



Town of Arlington, MA Redevelopment Board

Agenda & Meeting Notice March 27, 2019

The Arlington Redevelopment Board will meet Wednesday, March 27, 2019 at 7:30 PM in the **Town Hall, Charles Lyons Hearing Room, Floor 2, 730 Mass. Ave., Arlington, MA 02474**

1. Comments and Final Votes

7:30 p.m. - 10:30 p.m. Article 6: Density and Dimensional Requirements for Multi-family Uses
Article 7: Density and Dimensional Requirements for Mixed-uses

Article 8: Open Space Requirements for Multi-family Uses and Mixed uses

Article 9: Townhouses

Article 10: Upper-Story Building Step Backs

Article 11: Reduced Height Buffer Area

Article 12: Corner Lot Requirements

Article 13: Apartment Building Parking Requirements

Article 14: Parking Reduction Applicability

Article 15: Accessory Dwelling Units

Article 16: Affordable Housing Requirements

Article 17: Sign Regulations

Article 18: Floodplain District

Article 19: Inland Wetland District

Article 20: Review of Religious and Educational Uses

Article 21: Bicycle Parking

Article 22: Correcting Citation Errors

Article 23: Publication of Supporting Documentation – Zoning Board of Appeals

Article 24: Definition of Story, Half

Article 25: Driveway Slope

- Board members will be provided time to review any supporting materials related to the amendments and make comments
- Board members will vote on each article after deliberation

2. Adjourn

10:30 p.m. - Adjourn

3. Correspondence received:

I oppose the density articles 6-15 via email from Jenny Briggs 03-24-19

Memorandum to the Redevelopment Board via email from John Worden 03-22-19

Testimony for ARB Density Zoning Amendments via email from Patricia Worden 03-18-19

Testimony for ARB Hearing 3-25-2019 via email from Patricia Worden 03-25-19

Proposed pro-density zoning changes via email from Diane Krause 03-24-19

Writing in support of Article 15 of the Zoning Board Amendments via email from Ann Woodward 03-25-19

Comments on Selected Town Meeting Warrant Articles via email from Paul Parise 03-23-19

Proposed Zoning Changes via email from Lynn Dowling 03-25-19

Re: Increased Density via email from Asia Kepka 03-25-19

Zoning amendments before the ARB via email from Ralph Willmer 03-25-19

Proposed Amendments to Arlington Zoning Bylaw via email from Patricia Deal 03-25-19

Letter in opposition to the proposed density articles via email from Mark Rosenthal 03-25-19

Articles Increasing Density Bad via email from Kaspar Kasparian 03-25-19

Input to the Proposed Bylaw Amendments via email from Keith Schnebly 03-25-19

Comments on amendments to zoning bylaws via email from Jo Anne Preston 03-25-19

Zoning Bylaw Amendment Comments via email from Chris Loreti 03-25-19

Re: Density Amendments etc. via email from Frank Tadley 03-25-19

Re: ARB Comments via email from Christian Klein 03-26-19

Support for Proposed Zoning Amendments via email from Rochelle (Shelly) Dein 03-25-19

I support Density-Related articles via email from Thouis Jones 03-26-19

Zoning changes via email from Carl Nilsson 03-26-19

Comments on Proposed Articles via email from Barbara Wagner 03-26-19

Please Delay Voting on the Zoning Articles for another Year via email from Ellen Cohen 03-26-19

Support zoning changes via email from Chris Porter 03-26-19

Comments on Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal via email from Rachael Stark 03-27-19

Concerns via email from Andrew Freeman 03-27-19

We support the proposed zoning amendments via email from Jonathan Wallach and Linda Hanson 03-27-19

Rezoning Articles Require Further Study via email from Forrest Snyder 03-27-19

Zoning Changes via email from Anne Kazlauskas 03-27-19

Article 15-Accessory Dwelling Units via email from Thomas Danielczik 03-27-19

Concern about zoning articles proposed via email from Jenny Mauger 03-27-19

Proposed amendments - changes to Pro-urbanization articles, Art 16 etc. via email from Carl Wagner 03-27-19

Opposed to increasing Arlington density via email from Harold Helson 03-27-19

Flawed Buildout Affordability Analysis via email from Don Seltzer 03-26-19



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Comments and Final Votes

Summary:

7:30 p.m. - 10:30
p.m.

Article 6: Density and Dimensional Requirements for Multi-family Uses
Article 7: Density and Dimensional Requirements for Mixed-uses
Article 8: Open Space Requirements for Multi-family Uses and Mixed uses
Article 9: Townhouses
Article 10: Upper-Story Building Step Backs
Article 11: Reduced Height Buffer Area
Article 12: Corner Lot Requirements
Article 13: Apartment Building Parking Requirements
Article 14: Parking Reduction Applicability
Article 15: Accessory Dwelling Units
Article 16: Affordable Housing Requirements
Article 17: Sign Regulations
Article 18: Floodplain District
Article 19: Inland Wetland District
Article 20: Review of Religious and Educational Uses
Article 21: Bicycle Parking
Article 22: Correcting Citation Errors
Article 23: Publication of Supporting Documentation – Zoning Board of Appeals
Article 24: Definition of Story, Half
Article 25: Driveway Slope

- Board members will be provided time to review any supporting materials related to the amendments and make comments
- Board members will vote on each article after deliberation

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Reference Material	Agenda_Item_1_-_Amended_Articles_6-14_with_Density_Bonus_03-04-19.pdf	Amended Articles 6-14 with Density Bonus 03-04-19
▢ Reference Material	Agenda_Item_1_-_Article_20_correspondence_from_Town_Counsel_00021591.pdf	Article 20 Correspondence from Town Counsel 00021591

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 6

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL
REQUIREMENTS FOR MULTI-FAMILY USES**

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to change the density and dimensional requirements for multi-family uses in the R4, R5, R6, and R7 Districts by:

1. Amending SECTION 5.4.1. DISTRICTS AND PURPOSES to revise descriptions of the R5, R6, and R7 Districts;
2. Amending SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the minimum lot area, minimum lot area per unit, and minimum lot frontage for three-family dwellings, townhouse structures, and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District;
3. Amending SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to adjust the front yard, side yard, and rear yard for three-family dwellings, townhouse structures, and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District; and
4. Amending SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum height in feet, maximum stories, and maximum floor area ratio for townhouse structures and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District.

or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.4.1. DISTRICTS AND PURPOSES to revise descriptions of the R5, R6, and R7 Districts:

Comment [EZ1]: Keep in motion

Section 5.4.1 Districts and Purposes

- C. (1) R5: Apartment District/Low Density. The predominant use is two- to ~~three~~ four-story garden apartments located along or near principal arteries. The Town allows small-scale offices on principal arteries only. The Town discourages uses which would detract from the desired residential character, consume large amounts of land, or otherwise interfere with the intent of this Bylaw.
- (2) R6: Apartment District/Medium Density. The predominant land uses in the Medium-Density Apartment District consist of a mix of apartments up to ~~four~~ five stories high and offices at a smaller scale. The Town discourages uses which would detract from the desired residential and office character or otherwise interfere with the intent of this Bylaw.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the minimum lot area, minimum lot area per unit, and minimum lot frontage for three-family dwellings, townhouse structures, and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District:

Comment [EZ2]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

Section 5.4.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

R District Lot Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) for exceptions).

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (ft.)
R4			
Three-family dwelling	7,500 <u>5,000</u>	---	70 <u>50</u>
Townhouse structure	30,000 <u>5,000</u>	2,500 <u>1,500</u>	100 <u>50</u>
Apartment conversion	12,500 <u>---</u>	2,500 <u>1,000</u>	80 <u>---</u>
R5			
Townhouse structure, apartment building	20,000 <u>5,000</u>	1,450 <u>1,000</u>	100 <u>50</u>
R6			
Townhouse structure, apartment building, or office structure	20,000 <u>5,000</u>	700	100 <u>50</u>
R7 Any permitted principal structure	20,000 <u>5,000</u>	550	100 <u>50</u>
Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.			

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to adjust the front yard, side yard, and rear yard for three-family dwellings, townhouse structures, and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District:

Comment [EZ3]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

Section 5.4.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

R District Yard and Open Space Requirements (see 5.4.2(B) and 5.4.2(E) for exceptions).

Minimum Requirement	
District Use	Front Yard (ft.) Side Yard (ft.) Rear Yard (ft.)
R4	
Three-family dwelling	25-15 10 20
Townhouse structure	25-15 15-10 25-20
Apartment conversion	25- 10- 20-
R5	
Townhouse structure, apartment building	15-10 10+(L/10)-15 25-20
R6	
Townhouse structure, apartment building, or office structure	15+(H/10)-10 (H+L)/6-10 (H+L)/6-20
R7	
Any permitted principal structure	15+(H/10)-10 (H+L)/6 (H+L)/6
	At least 20 ft. 10 At least 20 ft. 20
Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.	

E. Exceptions to Side Yard Requirements in the R6 and R7 Districts.

For townhouse structures, apartment buildings, or office structures in the R6 district and for any permitted principal structure in the R7 district, no side yard is required at side lot lines that abut a Business district.

Comment [EZ4]: Incorporated into new 8.2 section. Remove from main motion.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum height in feet, maximum stories, and maximum floor area ratio for townhouse structures and apartment conversions in the R4 District, for townhouse and apartment buildings in the R5 District, for townhouse structure and apartment building in the R6 District, and for any permitted structure in the R7 District:

Comment [EZ5]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

R District Building Height and Floor Area Ratio Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) for exceptions)

District Use	Maximum Allowed		
	Maximum Height (ft.)	Maximum height (stories)	Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
R4			
Townhouse structure	35	3	0.70 <u>1.50</u>
Apartment conversion	<u>40</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>---</u>
R5			
<u>Townhouse structure, apartment building</u>	<u>45</u>	4	<u>1.50</u>
Any <u>Other</u> residential or other principal structure	35	3	0.80
R6			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> , apartment building, or office on more than 20,000 sq. ft.	<u>40</u> <u>55</u>	<u>4</u> <u>5</u>	<u>1.2</u> <u>1.80</u>
	<u>35</u> <u>45</u>	<u>3</u> <u>4</u>	
R7			
Any permitted principal structure	<u>40</u> <u>45</u>	5	<u>1.50</u> <u>2.00</u>
	60		
Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.			

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use
Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 7 **ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/DENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR MIXED-USE**

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to change the density and dimensional requirements for mixed-use in the B Districts by:

1. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the minimum lot area per unit for mixed-use on lots greater than 20,000 square feet in the B2 District;
2. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the front yard and side yard requirements for mixed-use in the B1 District;
3. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum height in feet and maximum stories for mixed-use in the B1, B3, and B5 Districts; and
4. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum floor area ratio for mixed-use in all of the Business Districts.

or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the minimum lot area per unit for mixed-use on lots greater than 20,000 square feet in the B2 District:

Comment [EZ6]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

Section 5.5.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

B District Lot Regulations

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (ft.)
B2			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.			50
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	>20,000	1,450 1,000	50

Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.

Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to reduce the front yard and side yard requirements for mixed-use in the B1 District:

Comment [EZ7]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

B District Yard and Open Space Requirements

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Front Yard (ft.)	Side Yard (ft.)	Rear Yard (ft.)
B1			
Mixed-use	20 10	10 0	20

Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum height in feet and maximum stories for mixed-use in the B1, B3, and B5 Districts and Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to increase the maximum floor area ratio for mixed-use in all of the Business Districts:

Comment [EZ8]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

B District Building Height and Floor Area Ratio Regulations

District Use	Maximum Allowed		
	Maximum Height (ft.)	Maximum height (stories)	Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
B1			
Mixed-use	35 <u>45</u>	3 <u>4</u>	0.75 <u>1.50</u>
B2			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.	50	4*	1.50 <u>1.80</u>
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	40	3 <small>*See Sec 5.2.17</small>	1.00 <u>1.50</u>
B2A			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.	60 50	5 4	1.50 <u>1.80</u>
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	50 40	4 3	1.00 <u>1.50</u>
B3			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.	60 50	5* 4	1.50 <u>1.80</u>
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	50 <u>60</u> 40 <u>50</u>	5 3 <u>4</u>	1.40 <u>1.50</u>
B4			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.	60 50	5 4*	1.50 <u>2.00</u>
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	50 40	4 3	1.00 <u>1.80</u>
B5			
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.	60 50	5 4*	1.80 <u>2.20</u>
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.	60 40 <u>50</u>	5 3 <u>4</u> *	1.40 <u>1.80</u>

Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 8

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/OPEN SPACE
REQUIREMENTS FOR MULTI-FAMILY USES AND MIXED-USE**

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to adjust the open space requirements for multi-family uses and mixed-use to eliminate the requirement for usable open space and increase the requirement for landscaped open space by:

1. Amending SECTION 2 DEFINITIONS for landscaped open space;
2. Amending SECTION 5.3.21. SUPPLEMENTAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS paragraph D;
3. Amending SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to eliminate the minimum usable open space requirement and increase the landscaped open space requirement for multi-family uses; and
4. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to eliminate the minimum usable open space requirement and increase the landscaped open space requirement for mixed-use.

or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 2 DEFINITIONS for landscaped open space:

Open Space, Landscaped: Open space designed and developed for pleasant appearance in trees, shrubs, ground covers and grass, including other landscaped elements such as natural features of the site, walks and terraces. Up to 25% of the landscaped open space may include, and also including open areas accessible to and developed for the use of the occupants of the building located upon a roof not more than 10 feet above the level of the lowest story used for dwelling purposes or a balcony at least 5 feet by 8 feet in size.

Comment [EZ9]: Incorporated into new section 8.2. Remove from main motion.

Amend SECTION 5.3.21. SUPPLEMENTAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS paragraph D:

Section 5.3.21 Supplemental Requirements in the Business and Industrial Districts

- D. For mixed uses and any permitted residential use not specifically identified in the tables in Section 5.5.2, the minimum open space requirements (computed from the residential floor area only) shall be ~~10% 20% landscaped open space in all Business districts and 20% usable in the B1, B2, B2A, B3, and B4 districts, and 15 percent usable in the B5 district.~~

Comment [EZ10]: Incorporated into new section 8.2. Remove from main motion.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to eliminate the minimum usable open space requirement and increase the landscaped open space requirement for multi-family uses:

Comment [EZ11]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

Section 5.4.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

R District Open Space and Lot Coverage Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) and 5.3.13(B) for exceptions).

District Use	Minimum / Maximum Requirements		
	Landscaped Open Space (Min.)	Usable Open Space (Min.)	Maximum Lot Coverage
R4			
Townhouse structure	10% 20%	30% _____	_____
Apartment conversion	10% 20%	30% _____	35%
R5			
Townhouse structure, apartment building	10% 20%	30% _____	_____
R6			
Townhouse structure, apartment building, or office structure	10% 20%	25% _____	_____
R7			
Any permitted principal structure	10% 20%	15% _____	_____
<u>Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.</u>			

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to eliminate the minimum usable open space requirement and increase the landscaped open space requirement for mixed-use:

Comment [EZ12]: Change so that the tables include a footnote referring to 8.2 for 4 or 5 unit buildings

Section 5.5.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

B District Open Space and Lot Coverage

Minimum/Open Space and Lot Coverage		Minimum/Maximum Requirement		
Use District		Landscaped Open Space	Usable Open Space	Maximum Lot Coverage
B1				
Mixed-use		20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
B2				
Mixed-use		10% 20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
B2A				
Mixed-use <=20,000 sq. ft.		----- 20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.		10% 20%		-----
B3				
Mixed-use <=20,000 sq. ft.		----- 20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.		10% 20%		-----
B4				
Mixed-use <=20,000 sq. ft.		----- 20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
Mixed-use >20,000 sq. ft.		10% 20%		-----
B5				
Mixed-use <= 20,000 sq. ft.		----- 20%	Sec. 5.3.21	-----
Mixed-use > 20,000 sq. ft.		10% 20%		-----
Note: See Section 8.2.4(C) for structures with 4 or 5 dwelling units.				

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 9

ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/

TOWNHOUSES

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to clarify references to townhouse and to increase the size of a townhouse structure by:

1. Amending SECTION 5.3.14. TOWNHOUSE STRUCTURES paragraph A to increase the size of a townhouse structure to not exceed 200 feet or 8 townhouses in length;
2. Amending SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure;
3. Amending SECTION 5.4.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure;
4. Amending SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure;
5. Amending SECTION 5.5.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR BUSINESS DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure; and
6. Amending SECTION 5.6.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR MU, PUD, I, T, and OS DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure.

or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.3.14. TOWNHOUSE STRUCTURES paragraph A to increase the size of a townhouse structure to not exceed 200 feet or 8 townhouses in length:

Section 5.3.14 Townhouse Structures

A. A townhouse structure shall not exceed ~~150~~ 200 feet or ~~6~~ 8 townhouses in length for a single-story structure nor 120 feet for that part of the structure more than one-story in height.

Amend SECTION 5.4.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure:

Section 5.4.2 Dimensional and Density Requirements

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

R District Lot Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) for exceptions).

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (ft.)
R3			
Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling; or other permitted structure except <u>townhouse structure</u>	5,000	-----	45
R5			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> , apartment building	20,000 5,000	1,450 1,000	100 50

Comment [EZ13]: Article can remain as is. Removed the changes in the tables though as those reductions are incorporated into Section 8.2. Change to specific "Townhouse Structure" is still important for editorial/usability reasons.

Comment [EZ14]: Could be incorporated into 8.2 as an incentive.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

R District Yard and Open Space Requirements (see 5.4.2(B) for exceptions).

District	Use	Minimum Requirement		
		Front Yard (ft.)	Side Yard (ft.)	Rear Yard (ft.)
R3	Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling; or other permitted structure except townhouse <u>structure</u>	10	One side: min. 10 Sum of two sides: min. 16	20
R5	Townhouse <u>structure</u> , apartment building	15 10	10+(L/10) 15	25 20

R District Open Space and Lot Coverage Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) and 5.3.13(B) for exceptions).

District	Use	Minimum / Maximum Requirements		
		Landscaped Open Space (Min.)	Usable Open Space (Min.)	Maximum Lot Coverage
R3	Single-family detached dwelling, two-family dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-family dwelling; or other permitted structure except townhouse <u>structure</u>	10%	30%	-----
R5	Townhouse <u>structure</u> , apartment building	10% 20%	30% -----	-----

R District Building Height and Floor Area Ratio Regulations (see 5.4.2(B) for exceptions)

District	Use	Maximum Allowed		
		Maximum Height (ft.)	Maximum height (stories)	Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
R6	Townhouse <u>structure</u> , apartment building, or office on more than 20,000 sq. ft.	40 55 35 45	4 5 3 4	1.2 1.80

Amend SECTION 5.4.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure:

Section 5.4.3 Use Regulations for Residential Districts

Class of Use	R0	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7
Residential								
Townhouse <u>structure</u>				SP	SP	SP	SP	SP

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

Amend SECTION 5.5.2. DIMENSIONAL AND DENSITY REQUIREMENTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure:

Section 5.5.2 Dimensional and Density Regulations

A. Tables of Dimensional and Density Regulations

B District Lot Regulations

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Area per Unit (sq. ft.)	Minimum Lot Frontage (ft.)
B2			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	5,000	1,450	50
B3			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	20,000	600	100
B5^A			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	20,000	550	100

^A The maximum height in feet of any building or buildings may be modified by special permit of the Arlington Redevelopment Board under Section 3.4 of this Bylaw, provided that the total roof area exceeding either maximum height shall be equal to an equal roof area, within the part of the project to which the same height limit applies, that is less than the maximum height so that the total of the products of the horizontal roof area of all roofs times their respective heights shall not exceed the product of the horizontal area of the total roof times the applicable maximum height permitted in the district, and provided further that the height of any roof shall not exceed the applicable maximum height permitted in the district by more than 12 feet.

B District Yard and Open Space Requirements

District Use	Minimum Requirement		
	Front Yard (ft.)	Side Yard (ft.)	Rear Yard (ft.)
B2			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	20	10	20
B3			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	15+(H/10)	(H+L)/6	(H+L)/6
B5			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	15+(H/10)	(H+L)/6 (at least 20 ft.)	(H+L)/6 (at least 20 ft.)

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

B District Open Space and Lot Coverage

Use District	Minimum/Maximum Requirement		
	Landscaped Open Space	Usable Open Space	Maximum Lot Coverage
B2			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	10%	20%	-----
B3			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	10%	20%	-----
B5			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	10%	15%	-----

B District Building Height and Floor Area Ratio Regulations

District Use	Maximum Allowed		
	Maximum Height (ft.)	Maximum height (stories)	Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
B2			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	35	3	1.00
B3			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	60	5	1.40
20,000 sq. ft.	40	3	
B5			
Townhouse <u>structure</u> or apartment building	75	-----	1.50
	40		

Amend SECTION 5.5.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR BUSINESS DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure:

5.5.3 Use Regulations for Business Districts

Class of Use	B1	B2	B2A	B3	B4	B5
Residential						
Townhouse <u>structure</u>	SP	SP	SP	SP		SP

Amend SECTION 5.6.3. USE REGULATIONS FOR USE REGULATIONS FOR MU, PUD, I, T, and OS DISTRICTS to remove references to townhouse and replace with townhouse structure:

5.6.3 Use Regulations for MU, PUD, I, T, and OS Districts

Class of Use	MU	PUD	I	T	OS
Residential					
Townhouse <u>structure</u>	SP	SP			

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 10

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/UPPER-STORY
BUILDING STEP BACKS**

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to adjust the upper-story building step back beginning at the fourth story level or 40 feet above grade by amending SECTION 5.3.17. UPPER-STORY BUILDING STEP BACKS and by amending SECTION 5.3.21. SUPPLEMENTAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS paragraph C to refer to four stories; or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.3.17. UPPER-STORY BUILDING STEP BACKS to adjust the upper-story building step back beginning at the fourth story level or 40 feet above grade:

5.3.17 Upper-Story Building Step Backs

For buildings more than three ~~four~~ stories in height, an additional 7.5-foot step-back (upper-story building setback) shall be provided beginning at the third ~~fourth~~ story level or 30 ~~40~~ feet above grade, whichever is less. The upper-story step back shall be provided along all building elevations with street frontage, excluding alleys.

Amend SECTION 5.3.21. SUPPLEMENTAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS paragraph C to refer to four stories:

5.3.21 Supplemental Requirements in the Business and Industrial Districts

C. Upper-Story ~~Setbacks~~ Building Step Back. In any district where the maximum building height exceeds three ~~four~~ stories, upper-story building ~~setbacks~~ step backs shall be required. See 5.3.17 for Upper-Story Building Step Back ~~requirements~~ requirement.

Comment [EZ15]: Other than for editorial changes as possible due to scope, this article would not be needed.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 11

ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/REDUCED HEIGHT

BUFFER AREA

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the height buffer area to 25 to 50 feet depending on orientation and to identify the specific requirements to allow application of the higher height limit by amending SECTION 5.3.19. REDUCED HEIGHT BUFFER AREA; or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.3.19. REDUCED HEIGHT BUFFER AREA to reduce the height buffer area to 25 to 50 feet depending on orientation and to identify the specific requirements to allow application of the higher height limit:

5.3.19 Reduced Height Buffer Area

- A. When two different maximum height limits are specified for the same zoning district in any Table of Dimensional and Density Regulations in this Section 5, the lower limit shall apply to any lot or part of a lot located in a height buffer area unless a finding of the Board of Appeals or the Arlington Redevelopment Board, as applicable, determines that the location, based on site-specific factors, or if the Applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Board of Appeals or the Arlington Redevelopment Board, as applicable, that proximity to it is determined as a specific finding of a special permit that the properties in the adjacent R0, R1, R2, or OS district would not be adversely affected due to existing use or topographic condition will not be detrimental based upon criteria established in Section 3.3.3 and Section 3.3.4. A height buffer area is defined as a lot or part of a lot which is located at a lesser distance from any land, not within a public way, in an R0, R1, R2 or OS district than the following:

Land in R0, R1, R2, OS is located	Lower height shall apply
Between northwest and northeast	Within 200 <u>50</u> feet
Easterly, between northeast and southeast, or westerly between northwest and southwest	Within 150 <u>35</u> feet
Southerly, between southeast and southwest	Within 100 <u>25</u> feet

Comment [EZ16]: Still in play pending comments from ARB.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use

Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 12

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/CORNER LOT
REQUIREMENTS**

Comment [EZ17]: Article stands on its own.

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to add a requirement for corner lots in the R4 through R7 Districts and all Business Districts which requires the minimum street yard to be equal to the front yard depth required by amending SECTION 5.3.8. CORNER LOTS AND THROUGH LOTS; or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Amend SECTION 5.3.8. CORNER LOTS AND THROUGH LOTS to add a requirement for corner lots in the R4 through R7 Districts and all Business Districts which requires the minimum street yard to be equal to the front yard depth required:

5.3.8 Corner Lots and Through Lots

- A. A corner lot shall have minimum street yards with depths which shall be the same as the required front yard depths for the adjoining lots. However, in the R4, R5, R6, and R7 districts and all of the business (B) districts, a corner lot shall have minimum street yards with depths which shall be the same as the required front yard depths for the district in which the street frontage is located.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use
Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 13

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/APARTMENT BUILDING
PARKING REQUIREMENTS**

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to reduce the parking requirements for apartment buildings by amending SECTION 6.1.4. TABLE OF OFF-STREET PARKING REGULATIONS to reduce the minimum number of spaces to 1 space per dwelling unit; or take any action related thereto.
(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

Comment [EZ18]: Article would not be needed as it is incorporated into 8.2

Amend SECTION 6.1.4. TABLE OF OFF-STREET PARKING REGULATIONS to reduce the minimum number of spaces to 1 space per dwelling unit for apartment buildings:

6.1.4 Table of Off-Street Parking Regulations

Use	Minimum Number of Spaces
Residential Uses	
Apartment building	1 space per efficiency dwelling unit; 1.15 space per 1 bedroom dwelling unit, 1.5 spaces per 2-bedroom dwelling unit, and 2 spaces per 3 or more bedroom dwelling unit, 1 space per dwelling unit and 1 space per 5 units of public housing for the elderly.

Zoning Bylaw Amendments for Multi-family Uses and Mixed-Use
Additions to the Zoning Bylaw shown in underline format. Deletions shown in ~~strikeout format~~.

ARTICLE 14

**ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT/PARKING REDUCTION
APPLICABILITY**

Comment [EZ19]: Article stands on its own.

To see if the Town will vote to amend the Zoning Bylaw to include the R7 District in SECTION 6.1.5. PARKING REDUCTION IN BUSINESS, INDUSTRIAL, AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES; or take any action related thereto.

(Inserted at the request of the Redevelopment Board)

**Amend the Zoning Bylaw to include the R7 District in SECTION 6.1.5. PARKING REDUCTION IN
BUSINESS, INDUSTRIAL, AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES:**

6.1.5 Parking Reduction in Business, Industrial, and Multi-Family Residential Zones

The Board of Appeals or Arlington Redevelopment Board, as applicable, may allow the reduction of the parking space requirements in the R5, R6, R7, Business, and Industrial Zones to 25 percent of that required in the Table of Off-Street Parking Regulations if the proposed parking is deemed adequate and where Transportation Demand Management practices are incorporated, as evidenced by a Transportation Demand Management Plan approved by the Special Permit Granting Authority. [...]



**Town of Arlington
Legal Department**

Douglas W. Heim
Town Counsel

50 Pleasant Street
Arlington, MA 02476
Phone: 781.316.3150
Fax: 781.316.3159
E-mail: dheim@town.arlington.ma.us
Website: www.arlingtonma.gov

To: Arlington Redevelopment Board;
Jennifer Raitt, Director of Planning & Community Development

From: Douglas W. Heim, Town Counsel

Date: March 25, 2019

Re: 2019 Annual Town Meeting Article 20

I write at your request to provide an alternative means of performing reviews of so-called "Dover Amendment" uses covered under c. 40A sec. 3; specifically an option which vests the ARB with the authority to conduct a site plan-like review for reasonable regulations imposed upon religious, educational, and day care facility uses.

As a reminder, c. 40A sec. 3 provides in relevant part:

"No zoning ordinance or by-law shall... prohibit, regulate or restrict the use of land or structures for religious purposes or for educational purposes on land owned or leased by the commonwealth or any of its agencies, subdivisions or bodies politic or by a religious sect or denomination, or by a nonprofit educational corporation; provided, however, that such land or structures may be subject to reasonable regulations concerning the bulk and height of structures and determining yard sizes, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking and building coverage requirements."¹

and,

¹ Permit me to pause to note that "subdivisions" or "bodies politic" of the Commonwealth generally include municipal governments and their departments.

“No zoning ordinance or bylaw in any city or town shall prohibit, or require a special permit for, the use of land or structures, or the expansion of existing structures, for the primary, accessory or incidental purpose of operating a child care facility; provided, however, that such land or structures may be subject to reasonable regulations concerning the bulk and height of structures and determining yard sizes, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking and building coverage requirements.”

These Dover Amendment provisions have been generally interpreted to mean that cities and towns may not condition use of a property for educational, religious, or child care facilities upon the grant of a special permit.² See e.g. *Campbell v. City Council of Lynn*, 616 N.E.2d 445, (Mass. 1993); *Bible Speaks v. Board of Appeals*, 8 Mass. App. Ct. 19,(1979). Municipalities may impose reasonable regulations concerning bulk, height, parking, etc., but reasonableness is a context-specific assessment. See e.g., *Trs. of Tufts Coll. v. City of Medford*, 415 Mass. 753, 757-59 (1993)(noting that the reasonableness of regulations is “as applied” to a given religious, educational, or child care use); *Campbell v. City Council of Lynn*, 415 Mass. 772, 778 (1993)(City could not apply its facially reasonable regulations because they thwarted educational purposes without serving a sufficient regulatory need); *Bible Speaks*, 8 Mass. App. Ct. 19, 31-34 (regulations cannot be used to nullify Dover exceptions to special permit requirements).

In order to facilitate a review for application of reasonable regulations, municipalities implement a wide range of strategies, with some vesting authority entirely within the Building Inspector or Commissioner as Arlington has traditionally done, and others having their Planning Board, Board of Appeals, or other similar entities engage in so-called “Site Plan Review” or “Limited Plan Review.” It is important to note at the outset that Site Plan Review as it is typically understood is a process entirely created by municipalities and their local ordinances with no explicit authority derived from or referenced to c. 40A. Accordingly, Site Plan Review means different things in different communities and a bylaw must set forth the process, criteria, and relief of Site Plan Review. It may however be best summarized by the Court in *Bowen v. Board of Appeals of Franklin*, “site plan review has to do with regulation of permitted uses, not their prohibition, as would be the case with a special permit or a variance,” 36 Mass. App. Ct. 954, 954-955 (1994).

It must be stressed that any process for examining a Dover-protected use cannot be tantamount to a special permit process under a different title. Indeed, while Massachusetts Courts have not determined that Site Plan Review generally violates that Dover Amendment, they have found that specific Site Plan Review processes impermissibly exceed the regulatory authority afforded under c. 40A sec. 3. See e.g., *Jewish Cemetery Ass’n of Mass. v. Bd. of Appeals of Wayland*, 18 LCR 428, 432 (Mass. Land Ct. 2010)(discussing the permissibility of site plan

² At different periods of time, some cities and towns may have maintained the technical requirement of a special permit under their zoning bylaws for religious or educational uses. However in such instances Courts have found that they often have “no discretion” to deny such special permits. See *Forster v. Bd. of Appeals of Belmont* (14 Mass. L. Rep. 463, 2002 Mass. Super. L. Rep. 463 (Mass. Super. Ct. Mar. 15, 2002)(School required to apply for special permit, but Dover Amendment afforded zoning board no discretion to deny a special permit application as submitted).

review requirements)(internal citations omitted). Particular concern arises in the context of our zoning bylaw, where we do not have Site Plan Review for any other purpose allowed by right. Given the scope of the warrant article before Town Meeting, in my opinion, a more in-depth Site Plan Review amendment cannot be placed before Town Meeting.

Thus, if the Board is inclined to amend its current vote to provide for an administrative review by the ARB or ZBA instead of the Building Inspector and Planning Department, I recommend the following as the most feasible alternative which codifies a greater role for the Board:

Add a new SECTION 3.5 RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL USE REVIEW that codifies an administrative review process that is consistent with M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 3

3.4 RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATION USE REVIEW

3.4.1 Purposes

The purpose of Section 3.5 is to provide for reasonable regulation of religious, non-profit educational, and child care facilities used primarily for such purposes consistent with G.L. c. 40A, §3. Specifically, reasonable regulation refers to the bulk and height of structures and in determining yard sizes, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking, and building coverage requirements. When applying reasonable regulation, the Town shall not unreasonablye impede the protected use without appreciably advancing critical municipal goals.

3.4.2 Procedures

- A. Building Inspector Review: To determine whether a religious, non-profit educational, or child care facility use is protected under G.L. c. 40A, §3, the property owner or agent of an owner shall submit to the Building Inspector such information necessary to make the following findings:
- (1) That the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed use of the property or structures is for a religious, non-profit educational, or child care purpose, or appropriate combination thereof; and
 - (2) That the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed use of the property or structure for these purposes is the dominant or primary use.
- B. ~~Department of Planning and Community Development~~Arlington Redevelopment Board Review: If the applicant has satisfied the Building Inspector per Section 3.5.2.A., the Building Inspector shall inform the Redevelopment Board~~Department of Planning and Community Development (“Department”)~~ that a given application is appropriate for administrative review for the purposes set

forth in Section 3.4.2.J. The ~~Board~~Department shall apply those requirements allowed by G.L. c. 40A, §3, in a reasonable fashion within the specific context of the proposed project as an administrative permitting process with the following responsibilities:

- (1) The applicant bears the burden of establishing that the application of a given regulation should be waived, reduced, or altered as unreasonable within the specific facts of both the site and the proposed use.
- (2) The ~~Department~~ Board bears the burden of applying only those regulations which serve a legitimate municipal concern.
- ~~(2)~~(3) The Board shall issue an administrative decision setting forth only those conditions allowed by c. 40A sec. 3 within ninety (90) days of receipt of the application from the Building Inspector unless an extension of time is agreed upon by the parties, but in any case, shall not withhold approval under this administrative review section.

3.4.3 Appeal

An appeal to the Board of Appeals or the Arlington Redevelopment Board may be taken by any person aggrieved due to the determination of the Building Inspector or the Department, as provided in G.L. c. 40A, § 8 and § 15.

An appeal of the decision of the Redevelopment Board's decision may be made as set forth in G.L. c. 40A, Section 17 to a court of competent jurisdiction.



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Correspondence received:

Summary:

I oppose the density articles 6-15 via email from Jenny Briggs 03-24-19

Memorandum to the Redevelopment Board via email from John Worden 03-22-19

Testimony for ARB Density Zoning Amendments via email from Patricia Worden 03-18-19

Testimony for ARB Hearing 3-25-2019 via email from Patricia Worden 03-25-19

Proposed pro-density zoning changes via email from Diane Krause 03-24-19

Writing in support of Article 15 of the Zoning Board Amendments via email from Ann Woodward 03-25-19

Comments on Selected Town Meeting Warrant Articles via email from Paul Parise 03-23-19

Proposed Zoning Changes via email from Lynn Dowling 03-25-19

Re: Increased Density via email from Asia Kepka 03-25-19

Zoning amendments before the ARB via email from Ralph Willmer 03-25-19

Proposed Amendments to Arlington Zoning Bylaw via email from Patricia Deal 03-25-19

Letter in opposition to the proposed density articles via email from Mark Rosenthal 03-25-19

Articles Increasing Density Bad via email from Kaspar Kasparian 03-25-19

Input to the Proposed Bylaw Amendments via email from Keith Schnebly 03-25-19

Comments on amendments to zoning bylaws via email from Jo Anne Preston 03-25-19

Zoning Bylaw Amendment Comments via email from Chris Loreti 03-25-19

Re: Density Amendments etc. via email from Frank Tadley 03-25-19

Re: ARB Comments via email from Christian Klein 03-26-19

Support for Proposed Zoning Amendments via email from Rochelle (Shelly) Dein 03-25-19

I support Density-Related articles via email from Thouis Jones 03-26-19

Zoning changes via email from Carl Nilsson 03-26-19

Comments on Proposed Articles via email from Barbara Wagner 03-26-19

Please Delay Voting on the Zoning Articles for another Year via email from Ellen Cohen 03-26-19

Support zoning changes via email from Chris Porter 03-26-19

Comments on Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal via email from Rachael Stark 03-27-19

Concerns via email from Andrew Freeman 03-27-19

We support the proposed zoning amendments via email from Jonathan Wallach and Linda Hanson 03-27-19

Rezoning Articles Require Further Study via email from Forrest Snyder 03-27-19

Zoning Changes via email from Anne Kazlauskas 03-27-19

Article 15-Accessory Dwelling Units via email from Thomas Danielczik 03-27-19

Concern about zoning articles proposed via email from Jenny Mauger 03-27-19

Proposed amendments - changes to Pro-urbanization articles, Art 16 etc. via email from Carl Wagner 03-27-19

Opposed to increasing Arlington density via email from Harold Helson 03-27-19

Flawed Buildout Affordability Analysis via email from Don Seltzer 03-26-19

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_I_oppose_the_density_articles_6-15_via_email_from_Jenny_Briggs_03-24-19.pdf	Correspondence - I oppose the density articles 6-15 via email from Jenny Briggs 03-24-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Memorandum_to_the_Redevelopment_Board_via_email_from_John_Worden_03-22-19.pdf	Correspondence - Memorandum to the Redevelopment Board via email from John Worden 03-22-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Testimony_for_ARB_Density_Zoning_Amendments_via_email_from_Patricia_Worden_03-18-19.pdf	Correspondence - Testimony for ARB Density Zoning Amendments via email from Patricia Worden 03-18-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Testimony_for_ARB_Hearing_03-25-19_via_email_from_Patricia_Worden_03-25-19.pdf	Testimony for ARB Hearing 3-25-2019 via email from Patricia Worden 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Proposed_pro-density_zoning_changes_via_email_from_Diane_Krause_03-24-19.pdf	Proposed pro-density zoning changes via email from Diane Krause 03-24-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Writing_in_support_of_Article_15_of_the_Zoning_Board_Amendments_via_email_from_Ann_Woodward_03-25-19.pdf	Writing in support of Article 15 of the Zoning Board Amendments via email from Ann Woodward 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Comments_on_Selected_Town_Meeting_Warrant_Articles_via_email_from_Paul_Parise_03-23-19.pdf	Comments on Selected Town Meeting Warrant Articles via email from Paul Parise 03-23-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Proposed_zoning_changes_via_email_from_Lynn_Dowling_03-25-19.pdf	Proposed Zoning Changes via email from Lynn Dowling 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_RE_Increased_Density_via_email_from_Asia_Kepka_03-25-19.pdf	Re: Increased Density via email from Asia Kepka 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Zoning_amendments_before_the_ARB_via_email_from_Ralph_Willmar_03-25-19.pdf	Zoning amendments before the ARB

Material	Correspondence_-_Zoning_amendments_before_the_ARB_via_email_from_Ralph_Willmer_03-25-19.pdf	via email from Ralph Willmer 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Proposed_Amendments_to_Arlington_Zoning_Bylaw_via_email_from_Patricia_Deal_03-25-19.pdf	Proposed Amendments to Arlington Zoning Bylaw via email from Patricia Deal 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Letter_in_opposition_to_the_proposed_density_articles_via_email_from_Mark_Rosenthal_03-25-19.pdf	Letter in opposition to the proposed density articles via email from mark Rosenthal 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Articles_Increasing_Density_Bad_via_email_from_Kaspar_Kasparian_03-25-19.pdf	Articles Increasing Density Bad via email from Kaspar Kasparian 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Input_to_the_Proposed_Bylaw_Amendments_via_email_from_Keith_Schnebly_03-25-19.pdf	Input to the Proposed Bylaw Amendments via email from Keith Schnebly 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Comments_on_amendments_to_zoning_bylaws_via_email_from_Jo_Anne_Preston_03-25-19.pdf	Comments on amendments to zoning bylaws via email from Jo Anne Preston 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Zoning_Bylaw_Amendment_Comments_via_email_from_Chris_Loreti_03-25-19.pdf	Zoning Bylaw Amendment Comments via email from Chris Loreti 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_RE_Density_Amendments_etc._via_email_from_Frank_Tadley_03-25-19.pdf	Re: Density Amendments etc. via email from Frank Tadley 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_RE_ARB_Comments_via_email_from_Christian_Klein_03-26-19.pdf	Re: ARB Comments via email from Christian Klein 03-26-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Support_for_Proposed_Zoning_Amendments_via_email_from_Rochelle_(Shelly)_Dein_03-25-19.pdf	Support for Proposed Zoning Amendments via email from Rochelle (Shelly) Dein 03-25-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_I_support_Density-Related_articles_via_email_from_Thouis_Jones_03-26-19.pdf	I support Density-Related articles via email from Thouis Jones 03-26-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Zoning_changes_via_email_from_Carl_Nilsson_03-26-19.pdf	Zoning changes via email from Carl Nilsson 03-26-19
Reference Material	Correspondence_-_Comments_on_Proposed_Articles_via_email_from_Barbara_Wagner_03-26-19.pdf	Comments on Proposed Articles via email from Barbara Wagner 03-26-

		19
		Please Delay Voting on the Zoning Articles for another Year via email from Ellen Cohen 03-26-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Please_Delay_Voting_on_the_Zoning_Articles_for_another_Year_via_email_from_Ellen_Cohen_03-26-19.pdf	
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Support_zoing_changes_via_email_from_Chris_Porter_03-26-19.pdf	Support zoning changes via email from Chris Porter 03-26-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Comments_on_Arlington_Multi-Family_Uses_and_Mixed_Use_Zoning_Proposal_via_email_from_Rachael_Stark_03-27-19.pdf	Comments on Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal via email from Rachael Stark 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Arlington_Redevlopment_Board_accepting_comments_on_pro-urbanization_and_density_articles_until_Weds_27th_at_4pm;_concerns_via_email_from_Andrew_Freeman_03-27-19.pdf	Concerns via email from Andrew Freeman 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _We_support_the_proposed_zoning_amendments_via_email_from_Jonathan_Wallach_and_Linda_Hanson_03-27-19.pdf	We support he proposed zoning amendments via email from Jonathan Wallach and Linda Hanson 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Rezoning_Articles_Require_Further_Study_via_email_from_Forrest_Snyder_03-27-19.pdf	Rezoning Articles Require Further Study via email from Forrest Snyder 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Zoning_Changes_via_email_from_Anne_Kazlauskas_03-27-19.pdf	Zoning Changes via email from Anne Kazlauskas 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Article_15-Accessory_Dwelling_Units_via_email_from_Thomas_Danielczik_03-27-19.pdf	Article 15-Accessory Dwelling Units via email from Thomas Danielczik 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Concern_about_zoning_articles_proposed_via_email_from_Jenny_Mauger_03-27-19.pdf	Concern about zoning articles proposed via email from Jenny Mauger 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Proposed_amendments_-_changes_to_Pro-urbanization_articles__Art16_ect._via_email_from_Carl_Wagner_03-27-19.pdf	Proposed amendments - changes to Pro-urbanization articles, Art 16 etc. via email from Carl Wagner 03-27-19
Reference Material	Correspondence - _Opposed_to_increasing_Arlington_density_via_email_from_Harold_Helson_03-27-19.pdf	Opposed to increasing Arlington density via email from Harold Helson 03-27-19

Reference
Material Correspondence_-_Flawed_Buildout_Affordability_Analysis_via_email_from_Don_Seltzer_03-26-19.pdf

Flawed Buildout
Affordability
Analysis via
email from Don
Seltzer 03-26-19

From: "jbtakecharge@aol.com" <jb20takecharge@aol.com>
To: ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, jrait@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Sun, 24 Mar 2019 18:12:44 -0400
Subject: I oppose the density articles 6-15

Dear Members of the ARB,

I am writing to hopefully have my voice heard in regards to the revised bylaw amendments on housing and increasing density in Arlington. I live in an R4 area in the center and would be greatly affected by these changes. I urge you to not support them. Please postpone acting on them for at least one year. I feel that the entire community has a right to be more involved in these decisions.

I work in Cambridge, and as I drive down Mass Ave at the end of each day I am appalled at the number of high volume condo/apt buildings that have been built recently, literally at the edge of the sidewalk with no green space and questionable parking. I chose to live in Arlington because of the amount of green space, the trees, and original architecture.

I have not seen any evidence to support that these changes would increase affordable housing, support small business, and keep the town's commitment to contain climate change. I see big developers tearing down current low rent buildings and building new luxury apartments. Why is our affordable housing being structured by private developers?

Please do not support these zoning changes which would have such a negative impact on our community.

Thank you,
Jenny Briggs

**Written Testimony of John L. Worden III regarding Zoning Articles
in the Warrant for the 2019 Annual Town Meeting**

6, 7, 8, and 9: If there is anything more lacking than affordable housing in Arlington, it is open space. Articles 6 through 9 seem designed to further reduce the small amounts of open space now required for buildings, and do nothing to increase affordable housing possibilities. In both of these respects, these articles are inconsistent with the goals of the Master Plan to preserve open space and increase affordable housing.

Counting roofs and balconies as open space is absurd. This exception, combined with the elimination of the usable open space requirement, effectively halves the amount of open space needed for townhouses in the R4 and R5 zoning districts. Indeed the reduction of lot sizes to the ridiculous level of 5,000 feet will give developers the perfect excuse to do 5 unit buildings, so nothing affordable will be required.

In addition, promoting the conversion of one and two family homes in the B1 zoning district to mixed uses up to 45 feet and 4 stories high is entirely inconsistent with the historical goal of maintaining these structures in the form of one and two family homes as they were constructed. For these four articles, the recommendations of the ARB should be **no action**.

10: This is just a giveaway to developers: add a storey and require the set back at that level, instead of the level below. The setbacks should be on all elevations of the building, and I may make an amendment at Town Meeting to achieve this slightly preferable result.

11: Reducing the buffer areas is a really bad idea, unfair to neighbors who live in abutting houses. One of the members of Arlington Residents for Responsible Redevelopment has done shadow studies showing that the combination of increased height and reduced buffer will greatly increase the shadowing of neighboring houses. Obviously, MAPC and/or CHAPA should have done such studies before proposing such a drastic change; if they failed or were afraid to do so, it shows an incredibly insensitive and arrogant attitude towards the people of Arlington who happen to live near the target zones. This should be recommended for **no action**.

12: Making it clear that there are two “front yards” which is the case in residential zones is sound, particularly if the front yards are not reduced. However, there should be added to the proposed language the following: *provided that such setbacks shall not be less than the average set backs on the block adjoining the corner lot*. If such language is not in the recommended vote, I will move an amendment at Town Meeting in order to achieve that result. As pointed out at the public hearing, it’s one thing to have a one story building on the corner of a residential street, and quite another to have a five-story one.

13: This seems unnecessary, since under Article 14, if approved, the special permit granting authority can effectuate a reduction where, and to the extent appropriate. Where

the average Arlington household has 1.8 cars (the Planning Dept. said 1.4 but that doesn't seem to line up with the numbers). It seems to me that you have to provide for that .8 or .4 car somewhere, and there should also be spaces for guests, etc.

14: If required parking is to be reduced (which will add to the pressure for on-street parking), there should be some percentage or minimum number of “fly-wheel” spaces for occasional over night guests, deliveries, repair men, and the like. Part of the program should be the institution of a system of utilizing the excess parking places, e.g. those revealed in the cherry-picked half dozen parking lots in the report presented at the hearing.

15: If you should, against the recommendation of the Residential Study Committee, and two previous Town Meetings, go ahead with accessory apartments, the present proposal should be amended in several respects:

1. The house envelope must be defined as what existed as of February 14, 2019
2. The unit must be affordable.
3. The lease must be for a minimum of one year.
4. No additional parking place will be required, as long as the tenant's vehicle can be accommodated on the premises.
5. If the premises is sold, the new owner must apply for a new permit, should a Continuation of the apartment be desired.
6. A condition of the permit must be that any employee of the Inspectional Services Dept. or the Planning & Community Development Dept. may have full access to inspect the premises for conformity with the permit, upon 24 hours notice, without the necessity of a warrant or court order.
7. If the terms of the permit are violated, the permit will *ipso facto* expire, and the accessory unit removed.

If the substance of such conditions is not included in the recommended vote, I will file an amendment to add them. The preferable recommendation on the Article is **no action**.

16: The concept is good, but it doesn't go far enough; change *0 to 5* to *0 to 4* and change *6 to 19* to *5 to 19* and add, after 15% affordable units, (*minimum of one*)

24 and 25: I endorse these Articles as necessary and logical changes.

Thank you for considering my thoughts. Kindly include this in the records of your hearings.

John L. Worden III
Town Meeting Member, Precinct. 8

March 20, 2019

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Patricia Worden" <pbworden@hotmail.com>
Cc: <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <klau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <awest@town.arlington.ma.us>, <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2019 15:22:00 -0400
Subject: Re: Testimony for ARB Density Zoning Amendments

Patricia

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

On Mar 18, 2019, at 2:34 PM, Patricia Worden <pbworden@hotmail.com> wrote:

Please enter the following into the record for March 11 Arlington Redevelopment Board hearing on zoning amendments

Please acknowledge receipt

Testimony of Patricia B. Worden regarding ARB Hearing on Density Articles

Please find in boldface below an exact transcript of the oral testimony I gave at the ARB Hearing on March 11, 2019. But prior to that please include in your record the following observations: Several individuals testified at the hearing who identified themselves as Housing Plan Implementation Committee members (of which I am a member but decided it would be inappropriate to state that in my oral presentation). The relevance and propriety of the HPIC membership in the context of ARB Hearings on zoning density amendments in the warrant is questionable. The Committee has apparently been in existence since 2017. But the membership during that time is not clear. The first meeting of the current Committee was on February 4, 2019 and the density articles have never been discussed by its members. There are only two sets of minutes for the HPIC during the two years during which it has allegedly been in existence. This makes it difficult, if not impossible to know what has been discussed and by whom. Transparency is lacking.

Oral Testimony of Patricia Barron Worden, Ph.D. at ARB Hearing March 11,2019

The only kind of housing Arlington need is affordable housing. That's not just my opinion – you will see it in the housing recommendation in the Master Plan which I have handed out.—pages 88-89. There is nothing in these articles which requires affordable housing. In fact they would do the opposite. The claim that we need more diversity and so need more housing is also the opposite of what the MP says which is on page 77 and – I quote – you can see it on your cell phones –“Arlington is unique among Boston's inner suburbs for its diverse housing stock.” There is nothing in the MP indicating that affordable housing requires decrease in Usabe open space or increase in density.

These ARB-MAPC density articles are a dream for developers. If approved by TM they will be a disaster for Arlington residents and businesses who are renting. 39% of dwelling units in Arlington are rentals. That is a very high number compared to other nearby towns. Our Town leaders need to protect the rights and housing stability of this group not exploit them for developers. 40% of Arlington renters pay less than \$1,500 per month in Arlington's housing pool for rent. That is even less than the rent for inclusionary units which is \$1,647 for a 2 bedroom unit. The going rent for new 2-bdroom units is about \$3,000. The shock for Arlington renters would be palpable and many would have to leave or would be evicted as is happening in Boston with its push for density and luxury units. People who can't afford the rent increases are being evicted in Boston at the rate of 43 per day according to the Boston Sunday Globe Magazine of February24. Ironically many of the luxury units are unoccupied.

There is no way that any inclusionary zoning or density bonus is going to accommodate the many market rate renters who are likely to be unable to afford the higher rents coming with this density gentrification. One must remember that 80% of Arlington renters are currently paying less than \$1,999 per year for Arlington's reasonable market rate units.

Raising rents for Arlington' businesses is going to result in a loss of these and with them the tax revenue which they produce. Replacing them with housing is going to bring large infrastructure and school costs. The rush to fill up every available space with crammed luxury apartments making street walls of buildings like the one at 887 Massachusetts Avenue at Arlington High School is going to remove our opportunities for attracting commercial and entrepreneurial businesses.

The Master Plan is also very clear about the importance of Usable open space. These ARB amendments are brutal in their Zero requirement for open space which is the absolute opposite of many statements in the MP. Page 34 of the Master Plan states “*Usable open space in the village centers is*

critical. This can take place on individual lots (such as dining terraces, forecourts, etc.) and collective spaces such as plazas, commons, greens, and pocket parks. These usable open spaces are a significant draw to the districts...”- page 34

When the ARB consultant was asked if children at these new mixed use buildings with no open space would have to play on the sidewalk. The consultant said – No- they would play in the park. When she was asked to name a park she said they would play on the Minuteman Bikeway.

This desire for usable open space became very clear to me when attending the meetings for the Master Plan – I believe I attended all of them. The outstanding Arlington site which attendees frequently brought up – the Walgreen’s site in East Arlington was one which residents for all over Arlington had hopes for. If the structure on that site were at the sides and not the rear then there would be a view from Massachusetts Avenue of our lovely Spy Pond – what many envisioned was opening up that view with structures at the sides of the lot including ground floor indoor and outdoor dining facilities and some enhancing lawn and trees and planters. But what the ARB consultants have come up with for that site if it is ever available is zoning that bring us - you can probably find it in their buildout – a monstrous humongous building Maxed out in every dimension and looming over the Avenue completely blocking any view of Spy Pond for all Arlingtonians except for the occupants of the luxury units.

This is a perfect example of awful Plans MAPC wants to bring to us.

Please don’t let them do it to Arlington.

Patricia Barron Worden, Ph.D.

former Member and Chair, Arlington School Committee

former member and Chair, Arlington Housing Authority

former Charter Member, Arlington Human Rights Commission

Town Meeting Member, Precinct 8

<pbw testimony for ARB hrgs March 2019.doc>

From: Patricia Worden <pbworden@hotmail.com>
To: "klau@town.arlington.ma.us" <klau@town.arlington.ma.us>, David Watson
<dwatson.tmm@gmail.com>, "ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us"
<ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, "ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us"
<ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>
Cc: "jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us" <jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 04:38:08 +0000
Subject: Testimony for ARB Hearing 3-25-2019

Dear Arlington Redevelopment Board Members,

Please find attached my Testimony regarding Article 15 (in the Warrant for the 2019 Town Meeting).

Please include the entire attachment for my Testimony (for the ARB Hearing on March 25, 2019).

Please acknowledge receipt.

Thank you,

Patricia B. Worden

I request that you correct the erroneous information currently on the ARB web page regarding the memorandum (also requiring correction) written by Jennifer Raitt describing the decision by the Residential Study Group. It should be made clear that the RSG does NOT support Article 15 and they voted unanimously NOT TO APPROVE IT (see second paragraph of testimony below). It is also important to note that the Building Inspector has stated that the article provisions could not be enforced and he would not conduct enforcement.

**FOLLOWING IS MY TESTIMONY REGARDING
ARTICLE 15 OF THE WARRANT FOR THE 2019 ATM.**

March 23, 2019

Dear Members of the Arlington Redevelopment Board:

Accessory apartments (also known as granny flats, Accessory Dwelling Units -ADUs etc.) have been rejected two times by Arlington and this third effort is disrespectful of our chosen form of Town government and Arlington's citizens. It is a top-down demand from Town officials at the

Department of Planning and Community Development (PD) - not a measure coming from needs expressed by residents and those residents trying to protect residents' quality of life and affordability concerns. The process being followed here is that of more autocratic – not democratic - systems and should be rejected. It lacks transparency. The PD oppose requirement of affordable rents for these units. This is not an Article designed to help those needing affordable rents, It could be very beneficial for realtors and developers. It is hoped that the ARB will agree with the unanimous recommendation of the RSG and vote NO ACTION on Article 15

The protocol deployed by the PD has involved avoidance and distortion of input of the Town-Meeting-established Residential Study Group. This group has the responsibility for reporting on factors affecting our neighborhoods. They are subject to the Open Meeting Law. They were not informed of the decision to place Accessory Apartments on the Warrant for ATM 2019. The Article was written for the ARB by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC). A member of the RSG immediately upon finding out about the decision to include the article for the 2019 ATM asked not to go forward with it this year because the RSG was planning to study and report on ADUs during the next year. (ARB Meeting, January 16, 2019) That request was denied. Prior to involving the RSG The PD presented the Article to both the Zoning Bylaw Working Group (ZBLWG) and the Housing Plan Implementation Committee (HPIC) although neither of these groups have the status of a Town Meeting Committee and are not specifically entrusted with neighborhood residential matters. When the RSG met on March 8, 2019 they decided that the Article needed much further work and the Building Inspector who is a member of the group stated that enforcement for Article 15 would be impossible and he would not do it. They decided that ARB should recommend NO ACTION on Article 15. A motion was unanimously approved that THE RSG RECOMMENDS NON-APPROVAL OF ARTICLE 15. As just one example of the many distortions used by the Director of Planning throughout the promotion of MAPC's articles for ATM she has listed the RSG decision on the ARB's web page as "support" for Article 15. In addition in her attached memorandum she simply avoids mentioning the recorded vote of unanimous opposition of the group. As evidence of the decision of the RSG please view the following video of the RSG meeting:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dXp7YMaC6So&feature=player_embedded

The PD never discussed possible unintended consequences or longterm effects on the Town nor how abuses would be dealt with except that they assume that the Town will suddenly be able to handle abuses and code violations in multi unit homes if we just allow this article potentially creating almost five thousand additional units. Arlington is the second most dense Town in Massachusetts – have we studied how to handle increase in density? Essentially the whole neighborhood-residential area of Town will become 2-family – what does that do for diversity? How does it honor the decision and choice of almost half of its residents to live in a single family district. How does it comply with the Zoning By Law’s definition of R0 and R1 Districts which includes the following – “The Town discourages intensive land uses that would detract from the single-family residential character of these neighborhoods.”

The PD claims that their promulgation of this article is based on the Town’s Master Plan and Housing Production Plan (HPP). It is not consistent with the MP which states that “Arlington has done more than most towns to create affordable housing.” The HPP was never approved by Town Meeting. It was written by a regional organization- MAPC and needs to be revised-completely overhauled. When they wrote it in 2016 MAPC apparently did not recognize that Arlington had already reached the statutory requirement of 1.5% of land area level of affordability which gives Arlington immunity from 40B requirements.

Approval of this article even with a restriction of containment in the house envelope as it existed on February 14 of this year would lead to speculative buying and teardowns by developers. That is because developers will hope to exploit the Housing Plan Implementation Committee’s (HPIC) stated plans to continue in the years ahead to seek zoning changes permitting varied accessory units. This group -of which I am a member but I have a dissenting opinion - plans that in addition to ADUs in the main house there will be free standing accessory apartments in the yard - for example in garages, and other separate buildings on the same property with no requirement for affordable rents. One way to stop this rush to change the whole Town with no increase in housing affordability is for the ARB to vote NO ACTION on article 15 or, if that fails, for Town Meeting members to vote NO at the ATM.

Surrounding communities are acutely aware of the degradation of districts that can happen with ADUs and most forbid them. Medford, Somerville,

Woburn, Belmont and Winchester do not allow them. Belmont has an exception for Historic Properties where an ADU can be, e.g., in the carriage house. So Belmont has 2 units - in historic properties ONLY. Some communities which allow ADUs do not allow any rents to be charged. Newton allows ADUs for properties over 25,000 sq ft and Burlington if the property is over 20,000 sq. ft. – in other words on lots around 400 % larger than Arlington lots. There are developers – some right here who say we need change – so go for it - try ADUs – you might like them. Watertown took that advice a few years ago and it turns out that they certainly did NOT like them- so they reversed course and now do not allow them

There are many possible unintended consequences if this article is approved by Town Meeting. The ARB and Planning Dept have addressed NONE of these:

- * They never required rents to be affordable.
- * The ARB have never discussed the extra financial support that Inspectional Services will need to manage abuses. Will they have to hire private investigators or monitor suspect websites or will they depend on complaints from neighbors to find violations?
- .
- * They never addressed any protections from airbnb and short term rentals which are sure to occur. Airbnb rentals in accessory apartments would be huge in an area so convenient to Cambridge and Boston. The ARB's minimum three month stay period is not enough prevent it. They have not required a parking place for ADUs although some of these units may be far from public transportation and on steep hills. Lack of parking will increase pressure for overnight street parking. Possible increases in school population and related costs have not been studied.

Most people in Arlington have bought houses with expectation of fairly stable situation and safety for their children –not expecting constant turnover of new tenants in their neighborhood like you might find in big city apartments. It would be a worry for parents of young children who need to know who's in the neighborhood when their children play outside or for grandparents like me when grandchildren stay over.

This push for ADUs ignores the fact that right now any homeowners can accommodate others who need temporary housing without any requirement for an accessory apartment. If we need to we can even install a bathroom, extra walls and entrance, microwave and appliances, just not a stove—but everything else. Many of my friends here have had needy family members and others stay in their homes for various periods. We have done so. We had my sister and her family stay with us for a lengthy period after a messy divorce in a foreign country. A few years later after he graduated from MIT one of our sons and his girlfriend moved in with us for five years. Inspectional services provides information to anyone needing to do house alterations.

Perhaps most disturbing of all in the promulgation of this Article is the bizarre lack of compliance with established and legally acceptable procedures of the Town and its Town Meeting form of government and in some cases with the Open Meeting Law. This is compounded by the direct involvement of MAPC and CHAPA and lack of appropriate record of this involvement and that of other persons and realtors as would be expected if the Open Meeting Law is being correctly observed.

Patricia B. Worden
Former Chair of Arlington Housing Authority
Town Meeting Member, Precinct 8

From: "Andrew Bunnell" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 10:02:21 -0400
Subject: Fwd: Proposed pro-density zoning changes

From: "Town of Arlington, MA" <do-not-reply@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Bunnell, Andrew" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: 24 Mar 2019 15:34:54 -0500
Subject: Proposed pro-density zoning changes

Message submitted from the <Town of Arlington> website.

Site Visitor Name: Diane Krause
Site Visitor Email: samburu@comcast.net

Mr. Bunnell, I live in Arlington on High Haith Rd. I'm writing to object to the proposed changes to reduce set backs, increase heights, reduce yard requirements, etc. for business and mixed use zones. I especially oppose Article 8 which eliminates open space and counts roof tops and balconies as green space—I find this to be shameful. I don't see any strict requirements for affordable housing, which is listed as the reason for the changes. Arlington does not have wide enough sidewalks and road space to support 5 story buildings without creating an unpleasant, street canyon environment. Shadows from these buildings, increased traffic, increased pressures on schools and utilities have not been addressed. These proposals seem only to benefit developers, landlords and real estate agents. I fear people living in existing apartments will be forced out as properties are sold to developers. I strongly oppose these measures. I also fear Article 15 will increase the likelihood of tear downs, another real problem that needs to be addressed. My overriding concern is the preservation of the character of Arlington. I believe these proposals don't do that.

From: Ann Woodward <AnnWoodward@msn.com>

To: "ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us" <ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, "klau@town.arlington.ma.us" <klau@town.arlington.ma.us>, "dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us" <dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us>, Erin Zwirko <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>, Jenny Raitt <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 14:01:11 +0000

Subject: writing in support of Article 15 of the Zoning Board Amendments

To ARB Members:

I'm writing in support of Article 15 of the Zoning Board Amendments to allow Accessory Dwelling Units in residential properties in Arlington. ADUs offer homeowners the opportunity to have older or younger family members, caretakers or companions, live in close proximity. This proposal has been thoroughly researched, including research on the experience of neighboring communities that have found ADUs meet this need without burdening the neighborhoods in which they're found.

I appreciate the ARBs consideration of this Amendment and encourage your support of the change.

Sincerely,

Ann Woodward
245 Renfrew Street
Arlington, MA 02476
781-547-1520

From: "Andrew Bunnell" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 10:02:10 -0400
Subject: Fwd: Comments on Selected Town Meeting Warrant Articles

From: Paul Parise <paulparise28@gmail.com>
To: Andrew Bunnell <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, E Benson <EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, K Lau <KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, D Watson <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Sat, 23 Mar 2019 17:57:00 -0400
Subject: Comments on Selected Town Meeting Warrant Articles

TO: ARLINGTON REDEVELOPMENT BOARD MEMBERS (ARB)
RE: Comments on Town Meeting (TM) Warrant Articles 6 through 16, 24, and 25

Please note for the record my comments on the above-listed TM zoning bylaw warrant articles.

I have attended numerous Town meetings (Town Forums, ARB, etc.) concerning the proposal of these zoning bylaw changes. From these presentations I understand that the motivation to propose some of these changes (Articles 6 - 16) is to increase the housing diversity, the affordable housing availability, the vibrancy/business opportunities in our commercial corridors, and increase our tax base. Two of the articles (24 and 25) concern smaller changes to existing bylaws.

For reasons given below, I am concerned that Articles 6 through 15 do not achieve the goals discussed above. I believe it is necessary that the Town study these increased density proposals; make changes to conform to our citizens' desires as detailed in the Master Plan; and carefully examine alternative methods to increase the affordable housing supply. I believe there may be many unintended negative consequences if these articles are adopted as currently written.

Some of my concerns include (but are not limited to):

- Loss of open space (I do not agree that balconies and roofs can effectively or partially mitigate this loss)
- Reduction of lot size to 5000 sq. ft. will not promote affordable housing production (it will in fact limit it by allowing multiple 5 unit buildings on a subdivided formerly large lot)
- Allowing up to 5 story buildings with zero setback at the sidewalk will create deep shadows on its street and neighbors in abutting districts. Without sufficiently wide sidewalks, the pedestrian experience will be rather negative and non-vibrant.
- Parking requirement reductions will further exacerbate specific parking issues in Town.
- I see no specific roadmap/path to developing more affordable housing based on these proposed bylaw changes. In fact I believe these only serve to develop more market-rate housing and commercial properties potentially leading to a displacement of current residents and businesses.
- I have not seen any legitimate buildout and shadow studies done specifically for the neighborhoods impacted. The sketches shown at recent meetings were not applicable to Arlington.
- Article 15 was recently reviewed by the Residential Study Group (RSG). I attended that meeting. For all the reasons given there, including the potential enforcement problems

discussed (Inspectional Services and Fire Dept.), I agree with the RSG and recommend No Action on Article 15.

I therefore ask that the ARB vote for No Action on these Articles 6 through 15.

While I support the concept of Article 16, I would prefer that it is amended in a manner to provide a greater ratio of affordable units to market-rate units than proposed. **Given that type of amendment, I would endorse Article 15.**

Lastly, I endorse Articles 24 and 25, especially the safety concerns associated with the Article 25 amendment.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,

Paul Parise
106 Hemlock St.
617-835-5616

From: Lynn Dowling <lynndowling42@gmail.com>

To: ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, awest@town.arlington.ma.us, jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 10:36:25 -0400

Subject: Proposed zoning changes

Dear ARB Board Members

I would like to submit in writing my opposition to the changing of the bylaws regarding increased density in Arlington.

Developers do not have the best interest of Arlington at hand. They are in the business of turning profits. The citizens of Arlington deserve to have projects vetted by the board with some chance of input especially if their neighborhoods are being impacted.

I have been to some meetings and I can assure you that the average citizen would find it impossible to follow the terminology and procedures.

I don't know if these meetings are intentionally opaque but as leaders in this field and representatives of Arlington we need you as the gatekeepers.

The impact of traffic, schools and taxes are my main concerns. These areas and others should be verified with independent studies before anything gets built.

I urge you not to change the by-laws.

Thank you.

Lynn Dowling.

17 Silk Street

Arlington

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Asia Kepka" <asiakepka@gmail.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us,
klau@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, "Mary Muszynski"
<MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 14:37:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Increased Density

Asia,

Thank you again for your comments. Please note that I removed Andrew West from the distribution list as he is no longer an ARB member.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Director, Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
730 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476
781-316-3092

From: Asia Kepka <asiakepka@gmail.com>
To: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, awest@town.arlington.ma.us, Jenny Raitt
<jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 14:09:31 -0400
Subject: Re: Increased Density

 GO8A0573.jpg
 GO8A0548.jpg
 GO8A0552.jpg
 GO8A0566.jpg

Dear members of ARB,

My apologies for mistakenly sending previous email - it was a quick draft.

Thank you for your hard work towards making our community a special place .

At the last ARB hearing one of the real estate agents mentioned our town of Arlington its way behind Cambridge and Somerville when it comes to development.

As i watch housing prices and traffic congestion spike in those communities - i'm grateful we are behind i can still afford to live here.

I write to you as East Arlington resident of 20 years. I always say no matter if i win lottery - i would not move bc i love my neighborhood. I share my vegetables from my front yard with neighbors who walk by on their way from work. Sometimes that dictates what they will make for dinner. That compensates for many problems that come with living in less than ideal spot.

I live inclose proximity of Mirak owned property - very close .Most of my house is in shadow. According to proposed changes many other residents may see their next door neighbor cast deep shadow on their house or drown out sunlight completely . It's not pleasant and it affects quality of one's life on daily basis.

Every time work has to be done on the building - workers have to access it via my property. My garden gets trampled even when they are careful. When work is done poorly - which was the case with painting the building - you get stuck with peeling paint, sanding , painting and peeling paint again . My garden has been covered with paint and it has been frustrating. Because the building has no place to put snow - i get plowed in every time i clear my driveway.

Increased traffic to and from Lehey Clinic that opened in 2008 caused constant trash thrown into my garden from passing and parked cars on daily basis. Visitor to the clinic discarded cigarette onto mulch near entrance to the building and within minutes my whole back yard was gone. If it wasn't for my stone patio between fence and my house - i would have lost everything. Despite this event - i see smokers all day long smoking outside same building.

I hope you can keep in mind that close proximity of new developments will mean increased danger in fire safety to existing and new houses. Many low income or middle class residents like me cannot afford to move and our homes are everything. Proposed changes will sure be great for real estate business but we as tax payers should be considered too.

There has not been one example shown how proposed changes have made another community better. More pavement and reduction in open space has only increased environmental risks .

As someone who has friends in wheel chairs and friends with strollers i look at proposed changes in reduction of required front green space with frustration. Narrow sidewalks mean no sidewalks during snow days for disable people.

When looking at certain homes one can guess which home provides opportunity for children to grow healthy and balanced lives.

I'm attaching photo of my house and few homes that were recently purchased in my neighborhood as well as 887 Mass Ave with " caged minimal green space". All examples are housing families with children- it's pretty clear which one we need more of to raise healthy kids. Once the proposed changes pass most of new residents will have little chance to compete with developers who will have clear path to building big luxury condo complexes that turn biggest profits.

Thank you

Asia Kepka

17 Silk st.









From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Ralph Willmer" <ralph.willmer@gmail.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us, "Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:35:10 -0400
Subject: Re: Zoning amendments before the ARB

Hi Ralph,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: Ralph Willmer <ralph.willmer@gmail.com>
To: Erin Zwirko <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:30:22 -0400
Subject: Zoning amendments before the ARB

Hi Erin -

I am sorry that I have not been able to attend the Monday evening hearings of the Arlington Redevelopment Board (ARB) due to other meeting commitments. I wanted to take the opportunity to provide some brief comments for the public hearing record and voice my support for the proposed zoning amendments.

First, it is important to note that this effort is driven by the recommendations contained in both the 2015 Master Plan and the 2016 Housing Production Plan. Both of these plans have been adopted by the Town of Arlington and thus act as the Town's overarching policy documents regarding land use planning, and housing diversity and affordability issues. Following the adoption of such plans, the typical process involves the implementation of a plan's recommendations, many of which would result in the drafting of amendments to the Zoning Bylaw. The Master Plan Implementation Committee (MPIC) has been methodically working through the recommendations of the Master Plan and has been working with other committees to address some of these recommended zoning changes. As part of this effort, the Town worked with the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) to identify the appropriate areas where changes could be effective.

As a result, the Town is now proposing a number of zoning amendments to address issues identified during the planning process such as changing demographics, the lack of diversity in housing types found in Arlington, locating housing in areas that are best served by transportation, and the need for more affordable housing. Through these recommended changes to zoning, the Town can create new opportunities for redevelopment along major transportation corridors that directly meet the needs of the Town's population. The areas affected are those that fall within the Town's higher density residential districts and the business districts.

Taken together, the proposed amendments should result in creating opportunities to redevelop properties particularly along the Mass Ave., Broadway, Summer St., and Pleasant St. corridors in a manner that is consistent with existing development at an appropriate scale for those roadways. any increases in height would be offset by design considerations such as step backs and height buffers to reduce the visual impacts from both the roadway and adjacent neighborhoods. Proposed projects would still be subject to ARB review and approval (through the Environmental Design Review Special Permit and the Town's Design Standards) to ensure that all aspects of site design are considered before a project is approved.

The reduction in the number of parking spaces is consistent with what numerous other communities have considered for multi-family buildings where the units tend to be smaller and do not require multiple spaces for each unit. This allows for more creative housing development without having to set aside more space for parking than is typically required.

Finally, in order to meet the need for more diverse housing options, it is important for the Town to allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs). This would create housing opportunities that meets the demand for a range of household types, such as seniors, multi-generational households, individuals with disabilities, lower income households, and single person households. ADUs would have to meet certain standards and criteria, and can only be located in the R0 and R1 zoning districts after issuance of a special permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Based on the experience of other municipalities in the area, such a change would not negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Ralph Willmer
Member Master Plan Implementation Committee and Zoning Bylaw Working Group
17 Walnut Court

To: The Arlington Redevelopment Board: Members and Staff
From: Patricia Deal, 9 Ronald Road, Arlington
Date: March 25, 2019
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Arlington Zoning Bylaw

I have appreciated the opportunity to attend the prior two ARB hearings on the proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments, and to speak at the March 11th meeting. I am sending along this summary of my key points and some additional thoughts.

1. It appears that the proposed amendments were not available for public review until February 14, 2019. Given the scope and scale of these changes, the time allowed for review – by Arlington citizens and Town Meeting members is insufficient. I suggest that the articles do not go forward in the 2019 Town Meeting and, as the City of Newton has recently done, the zoning changes be postponed until members of the Arlington community can be made aware of these changes and understand the impact they will have on the quality of life in our Town.
2. It is clear that the changes were the product of outside consultants and not from any grassroots plan. They are “cookie cutter” and could apply to any city or town where the agenda is to promote greater density. This is very unfair to Arlington citizens. My family moved to Arlington in 1955 and in that time I have never heard any resident say that we aspire to have Arlington have the density of a city.
3. I believe that you are hiding behind the Master Plan and using it as a shield from public opinion. The plan reflects many well-meaning goals – some of which are contradictory but the reduction of setbacks, the loss of open space and higher buildings in the “commercial corridor” are not specified. It would also be a concern if the ARB were to forfeit its role of review and permitting to default to an “permitted by right” approach.
4. If the goal is affordable housing, this is a very circuitous route to achieving that. We have a planning department as your governmental partner. Why are we not taking a direct approach to resolving this as appears to be happening in the planned Lowell and Park Street intersection. The drip, drip approach of negotiating for one or two units at a time will never get us there and is basically a give away to developers who really want to only build market rate units. In reading through the Bylaw amendments, my first thought was: The ARB is putting Arlington up “For Sale”, and doing so without most of our residents even knowing this is happening.
5. People live in the housing currently in the R 4 to R 7 districts, some of whom are economically vulnerable. These changes reflect an elitism that I am disappointed to encounter in my town. The majority of those preparing and voting on the proposed amendments live in R0 – R3 districts. How presumptuous to determine what is best for our fellow citizens as long as it is “Not In My Backyard.” We should be more concerned about preserving the affordable housing we currently have rather than selling the illusion that a unit here or there will make a difference.
6. As for vibrancy. In my memory, the most vibrancy in Arlington in recent decades came from a citizen initiative to expand our beer and wine and liquor licenses, making Arlington a dining destination. Now that was creative thinking something that these proposed amendments clearly lack. I suggest that you roll up your sleeves and work with the real people in the community to see if you can arrive at some really practical solutions. Your job is to represent the best interests of the people of Arlington and not the agenda of outside consultant groups.

Patricia Deal
9 Ronald Road, Arlington 02474

From: MBR <mbr@arlsoft.com>

To: ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, awest@town.arlington.ma.us, jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 14:47:53 -0400

Subject: Letter in opposition to the proposed density articles

I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the Arlington Redevelopment Board's proposed density articles.

These density articles have no chance whatsoever of achieving the stated goal of creating affordable housing. As a matter of fact, they're likely to cause the destruction of existing housing that Arlington residents of moderate means can afford and currently live in.

These articles would radically increase Arlington's population by something like 20%. Yet they make no provision for the additional services that will have to be provided for the new residents, and the additional taxes won't cover the additional services.

Although the ARB claims these articles will create affordable housing, there's nothing whatsoever in these articles that in any way guarantees that even one unit of affordable housing will be built!

As a matter of fact, these articles are likely to **REDUCE**, not increase the amount of Arlington's housing stock that people of moderate means can afford. Since new luxury apartments command much higher rents than existing ones, those increased rents plus the ability to build buildings with more floors than existing buildings, will provide developers incentive to tear down existing apartment buildings, thereby driving tenants out of older less expensive apartments. The newly built apartments they'll be replaced with will command a price higher than the old tenants can afford. Thus, Arlington's existing diversity will be destroyed as current tenants are driven out and replaced with tenants who can afford the new luxury rents.

These articles would also reduce setbacks along Mass. Av., Broadway, and Summer St. to nothing, while allowing walls of 5-story high buildings along the entire length of those streets. Usually, minimum green space requirements are met by plantings at ground level where all passers-by can see and enjoy them. That's an important part of what makes a town a pleasant place to live. But since these articles eliminate setbacks, ground-level plantings are not a possible option for meeting the requirements. As a result, the ARB proposes counting rooftop gardens. The result at ground level will be a sterile, unfriendly environment.

Drastic changes to the Town's zoning bylaws can have permanent detrimental effects on the town, so they must be carefully considered. I've spoken to many people in town, and virtually none of them have heard anything about the ARB's proposals to dramatically increase the Town's population density. These articles should not be rushed through. They should be the subject of extensive discussion, with an informed and aware Town citizenry as the primary participants. And the discussions should be real opportunities for Town citizens to fully understand what's being proposed, and to participate in coming up with better ideas, both on what Arlington's problems are, and on what solutions to those problems Arlington citizens want to see implemented. The time-limited guided discussions that have been conducted so far serve only to prevent Town citizens from having any real input.

These drastic proposed changes to Arlington's zoning bylaws are serious enough that they should be debated by Town citizens until there's substantial consensus. Although it's certainly possible that they could be rushed through while most Town citizens are unaware that they're even being considered, doing so would demonstrate the gravest disrespect for Abraham Lincoln's statement that our government is a government of the people, **BY** the people, and **FOR** the people.

Mark Rosenthal

Arlington resident

From: "Andrew Bunnell" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:41:21 -0400
Subject: Fwd: Articles Increasing Density Bad

From: Kaspar Kasparian <kkasparian@rcn.com>
To: ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us
Cc: jaraitti@town.arlington.ma.us, abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, awest@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:36:36 -0400
Subject: Articles Increasing Density Bad

Dear Arlington Redevelopment Board Members,

I object to all Articles that increase the density of Arlington.

The proposed development do not benefit our already dense urbanesque community. They will create only more congested that profits the few at the expense of the community as a whole. Rush hour traffic is a serious problem currently and over the past decade. For example, look at Park Street, Pleasant Street, and Lake Street (where pedestrians and cyclists are crossing without the benefit of a traffic light. Why is that ignored?

Moreover, parking is a major problem for our residents who are renters. And overnight on street parking is illegal. Currently, Laura Kiesel is addressing is addressing on street expectations as a hardship issue (see Article 79). Furthermore, the development is supposed to be for affordable housing. I did not hear that offered as a priority. The new building on Mass Ave near Arlington High School is charging \$3000 a month for a two bedroom apartment.

This proposed development is bad for Arlington. We have a density problem unlike Belmont, Lexington, and Winchester. I don't want our community to look more like Cambridge or Somerville.

Sincerely,
Kaspar Kasparian, TMM precinct 18

Sent from my iPhone

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Keith Schnebly" <keith.schnebly@verizon.net>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us,
ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
"Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:51:20 -0400
Subject: Re: Input to the Proposed By-Law Amendments

Hi Keith,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: Keith Schnebly <keith.schnebly@verizon.net>
To: jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us
Cc: ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us, keith.schnebly@verizon.net
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 19:49:31 +0000 (UTC)
Subject: Input to the Proposed By-Law Amendments

Hi Jennifer, Erin,

Erin, Thanks for getting back and speaking with me earlier today. Very helpful to me.

As I mentioned, my input is based on concerns about environmental impact of the proposed by laws. I brought this up during the 11 March public hearing asking about environmental impact studied and had a nice exchange with Andrew after that meeting about environmental impact assessment and development. I have always had a great interest in open space and tree canopy in urban and suburban areas and this is developing into a particular interest in trees in Arlington. I recently joined the Tree Committee in town. I am not speaking for the Tree Committee now, however.

When I look at the proposed changes, my biggest area of concern has to do with set backs, especially in the street front part of buildings. This is where plantings and greenery are given space that greatly affect the way the street-scape feels for residents and passers by. A great many of the buildings that are in the zones for the proposed changes were built in an earlier era and are anywhere from 2 - 6 stories high. Their impact on the street level feel is almost all positive or neutral both environmentally and aesthetically because there are setbacks that have allowed for planting and trees to grow. This also affects drainage and groundwater in significant ways. I support green planting on terraces, setbacks, and rooftops but I do not believe these are of much value at street level.

I also want to mention that it is very clear that the work you have been doing is very hard and that you have worked hard on it. Zoning is always a hot button issue for people because it affects quality of life in so many ways. I believe there may be value in postponing and continuing the work on these amendments in the next year and would look forward to working with you on that. Just know your work is appreciated.

Keith Schnebly
keith.schnebly@verizon.net

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "JO ANNE PRESTON" <ja-preston@comcast.net>
Cc: "Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>, abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 16:23:32 -0400
Subject: Re: Comments on amendments to zoning bylaws

Jo Anne,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Director, Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
730 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476
781-316-3092

From: JO ANNE PRESTON <ja-preston@comcast.net>
To: jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:59:53 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: Comments on amendments to zoning bylaws

Dear Mr, Bunnell,

I would like to ask the Redevelopment Board not to support the current amendments to the zoning bylaws as submitted to Town Meeting and give more time to study the effects on Arlington as Newton has recent done.

My objections to the proposed changes are rooted in academic research done at M.I.T. and published recently Urban Affairs Review this January, 2019.. The researcher Yonah Freemark conducted a study of the outcome of upzoning (similar to what has been proposed for Arlington) and four only land speculation, higher housing costs, including higher rents.

This well-regarded study informs all of us that more time should be devoted to evaluated the effects of these proposed zoning changes on Arlington.

He writes: "If the product of upzoning in no change in construction levels but increase in property transactions values, including for existing housing units [higher rents], the policy should have negative consequences in upzoned neighborhoods that rapidly become more expensive. . ."

This study and the ease in which developers can evade the inclusionary provision by dividing the property before sale, having a brother buy one- half, waiting two years, etc.

mean very little or no more affordable housing for Arlington while giving up much land that might make that possible.

Five story buildings allowed under these density zoning changes will not make our business centers vibrant. Belmont Center and Harvard Square have retail stores going out of business for the same reasons that Arlington retail is struggling --- people are increasing turning to the internet.

Accessory units, as revealed at the Residential Study Group meeting by the head of Inspectional Services, can not be monitored. He also said the Fire Chief opposes them as formulated under the article since he has not even been consulted about the fire safety implications.

For these and the reasons, these amendments should be given more time for community and town input and I recommend you do not approve them.

Jo Anne Preston

From: Chris Loreti <cloreti@verizon.net>

To: "abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us, EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, "DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us" <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>

Cc: Jenny Raitt <jrait@town.arlington.ma.us>, Adam Chapdelaine <achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us>

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2019 15:59:14 -0400

Subject: Zoning Bylaw Amendment Comments

Dear ARB Members,

Attached please find my written comments on the 2019 Zoning Bylaw amendments being proposed by the ARB. These comments reiterate and in some cases extend my oral comments at the recent ARB hearings.

I hope the board is aware of the recent decision of the Mayor Newton to slow down and more fully study some of the zoning changes being proposed there. I hope the ARB will do the same at least with Articles 6-9 as it has become clear that more work is needed on them.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Chris Loreti

56 Adams St.

Article 6

Master Plan p. 34 Residential Districts

Other Requirements. *Standards that affect intensity of use, such as maximum floor area ratio (FAR), lot coverage maximum percent, setbacks (front, side, rear), open space ratios, and minimum lot area/D.U., seem reasonable and consistent with prevailing development patterns in the neighborhoods. One exception is that townhouses typically have a higher FAR than 0.75. These building forms should be considered separately from apartment houses and office structures in the dimensional requirements.*

Actual Changes Contrary to the Master Plan:

1. Go well beyond townhouses
2. R5 through R7 zoning districts treat townhouses and apartment buildings the same
3. R5-R7 not even mentioned in the master plan as needing changed dimensional requirements

Article 7

Master Plan

Key Recommendations p 13 (Economic Development)

1. Amend the Zoning Bylaw to enhance flexibility in business districts to promote the development of higher value mixed use properties.

The B1 district helps to preserve small-scale businesses in or near residential areas, but changes in other business districts should be considered.

From the current Zoning Bylaw:

B1: Neighborhood Office District. In the Neighborhood Office District, the predominant uses include one- and two-family dwellings, houses with offices on the ground floor, or office structures which are in keeping with the scale of adjacent houses. Primarily located on or adjacent to Massachusetts Avenue, this district is intended to encourage preservation of small-scale structures to provide contrast and set off the higher-density, more active areas along the Avenue. Mixed-use buildings without retail space are allowed in this district. The Town discourages uses that would detract from the desired low level of activity, consume large amounts of land, or otherwise interfere with the intent of this Bylaw.

Actual Changes Contrary to the Master Plan and District Definition:

- Small-scale businesses not preserved in B1 district
- 0 side yard setback (mixed use) is not in keeping with scale of adjacent houses
- 45' maximum height vs. current 35' is out of scale
- 4 stories maximum vs. current 3 maximum is out of scale
- FAR doubled to 1.5 from 0.75 greatly increasing intensity of use.

Master Plan

Land Use p 34. Referring to business districts:

The maximum FAR of 1.0 to 1.4 is reasonable and can be adjusted with a special permit.

Actual Changes Contrary to Master Plan:

- FAR increased to as high as 2.2 much greater than any FAR currently allowed for any use in any district.
- Elimination of distinction between small and large lots for B3 and B5 regarding maximum heights and stories

On the same page of the Master Plan

In areas with many 2- or 3-story structures, a building of 5 stories and 60 feet could appear out of context and scale, but this type of impact can be mitigated with additional setback or building step backs, or a combination of thereof.

And from the Visual Preferences Survey conducted as Part of the Master Plan, most residents said this 5-story development was not of appropriate scale for Mass. Ave. or Broadway:



Actual Changes Contrary to Master Plan:

- Height limit and FAR increased to promote such 5-story buildings.
- Setbacks reduced to increasing rather than decreasing the feeling the building is out of scale

Article 8

Master Plan:

Land Use p 34. Referring to business districts:

Finally, Arlington's open space requirements (percent-age of total gross floor area) seem reasonable....Usable open space in the village centers is critical...These usable open spaces are a significant draw to the districts....

Actual Changes Contrary to Master Plan:

- Usable open space requirement is eliminated
- Landscaped open space is increased, but up to 25% can be on roofs
- Most open space in town is on privately owned lots. If reduced by just 10%, town would lose more open space than the total in the open space district.

Article 9

Combined with the changes proposed in Article 7, this article will promote the kind of ugliness exemplified by the townhouse recently completed at 75 Decatur St. This 3-unit townhouse is constructed with the front of the houses facing the side, and not the street, with a large garage right next to the sidewalk. The house is far too large for the lot, and completely out of scale with neighboring properties.

Article 10

The text of this article is not consistent with the recommendation made with MAPC. Step-backs were recommended to begin at the fourth story for buildings of four more stories. As written, the bylaw would only apply to 5-story buildings. This needs to be corrected.

Article 17

Portable signs should be eliminated from this amendment. As proposed they represent an unpermitted additional sign that may be installed without any time limits as long as the sign (or multiple signs) conform to the form and size limit described.

Other Corrections

To the extent they can be accommodated within the current set of warrant articles, the ARB should propose amendments that clarify that the open space requirements in the bylaw are based on percentage of gross floor area and that for all mixed used developments, the usable open space requirement is 20 percent. These requirements are not clear from looking at the tables.

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: <franktadley@rcn.com>
Cc: <abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, <KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 06:39:11 -0400
Subject: Re: density amendments etc.

Frank,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Town of Arlington
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

On Mar 25, 2019, at 10:30 PM, "franktadley@rcn.com" <franktadley@rcn.com> wrote:

Dear Ms. Raitt,

I want to express my support for the zoning amendments concerning density and the accessory dwelling units to be presented to the April 2019 Town Meeting. I am a resident of Arlington for many years and currently live at 260 Massachusetts Ave #8 in precinct 6. If additional changes such as added density bonuses for adding affordable housing units are suggested, I would be in favor.

I also want to show my support of the Department of Planning staff for undertaking the work to draft and to present the amendments. I encourage the Redevelopment Board to approve all proposed amendments.

Sincerely,

Frank Tadley

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Christian Klein" <cmqklein@gmail.com>
Cc: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>, <abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, <KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 06:38:25 -0400
Subject: Re: ARB Comments

Christian,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Town of Arlington
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

On Mar 25, 2019, at 10:21 PM, Christian Klein <cmqklein@gmail.com> wrote:

Ms. Raitt,

Please accept the following comments on the warrant articles before the ARB.

Article 15: The current inclusionary zoning bylaw only requires affordable housing in the high density districts. To truly democratize affordable housing in town, we need a method of encouraging affordability in all of our residential districts. Allowing the establishment of accessory units that are required to be affordable will open the vast majority of town to all income groups.

Article 23: If this article proceeds, it will be incumbent upon Town Meeting to provide additional resources to the ZBA to implement the request.

Article 24: Consider further amending the definition to read: "A story which is under a gable, hipped, ~~or gambrel~~, or other sloped roof with a pitch of at least 2:12, where less than one half the floor area measured from the underside of the roof framing to the finished floor below has a clear height of 7 feet ~~03~~ inches or more." I'd go for a lower height threshold, but I don't think anyone would accept it.

Article 25: Changing the measurement of driveway slope from an average slope calculation to a maximum slope is a very prudent measure.

In addition, I would encourage the board to consider establishing subdivision bylaws to discourage the subdivision of lots to avoid the affordable development threshold.

Thank you for your consideration,

Christian Klein

Rochelle (Shelly) Dein
7 Cleveland Street
Arlington, MA 02474

March 25, 2019

Jenny Raitt, Director
Town of Arlington
Planning & Community Development Department
730 Mass Ave Annex
Arlington, MA 02746

RE: Support for Proposed Zoning Amendments

Via email: JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us

Dear Jenny,

I am a homeowner in East Arlington; I have lived in Arlington for almost 35 years, first as a renter, and for the past 25 years as a homeowner in Precinct 3. During that time, I have seen housing prices (and rents) skyrocket.

To my mind, a significant factor is a shortage of housing, especially housing that is affordable to lower-income households. It is also true that housing affordable to middle-income households is also in extremely short supply.

I want to express my support of the proposed zoning amendments that increase permissible density, and that allow for accessory dwelling units. These amendments are to be presented at the April 2019 Town Meeting.

If additional changes, such as added density bonuses for adding affordable housing units are suggested, I would be in favor of those changes too.

Lastly, I also want to acknowledge the hard work done by the Planning & Community Development staff for undertaking the drafting and presentation of these amendments.

I encourage the Redevelopment Board to approve all proposed amendments to increase density and to permit accessory apartments .

Sincerely,


Rochelle (Shelly) Dein

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Thouis \ (Ray\) Jones" <thouis@gmail.com>
Cc: <EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>,
<KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>,
<MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 19:01:28 -0400
Subject: Re: I support Density-Related articles

Thouis,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Town of Arlington
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

> On Mar 26, 2019, at 6:49 PM, Thouis (Ray) Jones
> <thouis@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Hello,

>

> I just wanted to register my support for the proposed density-
> related rezoning articles, and commend you on the work you all
> put in on them.

>

> Thouis Jones

> Wyman Terrace

>

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Carl Nilsson" <carl@field-first.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us,
ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
"Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 18:18:49 -0400
Subject: Re: Zoning changes

Hi Carl,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

> From: Carl Nilsson <carl@field-first.com>
> To: "ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us"
> <ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
> Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 17:34:35 -0400
> Subject: Zoning changes

> Erin,
>
> My name is Carl Nilsson and I am an Arlington resident and
homeowner.
> I
> live on Mott St with my wife and two children who are 2 and
1/2 years
> and 9
> months old respectively.
>
> I am so pleased to see the amendments to the Arlington master
zoning
> plan.
> I think that these changes will bolster economic growth and
lead to a
> more
> vibrant town center as well as a more climate friendly town.
>
> I believe strongly that smart growth development is critical

to the
> health
> of a community and applaud these efforts.
>
> I am concerned about the lack of housing diversity in our
community and
> as
> a parent, I strongly support changes that enable more families
from
> different backgrounds to live in Arlington.
>
> Please email or call me with any questions or call me at 617-
470-5664.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Carl Nilsson
>
>
> --
>
> Carl Nilsson
> President, Field First LLC
>
>
>
> he, him, his pronouns

From: barwag@verizon.net

Date: March 26, 2019 at 5:26:03 PM EDT

To: ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us,

EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us,

DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us

Cc: jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us,

achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us, mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us

Subject: Comments on Proposed Articles

I don't agree with any of the proposed articles. I feel that the changes to height, parking requirements, lot size, green space, etc will all be detrimental to the town as it is today.

Barbara Wagner
6 Central Street
Arlington

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: <elscorn@aol.com>
Cc: <ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, <klau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us>, <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 18:02:58 -0400
Subject: Re: Please DELAY Voting on the Zoning Articles for another YEAR

Ellen,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Town of Arlington
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

On Mar 26, 2019, at 5:18 PM, "elscorn@aol.com" <elscorn@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Members of the ARB,

I have been attending both closed and open meetings of the ARB, reading the articles, Master Plan, and engaging with residents. I have really been able to hear both sides. I am not against development in Arlington per the goals of the Master Plan. However, in the open meetings I have attended, I have heard of many concerns about the zoning changes that must be clarified before a vote by the Town Meeting Members and Select Board. I own and live in an 1854 farm worker's house, 48 Park St, and have been harassed by builders wanting to tear down my house to build more luxury condos. I live off Broadway, one of the streets that could have major changes if the bylaw amendments are passed.

The more I hear about what concerns that have NOT been considered, I want the Select Board to DELAY voting on these articles for another year. Although the ARB promises Increased affordable housing, decreased taxes, roof top gardens in place of current tree canopy, increased income with tiny houses allowed to be built on existing lots without changing the zoning, and less parking because of less cars even though there's more housing.

I do not hear strong supporting evidence that any of this is guaranteed. The builders have the upper hand: they will avoid the requirement for inclusion of affordable housing, taxes will not go down, luxury housing does not guarantee fewer cars (buyers who come into town can afford more cars), Roof top gardens are private and don't include large trees for climate change. The Fire Chief has not been included in the discussion of Accessory Units, and thinks it's unsafe, the Inspection Services also was not included and won't be able to enforce building codes before or after, so there probably be an increase in illegal housing. No setbacks, no consideration for climate change, no communication about increased public transportation, no consideration of effect on increased school registration, "no moral responsibility of the builders to increase diversity." (3/25/19 Open meeting comment). Let's tighten the loopholes and figure out ways to support affordable housing first.

I think we should take a cue from the Mayor of Newton who has decided to DELAY voting on density for more consideration (Boston Globe 3/24).

Thanks for your consideration of a DELAY in voting on these amendments at this time.

Sincerely, Ellen S Cohen

If you have questions, email: elscorn@aol.com

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Chris Porter" <cdptrans@gmail.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us, "Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 17:30:53 -0400
Subject: Re: Support zoning changes

Hi Chris,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: Chris Porter <cdptrans@gmail.com>
To: ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 17:22:50 -0400
Subject: Support zoning changes

Dear Ms. Zwirko,

I am writing in support of the proposed zoning changes to increase the amount of housing and mixed-use development along commercial corridors.

The cost of housing in the Boston area is out of control. Arlington needs to do its part by increasing the supply of housing in areas where it makes sense. The proposed zoning changes would provide more opportunities for smaller, more affordable units in places well served by transit. The current zoning places overly restrictive requirements on factors such as parking, lot size, and open space that increase the costs of developing multi-family housing. Households are getting smaller and we need to diversify the housing stock to accommodate young people, elders, and families.

I support reductions in minimum parking requirements. Cities around the country are increasingly cutting back on minimum parking requirements. Many households in Arlington own only one car, or even none.

I agree that good design is important. Existing homeowners should be protected against shadows through appropriate height buffers and setbacks.

I hope the town's leaders and residents can move forward with zoning changes to better support today's housing needs.

Sincerely,

--

Chris Porter
28 Lakehill Ave.
cdptrans@gmail.com

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: refdesk@world.std.com
Cc: andre@ma-smartgrowth.org, abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us,
dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us, ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us,
klau@town.arlington.ma.us, "Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 11:08:02 -0400
Subject: Re: Comments on Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal -
walkability, density, infill, mixed use, street trees, guarantee of affordable units, protection
against tear down and cut down

Rachael,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: "refdesk@world.std.com" <refdesk@world.std.com>
To: Erin Zwirko <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
Cc: andre@ma-smartgrowth.org
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 10:44:07 -0400
Subject: Comments on Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal - walkability, density,
infill, mixed use, street trees, guarantee of affordable units, protection against tear down and cut down

Dear Erin Zwirko

See below my comments on the Arlington Multi-Family Uses and Mixed Use Zoning Proposal. There are a couple very big unanswered questions that concern me and a lot of people. Please look at and reply to these if possible, as well as the predictable problems and possible solutions I sent in January.

1/ What is the guarantee of affordable units?

A lot of us worry that you will allow developers to build 20 buildings of 5 units each and sleaze around the 6 unit limit for affordable units. We want clear and strong guarantees that these changes, and any new building, will create a good number of affordable units.

2/ What is the protection against tear downs and cut downs?

What guarantee do we have that we will not see wide scale tear downs of existing buildings and historic buildings and cut downs of existing mature trees? No one but real estate developers wants to see lots of tear down and cut down. What is our protection against this?

3/ What is our protection against "hit and run" big developers?

Many people worry that this will be a gold rush for "hit and run" big developers. Tear down whatever they can, throw up as many junky units as the

law allows, make a ton of cash, leave town fast, and leave Arlington with the long term bills. What protections do we have that all changes and new development will be done in a responsible and sustainable way?

Rachael Stark

> On Jan 7, 2019, at 4:02 PM, refdesk@world.std.com wrote:

>

> Dear Erin Zwirko,

>

> The Town of MAPC Arlington Multifamily Zoning Project Update Multifamily Zoning Recommendations look interesting. I look forward to learning more. I hope to attend the January 10th forum, but wanted to send my thoughts in advance as well. I am a long time advocate for walkability and walkable land use in Arlington. I have attended many meetings in Arlington and at the MBTA, MAPC and WalkBoston about walkability, walkable land use, active transportation, sustainable transit, transit oriented development, zoning, mixed use, mixed income, affordable housing, historic preservation, and urban forest preservation. As a librarian at the MIT Rotch library of architecture and planning, I learned even more about land use. My comments are a bit long, but I hope you will find them worth reading. They are based on 25 years worth of observation and activism in Arlington and beyond.

>

> Rachael Stark

>

> MODERATE DENSITY WORKS WELL WITH INFILL & MIXED USE

> I hope that all plans to create more areas of moderate density in Arlington focus on infill development and mixed use, rather than tear down of existing buildings. I hope the open space in new and existing building will focus on protection for existing mature trees and planting of new trees, rather than only more grass.

>

> CALM ANXIETY ABOUT DENSITY THROUGH EDUCATION ABOUT HISTORY

> I like to point out to people that Arlington has seen gracious and graceful increases in density for centuries though infill development. Our beloved Victorian era buildings were infill to the Colonial farms, 1920's two families were infill to the Victorian, modern buildings infill to the 1920's. We have been adding moderate density for centuries in ways that look good and work well. The secret is to avoid the temptation to tear down what was there before when you build more. Tear down and you get bland low value monotony in Menotomy. Tuck things in and you get intriguing high value variety. Some of our most beautiful existing buildings are historic examples of multi-family and mixed use. Most of what is suggested in the plan already exists in Town. Do more of what they did in 1880 and 1920, and do it as well as they did it, and all is well. Build thoughtfully, build quality and build to last. Some Arlington residents are very anxious about density. They imagine the skyscrapers of Tokyo or the wind tunnels of 5th Avenue Manhattan arriving on Mass Ave. If you point out that we have been doing infill for centuries, AND if you make sure to use the same methods that have worked for centuries, then they often calm down.

>

> PORCHES & TREES ARE WONDERFUL OPEN SPACE WITHOUT NEED FOR LARGE LOTS OF GRASS

> I live in one of Arlington's many wonderful 1920's two families. We have a lovely back porch that overlooks trees from several blocks around. We use it all the time and enjoy it immensely. We garden in pots on our porch, eat dinner there, read there, chat with our neighbors from there, and invite

family and friends to enjoy it with us. A well shaded porch surrounded by trees can be much more enjoyable than a sun blasted patch of grass. Houses do not have to be "protected" from neighbors with a moat of grass setback surrounding them. Exactly what are we guarding against with setback and side yards? What are we so afraid of? Trees are what make open space enjoyable. Trees have a tiny footprint on the ground, but greatly improve property value and quality of life. Trees protect us from flooding by absorbing water from the rain, and protect us from climate change by absorbing carbon from the air. I hope the plan includes protection for existing mature trees on private and public property, and also encourages and supports the planting and care of additional trees.

>

> SETBACK & HEIGHT BUFFER ABOVE SECOND FLOOR NOT NEEDED - GIVE US SMOOTH, CONTINUOUS SIDEWALKS WITH STREET TREES

> I do not think the stepped appearance of proposed buildings will help persuade people that taller buildings are ok. People want smooth, continuous sidewalks with ample street trees. They want a varied and lively street scene, safe crossing of streets, useful things to walk to, and nothing in the way of walking down the sidewalk. No light poles in the way, no oversized granite planters, no bumpy bricks, no bushes to obstruct sightlines. Just well maintained, smooth continuous sidewalks shaded by well maintained street trees. If you make the walking pleasant, then people do not mind walking by taller buildings. If you make walking unpleasant, then they mind everything.

>

> REDUCED PARKING WORKS ONLY WITH INCREASED WALKABILITY AND BUS SERVICE

> Reduced parking is a great idea, and essential to the success of your plans. Thank you for including it. But reduced parking ONLY works when it is paired with increased walkability, bikeability, bus service, and possibly shuttles. Give us better ways to get around and we need less parking. Hold the MBTA to their schedules. No more bus bunching with 30 minute waits and then 3 buses at once. If walking and biking were safer and more pleasant, then more people would get rid of their cars. If the MBTA bus service were frequent and reliable then more people would ride the bus to work and play and shop. Alewife is currently a hive of shuttles. Add more shuttles up the hills of Arlington and to other places with poor MBTA service. Let people get to Mass Ave and Alewife without need to drive there. Make it very clear that the new development is intended for people with few or no cars. Insist that this be mentioned every time a unit turns over. Reduce the need for cars and you can reduce the demand for space needed to store them.

>

> CHRIS LEINBERGER DESCRIBES "VALUE CAPTURE" TO CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING

> If you have not yet read "The Option of Urbanism" by Chris Leinberger, I recommend it highly. "Value capture" makes affordable housing practical. Developers and municipalities share the increase in property value caused by increased walkability. This can be used to keep some housing affordable, even in highly desirable walkable areas near transit. Build nothing but multi-family "luxury" units and you only make the problem worse. Build oversized "Mac Mansions" with way too many square feet of house space and garage and you annoy people. Give us more walkable infill near useful and interesting services and we vote with our feet to be there.

>

>

>> Begin forwarded message:

>>

>> From: "Town of Arlington, MA" <do-not-reply@town.arlington.ma.us>

>> Subject: Jan. 10 Forum on Multifamily Housing Production

>> Date: December 18, 2018 at 5:18:12 PM EST

>> To: refdesk@world.std.com
>> Reply-To: do-not-reply@town.arlington.ma.us
>>
>> Jan. 10 Forum on Multifamily Housing Production
>> Date: 12/18/2018 5:15 PM
>> Jan. 10 Forum on Multifamily Housing Production
>> Join the Department of Planning and Community Development on Thursday,
January 10, 2019, 7:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m., in Town Hall Auditorium, to learn
about proposed zoning recommendations to encourage multifamily housing
production. The Multifamily Zoning Project builds on recommendations in the
Town's Housing Production Plan, which seeks to increase housing diversity and
affordability by facilitating the production of multifamily housing in key
smart growth locations. Read the full release, Housing Production Plan, and
recommendations at arlingtonma.gov/planning.
>>
>

From: Andrew Freeman <freemandrew@gmail.com>

To: ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us,
EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us,
DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us, jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us,
achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us

Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 10:55:20 -0400

Subject: Fwd: [arlington] Arlington Redevelopment Board accepting comments on pro-urbanization and density articles until Weds 27th at 4pm; concerns

I support higher density because I recognize that our region has a serious housing crisis. Any outstanding issues with the articles (or even gross misunderstandings on my part) are probably not cause enough to sink the effort to balance things.

I would also welcome better protections or requirements for affordability.

Thank you,
Andrew Freeman
Kimball Rd

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Jonathan Wallach" <jfwallach@rcn.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us,
ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
"Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 10:48:16 -0400
Subject: Re: We support the proposed zoning amendments

Jonathan,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: Jonathan Wallach <jfwallach@rcn.com>
To: <ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 10:46:42 -0400
Subject: We support the proposed zoning amendments

We want to express our support of the zoning amendments currently under consideration by the ARB and to be presented to the April 2019 Town Meeting. If additional changes such as added density bonuses for adding affordable housing units are suggested, we would be in favor.

We have lived in Arlington for over 30 years and currently reside at 11 Webster Street in Precinct 7.

We also want to thank the Department of Planning staff for undertaking the work to draft and to present the amendments.

We strongly encourage the Redevelopment Board to approve all proposed amendments.

Thank you.

Jonathan Wallach and Linda Hanson

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Forrest Snyder" <forrest@forrestsnyder.com>, ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us, DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us
Cc: achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us, mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us, JCurro@town.arlington.ma.us, DDunn@town.arlington.ma.us, JHurd@town.arlington.ma.us, DMahon@town.arlington.ma.us, "Clarissa Rowe" <CRowe@town.arlington.ma.us>, "Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 09:34:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Rezoning Articles Require Further Study

Forrest,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Director, Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
730 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476
781-316-3092

From: Forrest Snyder <forrest@forrestsnyder.com>
To: ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us, DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us
Cc: jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us, achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us, mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us, JCurro@town.arlington.ma.us, DDunn@town.arlington.ma.us, JHurd@town.arlington.ma.us, DMahon@town.arlington.ma.us, crowe@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 09:27:46 -0400
Subject: Rezoning Articles Require Further Study

To the Members of the Arlington Redevelopment Board,

I have attended two of your meetings concerned with changing zoning to allow greater density. As written, these articles are short-sighted and not in Arlington's best interest. Please reject the rezoning articles at this time, so that further study and consideration may be given.

In particular, I am most concerned that the articles have been rushed through a process which has provided little time for Arlingtonians to understand the article's potential impacts. In general, the citizenry has no knowledge or understanding of these articles. To pass something that will have such a large impact on the Town without public scrutiny fails any test of good governance.

If affordability is the major issue, it should be addressed directly, not through zoning changes that depend on a developer's goodwill. At the very least, changes in zoning should not allow any loopholes. Simply, if a developer wants to build in Arlington, they must also add to the affordable housing stock. Period.

I would point out that developers are doing a fine job of mucking up Arlington under the existing zoning regulations. Under them, one need look no further than 887 Massachusetts Avenue. This building with its flat, banal, facade has minimal setbacks and actually detracts from the aesthetic interest of the streetscape. Its apartments are unaffordable by the great majority of Arlington renters. Similarly, the building's mixed-use retails space sits empty and unused. Frankly, it's an embarrassment that such a thing could be built in Arlington. The changes to zoning would allow, indeed encourage, worse building.

In addition, Greenspace has been a top priority for Arlington's public for a long time. The zoning articles as written actually eliminate much desired greenspace and will make Arlington less attractive and poorer recreationally.

The article to allow Accessory Dwelling Units is misguided at best. Again, the general impetuous for denser, smaller, affordable housing may be a good one, but this current article does not adequately help address that issue.

Finally, I would like to see the impetuous for greater urban density, population diversity, and affordable housing come from townspeople, not outside interests.

Sincerely,

Forrest Snyder

15 Allen Street, #1
Arlington, MA 02474

From: "Erin Zwirko" <EZwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "Anne Louise Kazlauskas" <alkalinelilac@gmail.com>
Cc: abunnell@town.arlington.ma.us, dwatson@town.arlington.ma.us,
ebenson@town.arlington.ma.us, JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us, klau@town.arlington.ma.us,
"Mary Muszynski" <MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 11:42:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Zoning changes

Anne,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Erin

Erin Zwirko, AICP, LEED AP
Assistant Director
Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
direct: 781-316-3091
ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us

From: Anne Louise Kazlauskas <alkalinelilac@gmail.com>
To: "ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us" <ezwirko@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 11:38:11 -0400
Subject: Zoning changes

I am generally in favour of what i understand of the proposed zoning changes. I am certainly in favour of careful, efficient design of mixed use buildings & housing affordable for all incomes - preferably developments with people of all incomes in the same physical buildings.

Not sure whether i understand all the descriptions of open space but environmentally responsible sustainable landscaping & less "landscaped" open space at or near housing developments is important to me.

Limiting cars in general is a good thing, but as someone who has struggled with finding affordable places to park, i worry about always limiting parking spaces to one space per unit - especially where 2 or more unrelated people live together. I hear there is motion possibly to allow night street parking to disabled & low income people (separate from this development proposal). There is much need for this consideration in Arlington concurrent with these development ideas.

Thank you.
Anne Kazlauskas
Bow Street
Arlington Heights

From: thomas danielczik <thodani@hotmail.com>
To: "ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>,
"EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us" <EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, "KLau@town.arlington.ma.us"
<KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, "DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us" <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>
Cc: "jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us" <jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us>, "achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us"
<achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us>, "mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us"
<mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 16:18:40 +0000
Subject: Article 15/Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear Members of the Redevelopment Board:

I would like to express my strong opposition to Article 15, allowing accessory dwelling units in R0 and RI districts, and respectfully ask you to vote no on advancing this article in its current form to Town Meeting.

The addition of these units would dramatically change the character of single-family neighborhoods in Arlington. They would essentially over time turn these neighborhoods into two-family districts, despite the name. Developers would have an even bigger incentive to tear down modest homes and replace them with larger houses, blocking views and sunlight, and invading neighbors privacy. New entrances would be added to sides and backs of homes and add foot traffic and noise to areas that would otherwise be a quiet porch or backyard.

People don't just buy a house but rather a home in a neighborhood that they love and that becomes their retreat and refuge from the stresses of daily life. This is not something that a town should take lightly in their decision-making process because most homeowners can't just pick up and find a new home and neighborhood, and we shouldn't have to.

Please consider the real lives of many people who'd be significantly impacted by this article.

Sincerely,

Thomas Danielczik
83 Ronald Road
Precinct 15

From: Jenny Mauger <jennaynay@gmail.com>
To: ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us,
EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us,
DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us
Cc: jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us,
achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us, mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 11:54:35 -0400
Subject: Concern about zoning articles proposed

Hi - I live in Arlington Heights and I want to express my concern about the new zoning articles being proposed. I do not think these should be passed this year in any manner.

Primarily, I think that the zoning changes introduced in 2016 have not yet been taken advantage of and these additional changes are too much too soon. Many are complaining about the building at 887 Mass Ave; we as a town should see whether more structures similar to that are built under our current zoning rather than push even more dense zoning changes. I'm concerned that allowing "multi-use" 5 story buildings will lead to developers building 4 stories of apartments over a vacant storefront and there will be no incentive to rent that storefront to anyone. I don't like that it would also encourage tearing down of existing, smaller scale, less expensive housing to build these structures. I think the reduction in parking space requirement to 1 per unit is a bad idea. Certainly we can say that "if people need parking they will choose to rent where it is available" but I think it's more likely someone will choose to rent there because it is more affordable, then complain that they need parking and should be issued a street parking spot. Arlington is not *that* transit friendly.

Thank you for reading.
Jenny Mauger

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "C Wagner" <cawagner@hotmail.com>, ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us,
EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us,
DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us, achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us, "Mary Krepelka"
<mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 13:02:35 -0400
Subject: Re: Proposed amendments / changes to Pro-urbanization articles, Art 16 etc

Carl,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Director, Department of Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
730 Massachusetts Avenue
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476
781-316-3092

From: C Wagner <cawagner@hotmail.com>
To: "ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us" <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>,
"EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us" <EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us>, "KLau@town.arlington.ma.us"
<KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, "DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us" <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>,
"achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us" <achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us>, "Mary Krepelka"
<mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us>, Jenny Raitt <jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 15:52:25 +0000
Subject: Proposed amendments / changes to Pro-urbanization articles, Art 16 etc

Dear Members of the ARB:
cc: Town Manager, Dir of Planning, Select Board via Ms. Krepelka

I have heard that the proponents of the pro-density/urbanization articles before you may have articles that reference 'density bonus', and other changes to push large development with some reference to affordability.

I'd first point out the Articles as submitted to you are completely lacking in affordability assistance - and the combination of reducing amount of lot space required per unit **to 1,000 sq ft per unit** and proposed division of **lot size down to only 5,000 sq ft** would allow developers to avoid Arlington's existing affordable apartment "inclusionary zoning" requirements - **because these existing protections begin at the 6th unit.**

For this reason, while I support Mr Revilak's notion of increasing the inclusionary affordable unit level from 15% to 20%, **his article would not stop the detrimental effect to affordable unit requirements in these articles.**

Any proposed amendment to these articles that the proponents cast as "affordable" should first pass a test that it would create more actual units of affordable housing than now - and when developers exploit these proposed removals of our bylaw protections maximally. So, there should never be a 'bonus' or a way for developers to produce less affordable unit numbers, such as the proposed articles allow for 4 and 5 unit placements per lot.

We should put these pro-urbanization/pro-density Articles off until you and the town's population have had a decent amount of time to review them, instead of pushing them. Town Meeting Members should have more time to decide and inform themselves about these Articles before they - 250 people - decide the fate of a town we love for its open spaces, its current density (already 2nd in the Commonwealth), its school capacity, its height and shade. We don't love how close we live to our neighbors -- so we also certainly don't want that any worse!

There is a larger issue here: The residents (renters and owners) and businesses have not been adequately consulted before these Articles were proposed and crafted. The proponents have failed to remember that the people who live and work in Arlington are the most important stakeholders - and whom these officials are paid by. Instead, it has been very troubling to see MAPC, CHAPA, and MMC - all outside organizations - active in creating these Articles, and attaching the untrue notions that they somehow help us with our affordability and property tax bill issues -- both of which we show are not the case on the website www.arfrr.org

The reason that the tax-payers are concerned about the way the ARB is constituted (currently appointed by unelected officials) is because of this concern over these Articles. I therefore ask you to vote against all of the Articles and any amendment that would not actually create higher numbers of affordable units per development and across our town.

Carl Wagner

From: "Jenny Raitt" <JRaitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
To: "ArlingtonGovt@HaroldHelson.us" <ArlingtonGovt@haroldhelson.us>
Cc: <ABunnell@town.arlington.ma.us>, <EBenson@town.arlington.ma.us>,
<KLau@town.arlington.ma.us>, <DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us>,
<achapdelaine@town.arlington.ma.us>, <mkrepelka@town.arlington.ma.us>,
<MMuszynski@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Wed, 27 Mar 2019 16:07:56 -0400
Subject: Re: Opposed to increasing Arlington density

Harold,

Thank you for your comments.

Best,
Jenny

Jennifer Raitt
Town of Arlington
Director of Planning and Community Development
781-316-3092

On Mar 27, 2019, at 2:50 PM, ArlingtonGovt@HaroldHelson.us
<ArlingtonGovt@haroldhelson.us> wrote:

Dear town officials:

I am very concerned about the initiative to increase Arlington density.

1. I like the town the way it is. We don't need to increase the population in order to help Boston's housing needs.
2. I've come to understand that the initiatives, while claiming to increase affordable housing, would do the opposite.
3. New construction would be ugly and not in keeping with our historic town. I also don't want tall buildings.
4. The initiatives would worsen traffic and parking.

Not to be cynical, but I imagine the initiatives are being promoted by the crass interests of developers. We've had a number of recent constructions that were illegal and/or ugly. I doubt new construction would be any different.

Finally, these initiatives are being pushed through too quickly, without adequate study. Has the long-promised shadow study ever appeared? Have the effects on traffic been studied? **The likely negative effects of zoning changes have not been sufficiently studied.**

I need you to put aside commercial interests and protect the Arlington we currently love. Oppose these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Harold Helson

Bartlett Ave

From: Don Seltzer <timoneer@gmail.com>
To: Andrew Bunnell <abunnell@>, Gene Benson
<genebenson@>, DWatson@town.arlington.ma.us, KLau@town.arlington.ma.us, Jenny Raitt
<jraitt@town.arlington.ma.us>
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2019 22:20:14 -0400
Subject: Flawed Buildout Affordability Analysis

To the Arlington Redevelopment Board

I apologize for sending this correspondence at such a late date. I am aware of the flood of letters that you have been receiving in the last few days and I did not intend to add to the list with another statement of For or Against sentiments. I write this because I have only just come across some data that has been provided to the Board that is seriously and demonstrably flawed.

It was only today that I took a closer look at the ARB Hearing Presentation document that was first presented two weeks ago. Within it is a table on page 18 labeled 'Build Out Analysis - Residential'. As far as I know, it is the only study that has been done to estimate the number of affordable housing units that may result from the adoption of the proposed warrant articles. A quick reading of the last row of the table suggests an increase of 444 affordable units, going from 1048 to 1492 projected.

There are several fundamental flaws in the reasoning behind this table which I will demonstrate by looking at the numbers for just the residential zones, R4-R7, aggregating the numbers.

	Total Allowed Units	Total Allowed Affordable Units	Total Projected Units	Total Projected Affordable Units
R4	233	35	252	38
R5	1274	191	1911	287
R6	1225	184	1911	287

R7	486	73	729	109
R4-R7	3218	483	4803	721

Both the currently allowable affordable units and the projected numbers under the zoning changes make the simplistic and erroneous assumption that affordable units will be 15% of all units built. After several weeks of public hearings you are undoubtedly aware of (and probably tired of repeatedly hearing) that this will almost certainly not be the case, that developers will use the loopholes of subdivision and exemption of five units or less to avoid the inclusionary requirement. You also won't see ten unit developments (8 market rate and 2 affordable) but instead nine unit buildings (8 market rate and 1 affordable). This is not just speculation. This is exactly what has happened with the very first mixed-use developments built under the 2016 zoning change. 887 Mass Ave and 483 Summer combined will have 12 market rate and 1 affordable, hardly the 15% assumption built into the projections.

At the beginning of my letter I claimed that this data is demonstrably false. As proof, I cite the claim that only 483 affordable units in the R4-R7 districts are allowable under our current bylaws, but 721 affordable units would be possible under the proposed changes. In fact, **there are currently 948 affordable units today** in those districts (from the SHI list; I would be glad to provide a detailed list with addresses). This is nearly twice what the MAPC 'study' claims is possible under our current zoning laws. It is even 31% more than what they claim is achievable under their proposed density changes.

The affordability data they have provided you is useless because MAPC has a single-minded view of how affordable housing is created, and they have crafted these proposals based upon this flawed view.

In all of their research they have failed to discover a simple truth about Arlington. Most of our affordable housing has come the Town's Housing Authority or non-profits such as the HCA. They efficiently use our Town's limited resources to create buildings that are 100% affordable, not some token amount.

Please consider this as another serious shortcoming in the work product from MAPC.

Sincerely,

Don Seltzer