow between nodes (East Arlington and Arlington Heights) emphasizing commercial areas that then drop off into residential areas and open spaces. Ms. Raitt suggested that we work on visualizations to illustrate what is being discussed. Mr. West stated density, tax base, and population diversity should be discussed in Town Meeting. Mr. Watson stated it was important for the public to understand that the Board can’t prescribe what developers will do but can establish some boundaries.

The Chair suggested the department prepare warrant language and the Board will continue its discussion. Ms. Raitt stated she would bring the draft warrant articles to the January 7 meeting, along with any other supporting documents. Mr. Benson asked about the January 10 meeting. Ms. Raitt stated that it is a public meeting with a brief presentation and world café style engagement for participants to learn about the early proposals.

The Chair moved to the next agenda item: Signs. Ms. Zwirko presented an analysis of the signage section of the zoning bylaw, produced by Roger Eastman and colleagues from . Mr. West spoke favorably about the analysis. The Chair stated he agreed with the proposal to keep sign requirements in zoning bylaw and remove them from the town bylaw. Mr. Benson stated he has many comments and disagreed with regulations regarding movie marquees and gasoline stations. He expressed concern that some of the proposed recommendations would not give the Board enough authority. He also stated many houses in his neighborhood have more than one sign (house numbers, political signs, alarms, etc.), which is a “violation,” and this should be addressed in the regulations. Mr. Benson suggested making a distinction between commercial and noncommercial speech protection. Mr. Lau asked how enforcement would be addressed. The Chair stated this was the zoning enforcement officer is in charge of compliance with the bylaw.

Mr. West moved to adjourn; Mr. Lau seconded. Board voted all in favor.

Meeting Adjourned.

DRAFT

Arlington Redevelopment Board
January 7, 2019, 7:30 p.m.
Senior Center, Main Room, First Floor
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Andrew Bunnell (Chair), Andrew West, David Watson, Eugene Benson, Kin Lau

STAFF: Jennifer Raitt, Director of Planning and Community Development; Erin Zwirko, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:30 pm and turned to the first item on the agenda, EDR special permit public hearing for 10 Sunnyside Ave. The proponent requested postponement and for the hearing to be reschedule to January 28 at 7:30 p.m. The chair entertained a motion to reschedule. Chair presented letter of continuance to be signed. Mr. Benson so moved, Mr. Lau seconded, Board voted all in favor. (5-0)

Agenda Item 2 being delayed till 8:20, The Chair moved to review of minutes of November 19. The Chair made two corrections to the minutes: Mr. West was present; Mr. Lau was not; and there were two votes of 4-0, not 5-0. Ms. Raitt stated she will adjust accordingly. Mr. Benson moved to accept the minutes with the Chair's changes and with Ms. Raitt's proviso. Mr. Watson seconded. Board voted all in favor. (5-0)

Ms. Raitt listed upcoming meetings: Thursday 1/10, Forum, Auditorium, 7 pm, regarding housing; and the Board meetings on 1/16 and 1/28.

The Chair requested a motion for recess to 8:20 p.m. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. West seconded. Board voted all in favor. (5-0)

Meeting Recessed.

The Chair reopened the meeting at 8:20 p.m. and turned to the proposed warrant articles for 2019 Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Raitt reviewed the proposed articles. Article A, zoning bylaw amendment, sign regulations: Mr. Benson stated A and B may be merged together. Ms. Raitt stated Article B is just for reference because it is for the Select Board to amend the Town Bylaw and should not be inserted into A. Ms. Raitt addressed Articles C and D together. She stated that she will discuss these articles with the Conservation Commission chair the following Friday and will update the Board on the 16th as to a possible plan of action. Article E, codification of Dover Amendment reviews. Mr. Benson stated the bylaw is okay but could be improved. Ms. Raitt stated the bylaw requires a special permit for these uses, but needs a separate section to clarify the review process; and also to move 3.4 Paragraph J to a separate section. Article F, bicycle parking standards. Mr. Watson stated he is looking forward to seeing the changes but would like a bike parking guide alongside the bylaw changes. Ms. Raitt stated the Senior Transportation Planner, Daniel Amstutz, is interested in development of the guide and of the bylaw language. A companion guide should be considered as a separate document.

Articles G-Q, multifamily zoning. The Chair reminded the Board that the language for the vote is in process; right now the warrant language needs review. Mr. Benson referred to Article I, expressing continued concerns and interest in the Board maintaining special permit authority. The Chair agreed with Mr. Benson that this should be under special permit control, at least initially. Mr. West asked if there will be an analysis of proposed densities. The Chair stated this will be in process once articles are filed. Mr. Benson requested continued discussion of parking requirements, E and G. He requested that the report about the survey be shared with the Board. He could not link to this; Ms. Raitt stated she will send to Mr. Benson. Mr. Benson stated per his own informal survey, the vast majority of two-families in East Arlington had more than two cars in the driveway, indicating to him that one parking space might not be enough.

Article R, administrative corrections. Ms. Raitt stated bylaw references need to be updated administratively.

Article S, accessory dwelling units. The Chair asked if this is ready to go. Ms. Raitt stated they would start with what they had shared with the Board about a year ago. Mr. Benson did not think they had had enough time for input; he favors accessory units but has concerns about the proposal.

The Chair stated as far as the timeline goes, this evening they would see to the proposed warrant language, not actual language to be discussed. There will have to be a vote by next Wednesday. Ms. Raitt stated the articles are due on the 25th. The Chair asked when they could expect to see the proposed amendments. Ms. Raitt stated that in February they would draft more language; in March the Board will hold public hearings; by the second week of April, report to Town Meeting would be finalized. Mr. Lau asked how many more meetings to expect; Ms. Raitt replied four Board meetings plus four neighborhood meetings.

The Chair requested red-lined changes on any draft language be returned to Ms. Raitt by Thursday.

The Chair opened the floor for public questions.

Carl Wagner stated that the people of Arlington do not want more density, and a yes vote here and in Town Meeting on items G-M will ruin the town. He stated in the town voted no twice, in 2014 and maybe 2016, on accessory apartments. He requested the Board not force things down the throat of the Town Meeting members and thus the voters.

Wynelle Evans, member of the Residential Study Group, stated further study is needed on Article S -- amending to allow accessory units -- before another vote is taken, to avoid unintended consequences (e.g., inspection, enforcement, compliance). She requested the Board allow the Residential Study Group to do its job on this article.

Jo Anne Preston stated her concern that an outside group was invited in to perform the analysis and make recommendations. Their only interest is increasing housing density. Every school is at maximum capacity. There will be not be unintended consequences but ignored consequences. The Chair stated the stated goal of the Master Plan is to increase housing in Arlington, and there is no intention to discourage children from coming into town. Ms. Preston replied that they will need to plan for another elementary school. She also was concerned about the street walls' effect on climate change, and stated that moving green spaces to balconies and roofs is not a solution. She stated more social planning is required, and there was no discussion of low-cost housing. The Chair stated the inclusionary zoning bylaw will not change, and the increased developments would trigger the affordable housing requirement. Ms. Preston then suggested the town look into cohousing and other intentional communities.

The Chair requested a motion to adjourn; Mr. Lau moved to adjourn, Mr. Watson seconded. Board voted all in favor. (5-0)

Meeting Adjourned.

Arlington Redevelopment Board
January 16, 2019, 7:30 p.m.
Senior Center, Main Room, First Floor
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Andrew Bunnell (Chair), Andrew West, David Watson, Eugene Benson, Kin Lau

STAFF: Jennifer Raitt, Director of Planning and Community Development; Erin Zwirko, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:30 pm and turned to the first item on the agenda, proposed warrant articles for 2019 Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Raitt began with Article A, sign regulations: no new edits since the Board's January 7 meeting. Article B: removed because it was a Town Bylaw change; B and C had minor edits; the Conservation Commission approved these as is. Mr. Watson stated he was not in favor of moving forward tonight. Mr. Benson stated he is in favor of moving ahead even though the language might need clarification. Ms. Raitt stated the minor edits (e.g., citation errors) could be moved to Article Q. Article D, clarification of Dover review process: only change is the addition of enumerated lists for clarity. Article E: no change. Articles F through P (no Article L): Ms. Zwirko noted minor changes since the Board's January 7 meeting.

The Chair asked the Board for comments.

Elizabeth Pyle of the Residential Study Group (RSG) interjected that before any action is taken, accessory units should come before the RSG to avoid a host of unintended consequences. Mr. Benson agreed with this. Wynelle Evans, also a member of the RSG, echoed Ms. Pyle's comments.

Mr. West spoke in favor of higher density but requested visuals of proposed changes. Mr. Benson stated that increased density might potentially create buildings large enough for affordable housing units.

The Chair asked if there were more questions on language from the Board.

The Chair permitted Patricia Worden as a Housing Plan Implementation Committee member to comment. She stated the proposals would make it easier for developers to build five unit buildings rather than six, causing a decrease in the opportunity for affordable housing. Mr. Benson disagreed.

The Chair requested a vote to file the articles. All moved and seconded. (5-0)

A-G: Board voted in favor. (5-0)

H (special permits): the Chair required a unanimous vote; vote postponed.

I-K: Board voted in favor. (5-0)

M-N: Board voted in favor. (5-0)

O: Board voted in favor. Mr. Benson abstained. (4 yes, 1 abstention)

P-R: Board voted in favor, with understanding that Article R is being referred to the Residential Study Group. (5-0)

The Chair moved to the next agenda item, future meetings. Ms. Raitt suggested upcoming dates and topics. Discussion followed. The Chair moved to the next agenda item, request by the proponent to postpone the 10 Sunnyside Avenue public hearing. The request would move the hearing from January 28 to February 25. Discussion ensued; moved, seconded; Board voted in favor (5-0), Chair will sign the letter.

Motion to adjourn. Board voted all in favor. (5-0)

Meeting Adjourned.

DRAFT



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Correspondence received

Summary:

Correspondence received: From Steve Revilak re Inclusionary Zoning Warrant Article 012419

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
Reference Material	Correspondence_from_Steve_Revilak_re_Inclusionary_Zoning_Warrant_Article_012419.pdf	Correspondence received: From Steve Revilak re Inclusionary Zoning Warrant Article 012419

From: Stephen Revilak

To: Arlington Redevelopment Board, Department of Planning and Community Development

Subject: Zoning Bylaw Amendment/Inclusionary Zoning Requirements

Date: Jan. 24, 2019

Dear ARB and DPCD,

I've filed paperwork to bring a zoning-related article before town meeting this year. The following pages contain the warrant article language, a proposed main motion, and a few paragraphs of explanatory text.

I would appreciate any feedback you have to offer, and I look forward to discussing the matter further.

Regards,

Stephen Revilak

Warrant Language

Zoning Bylaw Amendment/Inclusionary Zoning requirements

To see if the town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw by increasing the affordability requirements contained in Section 8.2 AFFORDABILITY REQUIREMENTS, such that a greater number of affordable units would be required for certain projects; or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of Stephen Revilak and ten registered voters.)

Proposed main motion

That Section 8.2.3 (A) of the Zoning Bylaw of the Town of Arlington, Massachusetts be modified by

- Striking the first sentence, and replacing it with the text "In any development subject to this Section 8.2, a percentage of the dwelling units shall be affordable units as defined in Section 2 of this Bylaw, where the percentage is given by the the following table:"
- Inserting the following table after the first sentence:

Total Number of Units	Required Affordable Units
0 to 5 units	No affordability requirement
6 to 19 units	15% affordable units
20 units or more	20% affordable units

So that Section 8.2.3(A) reads as follows:

~~In any development subject to this Section 8.2, 15% of the dwelling units shall be affordable units as defined in Section 2 of this Bylaw.~~ In any development subject to this Section 8.2, a percentage of the dwelling units shall be affordable units as defined in Section 2 of this Bylaw, where the percentage is given by the the following table:

Total Number of Units	Required Affordable Units
0 to 5 units	No affordability requirement
6 to 19 units	15% affordable units
20 units or more	20% affordable units

For purposes of this Section 8.2., each room for renter occupancy in a single-room occupancy building shall be deemed a dwelling unit. In determining the total number of affordable units required, calculation of a fractional unit of 0.5 or more shall be rounded up to the next whole number.

Remarks

This article was inspired by Chairman Bunnell's remarks during the ARB meeting of January 7, 2019: if adopted by town meeting, the multifamily zoning amendments could allow developments that trigger the inclusionary provisions of Arlington's Zoning Bylaw. To that end, I am proposing a bylaw amendment that would require a greater percentage of affordable units on larger projects.

The substance of the main motion was based on Somerville's inclusionary zoning provisions. Somerville requires 15% inclusionary units for a 6--7 unit project, 17.5% inclusionary units for a 8--17 unit project, and 20% inclusionary units for a 20+ unit project.¹ In short, the larger the project, the greater the inclusionary requirement.

The specifics of Somerville's inclusionary ordinance came out of a needs-based assessment, conducted by the city's Office of Planning and Community Development.² I have not conducted a similar assessment for Arlington, but I do believe that a tiered percentage could benefit the town. Therefore, I am proposing a higher percentage (20%) of inclusionary units on projects of twenty units or more. At a certain level, inclusionary zoning requires developers to provide a "bulk discount" on housing, where market rate units subsidize the inclusionary ones. I understand that too steep a requirement could undermine the financial viability of such projects, and I do not wish to see that happen. The twenty percent tier is intentionally conservative.

Finally, I would like to be up-front about two issues this proposal does not address.

First, the Somerville Planning Department memo talks about the characteristics of comprehensive inclusionary ordinances:

"... comprehensive inclusionary ordinances are more complicated than a single percentage of required units. The inclusionary ordinance works like a set of dials and switches, each one controlling a separate factor. These factors include: the percentage of required units, whether they are on-site, if bonuses are provided, what the income requirements are, what interior finishes are required, the size of the living units, what other factors might impact

1 See "Zoning Ordinance for the City of Somerville", Article 13 INCLUSIONARY HOUSING, and table 13.3.4.A

2 See "Draft Staff Report and Preliminary Recommendations Regarding Inclusionary Zoning", dated Feb 18, 2016, and retrieved from <https://www.somervillema.gov/sites/default/files/inclusionary-housing-preliminary-impacts-memo-2-20-2016.pdf>.

affordability (landscape, parking, design, application fees, permitting etc.), and what number of units triggers inclusionary zoning."³

I suspect that Arlington could benefit from such a level of subtlety and nuance, but I have not attempted to provide it here.

Second, there is the effectiveness of Arlington's Inclusionary Zoning bylaw as a vehicle for creating affordable housing. Since its enactment in 2001, our inclusionary zoning bylaw has created a total of 54 affordable units, in five development projects.⁴ Though modestly successful, this not sufficient to meet the town's affordable housing needs. As a point of comparison, Somerville produced 145 units of inclusionary housing between 2010 and 2016⁵ (during the same period, Arlington produced 43 units). I believe the reasons for this lie beyond Section 8.2 of our Zoning Bylaw. The article before you will not change the frequency at which Arlington's Inclusionary Zoning is triggered.

Despite these limitations, I believe this article is a worthwhile step forward, at least until such time that Arlington can conduct a comprehensive needs-based assessment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stephen Revilak

³ *ibid*, pg. 10

⁴ These 54 units break down as follows: 6 at 30 Water St (2004), 4 at 264 Mass Ave (2004), 17 at the Brigham's redevelopment (2012), 26 at the Symmes redevelopment (2014), and 1 at 483 Summer St (2019). Figures provided by the Department of Planning and Community Development.

⁵ "Draft Staff Report and Preliminary Recommendations Regarding Inclusionary Zoning", pg. 2