

From: Marchesini, Danilo
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 7:40 AM
To: Marchesini, Danilo
Subject: Opposing Warrant Articles 12, 4-through-11 for Fall 2023 Special Town Meetings

Good morning,

My name is Danilo Marchesini, and I have been living in Arlington since 2009 with my wife and my two sons, who are now 1st-yr students in high-school. Below an email I sent to my Town Meeting Members, encouraging them to vote against Article 12 and sharing with them some of my arguments why I oppose Article 12 (and Articles 4-to-11). I won't be able to attend tonight's ARB meeting, so I thought it would be useful to send you all this email.

With this email, **I would like to share with you that I most strongly oppose Warrant Article 12 "Zoning Bylaw Amendment / MBTA Communities Overlay District".**

Whereas I do not oppose the effort to allow for the 2,046 units as required by law, I do very strongly oppose the effort by the working group of the Arlington Redevelopment Board to go far beyond what is required (the latest number I have read is 4 times the density and units required by the state).

Why are we going so far beyond what is required? How is this going to benefit Arlington residents at all? What studies of impact on town finances, real estate taxes, congestion, schools, roads/fire/sewer and open spaces/trees have been done? Where is the plan that shows zoning to allow the 2,046 units required by the law?

Considering the unknown impact and consequences, it would be strongly advisable and reasonable NOT to exceed the requirements of 2,046 units. What about school overcrowding? How about the need for new schools and infrastructure spending? Just complying with the 2,046 units requirement will introduce hardships (e.g., increased load on services like school and crowding and un-researched effects on property taxes, rents, and town finances). Since there are concerns and risks with just complying, to do more than what is required is, in my opinion, reckless. Since it is much harder to remove bad density than to introduce density, it would be reasonable to meet the law, but move cautiously, because we don't know about the negative and unintended consequences.

I am also concerned about how representative the aforementioned working group is of the broad parts of Arlington's businesses and residents, i.e., I am worried that the ARB working group is expressing a minority agenda, instead of representing the most important stakeholders in Arlington, i.e., the people who live and work here. Furthermore, my perception is that the working group process has continually lacked adequate data, research, scenario details and quantifiable answers.

There are many more concerns, including 1) the fact that this is not an affordability law - it is likely that this will make housing higher priced than existing comparable units, raising the cost of renting or owning a home (as happened to the development recently built near Stop & Shop); 2) the proposal is not realistic about transport options (as not providing adequate parking in the density overlays; such density should be located close to Alewife, where cars are less needed); Arlington should require adequate setbacks (location of building on lots) from abutting buildings and the street border, so that shade trees are able to grow (yet the working group has repeatedly proposed shortened setbacks); the density overlay building heights and sizes planned must be abutter/neighbor friendly (whereas they are currently not); etc...

Therefore, I strongly oppose Article 12, as well as Articles 4-to-11, while I would support an article with detailed maps/scenarios that meets but does not exceed the 2,046 units requirement.

Thank you very much!

Sincerely,
Danilo Marchesini
14 Walnut Ct, Arlington MA