

Re: Arlington resident CONCERNED OVER MBTA density overlay

L DiStasio <oceannstars333@hotmail.com>

Thu 2023-08-31 21:18

To: Stephen Revilak <srevilak@town.arlington.ma.us>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello

I am a long time resident of Arlington. I love this town. I am very concerned to hear that the board is willing to increase from the 10% that is required.

I am deeply concerned and have a few questions - given there is no forum for which I can attend since I work during the day when the ARB has been holding their meetings.

1. Where is the plan that shows zoning to allow the 2,046 units required by the law?
2. Why are we going so far beyond what is required, when we are already one of the densest communities in the state?
3. Under what authority does the WG have to over-comply at such an extreme level?
4. How does this benefit Arlington residents at all?

5. What studies of impact on town finances, real estate taxes, congestion, schools, roads/fire /water and sewer and open spaces/trees have been done?

I would appreciate a response.

respectfully,
Laura DiStasio

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Re: Arlington resident CONCERNED OVER MBTA density overlay

L DiStasio <oceannstars333@hotmail.com>

Thu 2023-08-31 21:24

To:Stephen Revilak <srevilak@town.arlington.ma.us>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I also have more concerns;

•

1. The Working Group is **not a representative group** of broad parts of Arlington's businesses and residents. In other communities, similar groups must better represent the townspeople. Groups that should be included in the planning process for this largest change in our zoning in our lifetimes include: affordable housing, open and green spaces, historic districts and preservation, business and retail stores, Arlington public schools, Arlington finance committee, to name just a few.
2. **The process in Arlington should include several scenarios, at least including a map and scenario of meeting, but not exceeding** the Act's requirements of 2,046 units and with some of the density placed, as the Act intends, within easy walking of Alewife. **WHY IS THIS MINIMUM SCENARIO NOT BEING MADE AVAILABLE ?**
3. **Arlington should better notify and better get the input** of residents and businesses. Other communities are better involving their residents and businesses, such as sending letters or cards to homes and businesses in the density overlay areas, allowing for more public input and comment (Arlington has only had one public forum on July 25 - and comments were two thirds expressing concern). The WG proposals are justified poorly by a 213-respondent survey and an earlier very general survey of 1,000 - which didn't ask about density overlay details.
4. **The response should have better data about each map/scenario.** Arlington's response has lacked serious studies of the potential negative or unintended effects on services (school overcrowding or need for new schools and infrastructure spending), town finances, effect on existing affordability, effect on real estate taxes.
5. **Most people just don't know the Arlington 'overcompliance' proposal is happening - and when they do hear about it, they are**

very concerned. Arlington's process is a small group of pro-market rate density advocates expressing a minority agenda, instead of a broad effort to involve Arlington's most important stakeholders, the people who live and work here.

I would appreciate a response.

respectfully,
Laura DiStasio

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows