

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, September 11, 2023, at 7:30 PM
Town Hall Auditorium
730 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Stephen Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director, Planning and Community Development; Marisa Lau, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Development

GUESTS: Sanjay Newton, Chair, MBTA Communities Working Group; Matthew Littell, Utile, Urban Planning Consultants

The Chair called the meeting of the Board to order. She called for a moment of silence in observance of the victims of the September 11 attacks in 2001.

The Chair opened with **Agenda Item 1 – Review Meeting Minutes.**

August 28, 2023 – The Board had no comments on the minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the August 28 minutes. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 2 – Public Hearing: Docket #3766, 315 Broadway.**

Ms. Ricker stated this docket is a request from Thai Moon for signage for their new location. She said that the applicant has requested a continuance of the hearing until Monday, September 18, 2023. The Chair asked for a motion to approve the request for continuance. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 3 – Public Hearing: Warrant Articles for Fall 2023 Special Town Meeting.**

The Chair stated that this meeting would be the first of three nights of hearings for a total of 10 warrant articles that will be in front of the Redevelopment Board. The Board will hear from members of the public wishing to speak on any of these articles as they are scheduled. One article is scheduled for this evening. The Board will pose any questions they have to members of the Working Group. The Board will reserve deliberation and voting on each article until the last night of hearings on October 2, 2023. The subject matter for the hearing this evening as posted on the agenda is the MBTA Communities zoning article. Anyone who wishes to address the Board needs to sign one of the sign-in sheets in the entryway. Speakers should preface their comments with their first and last name and Arlington street address. Anyone addressing the Board will have up to two minutes for their remarks. The Board will try to get through as many speakers as possible, but they may not get to every speaker this evening. Anyone who wishes to speak but is unable to do so is welcome to submit written comments to the Redevelopment Board. All comments are reviewed, and anything received before 3:00 pm today has been added to tonight's agenda under the Correspondence tab. The Chair reminded the audience that at a public hearing, attendees may not applaud or otherwise express approval or disapproval for any statement or action that takes place at the hearing. She also asked that people refrain from interrupting other speakers, and that everyone conducts themselves in a civil and courteous manner to all speakers this evening. Anyone who repeatedly fails to adhere to this requirement will be asked to remove themselves from the hearing. All questions should be addressed through the Chair. Speakers should not attempt to engage in a debate with the Redevelopment Board, Working Group members, or any of the other hearing participants. The Board will catalog questions posed to the Board and will address those at the appropriate time.

Ms. Ricker introduced herself and Mr. Newton, and they began a slide show to share the background and process of the work on the MBTA Communities zone and to present two alternatives to the Board for an MBTA Communities zone that is compliant with the state's guidelines. She thanked the Board for their support and guidance over the past ten months while the Working Group has developed two alternatives for consideration, in preparation for a vote of Town Meeting on a warrant article to establish an MBTA Communities zone. Since the Board voted to create the Working Group on

November 7, 2022, the Working Group has engaged in a tremendous amount of community outreach and iterative mapping resulting in these two alternatives. She thanked the members of the Working Group for their hard work and dedication and commitment to the process. She also thanked the Department of Planning and Community Development (DPCD) staff and other Town employees who have pitched in to make the public outreach and public meetings so successful.

Ms. Ricker explained that under MBTA Communities law, Mass General Law Chapter 40A, Section 3, 177 communities in Eastern Massachusetts are subject to this law. The state has categorized Arlington as an adjacent community, meaning that Arlington does not have rail transit within its town limits but is adjacent to communities with rail transit. All 177 communities must provide at least one zoning district where multi-family housing (three or more dwelling units) is allowed by right, housing is permitted with at least 15 units per acre, housing cannot be age-restricted, and housing must be suitable for families with children. The capacity calculation is a calculation method used by the state to determine if a zone is of reasonable size. It is not a calculation of how many units will be constructed. This model includes assumptions that do not reflect market reality or challenges on the ground. It is unreasonable to think that every unit of housing built under this zone will be 1,000 square feet, or minus parking, or even get built at all. That is why the measure of capacity is a variable and not a constant. Whatever the capacity number is, it will not include whatever housing is there already. It is a measurement as if all housing that already exists within the zone were no longer there and as if every lot was rebuilt to the maximum.

Ms. Ricker shared a slide with different examples of types of multi-family housing, which result in different dwelling densities. She shared an image of several developments in Arlington and their dwelling densities, including 438 Mass Ave, which is 134 units at 49 units per acre.

Most of Arlington's zoning today was drawn in 1975, and it reflects the use and massing of whatever was there in 1975. Today, a building that is three-family or more cannot be built without a special permit. Multi-family housing is located in pockets around town and mostly exists where multi-family housing existed 50 years ago.

For Arlington, the reasonable size requirement in the MBTA Communities legislation means a minimum of 32 acres where multi-family housing is allowed to be built without a special permit, with a minimum capacity of 2,046 units. The benefits to the Town are huge. Compliance enables Arlington to remain eligible for MassWorks and other grant funding, including grants that the Town regularly applies for, often successfully, that will allow us to continue our work on behalf of the community.

Mr. Newton said that the Redevelopment Board voted in November 2022 to establish a Working Group to determine the location of Arlington's MBTA Communities zoning district, using community outreach, stakeholder engagement, and iterative mapping. DPCD held a first public meeting in November 2022 and solicited interest in the Working Group. Since January 2023, the Working Group has met regularly to strategize outreach to community members and develop the MBTA Communities district iteratively and in response to public comments collected via survey, stakeholder meetings, and public meetings. Hearing from and speaking to the community requires multiple forms of engagement. The Working Group partnered with Teresa Marzili, the Town's Community Outreach and Engagement Coordinator, to craft additional outreach opportunities. The Working Group also analyzed a number of existing Town planning documents. The establishment of new housing districts and development of new housing is supported in several of Arlington's planning documents, including the Master Plan, the Fair Housing Plan, the Net Zero Action Plan, the Community Equity Audit, and the Housing Production Plan. The Working Group's analysis and outreach led them to the following principles:

- Encourage more housing in a variety of sizes and price points.
- Encourage housing located near public transit.
- Encourage housing to provide a customer base in support of local businesses.
- Encourage multi-family housing spread across Arlington.
- Ensure compliance with the MBTA Communities Act.

Due to the limited time available at the meeting, Mr. Newton said that he would not go into detail about all the information contained on the next several slides in the presentation, and he encouraged people to go to the Town website, where this presentation would be posted on Wednesday, September 12, 2023, and where the Working Group's

Final Report is already posted. The Report contains a great deal of detail about these principles and about the entire proposal. He then briefly discussed each of the principles:

- Encourage more housing in a variety of sizes and price points – This principle benefits many members of our community, from seniors looking to downsize, municipal workers who would like to live in the community they serve, and people who need accessibility features. Mr. Newton noted that approximately 2,100 homes currently exist in the proposed zone. If that area were zoned for the bare minimum requirement of 2,046 units, it would result in no new housing.
- Encourage housing located near public transit – This principle was supported by the Working Group’s community survey and by the Town’s Net Zero Action Plan and the Connect Arlington Sustainable Transportation Plan. Allowing more housing near transit and adjacent to mixed-use areas is an important part of meeting Arlington’s climate goals.
- Encourage housing to provide a customer base in support of local business – Locating housing near local businesses creates the potential for commercial vitality. The consultant Utile provided a rough estimate that it takes one household to support 30 square feet of retail space.
- Encourage multi-family housing spread across Arlington – The Working Group has received suggestions to locate the zone in almost every neighborhood in town. The Working Group also heard from community members and the school district that it was important not to cluster the district in the catchment area of just one or a small number of elementary schools.
- Ensure compliance with the MBTA Communities Act – the guidelines for creating a compliant district are complex. The Working Group has worked in partnership with the staff of DPCD and with their consultant Utile. DPCD has submitted the proposed map and zoning language to the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC) for pre-adoption review, and we expect to have results of that review before Town Meeting discusses the proposal. The guidelines from EOHLC were revised on August 17, 2023. The new guidelines allowed limited options to require ground-floor commercial space. The Working Group believed that the new provisions did not offer an improvement over their current strategies of incentivizing ground floor commercial and placing the district outside of areas currently zoned for commercial use.

Ms. Ricker shared that the Working Group has developed an overlay zone consisting of three sub-districts. Each sub-district has dimensional requirements specific to that sub-district, including set-back and height requirements. The incentive programs for each sub-district are also different to better reflect the design differences of each area. For example, in the Neighborhood sub-district, the overall height is shorter, and the setbacks are larger. The Working Group contemplated height and setback requirements very thoughtfully. They decided that in order to support the desire of older residents to age in place, allowing four stories, which requires an elevator, would lead to development that is accessible and appropriate for seniors and others. The Working Group is also recommending a parking maximum of one space per unit rather than a parking minimum, a recommendation supported by published Town plans. We are waiting to hear back from EOHLC about whether implementation of a parking maximum is allowable in the district.

The Working Group is proposing a series of development bonuses in order to incentivize the type of development supported by our public outreach but that could not otherwise be achieved by right within the framework of the MBTA Communities Act, including bonuses for mixed-use development, for provision of affordable housing above the current inclusionary zoning requirement, and for provision of open space within the project. The bonuses are available only in the Mass Ave and Broadway sub-districts and are not applicable to the Neighborhood sub-district, which has a cap of four stories. The Working Group is recommending a two-floor bonus on Mass Ave and a one-floor bonus on Broadway for inclusion of non-residential square footage on the first floor. In addition to the bonus floors, property owners would be allowed to bring the first four floors of the building frontage to the front lot line if the first floor is for commercial purposes. The affordable housing bonus was developed by the affordable housing professionals in the Working Group to promote development of affordable housing units beyond the current inclusionary zoning requirements. A developer may decide to apply the bonus to building both more regular and more affordable units. In order to support provision of additional environmental assets for a project, the Working Group recommends a bonus of one floor for a project that is certifiably GOLD, equaling 100 points under the US Green Building Council’s SITES program.

Ms. Ricker shared the map of Alternative 1 of the MBTA Communities district. The map shows the zone along Mass Ave and Broadway all the way from East Arlington into the Heights. It includes 5 contiguous acres, as required by the state,

and the zone is disbursed among several neighborhoods. The Working Group avoided parcels zoned commercial or industrial and prioritized areas already zoned residential. The height is concentrated on Mass Ave, with shorter buildings allowed on Broadway, and shorter still in the Neighborhood Multi-Family sub-district. Alternative 1 includes neighborhood housing along Paul Revere Road, to the south side of Mass Ave. She then shared the Model Outputs for Alternative 1: 109 acres, 7,200 units (2,100 units already exist in this area), with a gross district density of 67 units per acre.

Ms. Ricker then shared the map of Alternative 2. Alternative 2 shifts the part of the zone located along Paul Revere Rd to the south of Mass Ave to an area north of Mass Ave along Grove and Forest Streets. The Model Outputs for Alternative 2 are: 115 acres, 7,400 units, 65 units per acre.

Both alternatives meet the targets for compliance, and both are currently being evaluated by the state.

The Chair thanked the Working Group and the staff of DPCD for their comprehensive process, including a wide array of public engagement, which has heavily informed many of these recommendations. The design process is not always linear; it requires that participants broadly imagine possibilities and potential before narrowing their focus and possible outcomes as informed by stakeholder engagement, evaluating the relative merits, and testing against existing constraints. It requires that everyone involved be comfortable imagining “what” before evaluating “how.” For some people, that process is unfamiliar and uncomfortable. She appreciates the many members of the community who have answered surveys, attended workshops, provided written feedback, and attended open office hours, to share their perspectives and learn about how and why Arlington has put so much time and thought into crafting its proposal. She appreciates that the Working Group distributed the zone across the three main business areas of town, along our primary transportation corridors, in all our elementary school communities, while maintaining the required contiguous acreage. While the final recommendations and details are still to be reviewed and defined by the Redevelopment Board and through public comment, as a whole, they are a net positive for Arlington homeowners and renters and our widely supported sustainability goals as a town. Arlington is not a town that accepts the bare minimum or aspires to the lowest common denominator. We are a progressive town that leads the region when it comes to adopting policies that are rooted in equity and social, economic, and environmental justice.

The Chair asked if we asking the state for guidance about the issue of parking maximums versus minimums, and Ms. Ricker said that we are. The Chair said that there seems to be a conflict between section C1 and C4. Section C1 says that parking can be waived down to zero, but Section C4 refers to the section in the existing zoning bylaw that allows us to provide fewer parking spaces. That portion of Section C4 may need to be eliminated.

The Chair asked about the mixed-use bonus, with 60% of ground floor space used for commercial. The Board generally looks to maximize the commercial space, and she wants to understand the context of the recommendation of 60%. Mr. Newton replied that the recommendation of 60% came out of conversations with Utile. The ground floor needs space to make the residential units functional, including lobbies, elevators, mailrooms, loading docks, etc. Mr. Littell also replied that the requirement included that the frontage be occupied by the commercial space in order to provide vibrancy and activity on the street.

The Chair asked if we have asked for clarification from the EOHLC about whether the requirements around listing on the subsidized housing inventory and rounding up are more restrictive than our current code. Ms. Ricker said that because the affordable housing provision is a bonus and is not included in the base zoning, EOHLC will not evaluate the proposal based on the feasibility of including affordable housing.

The Chair asked if the Working Group considered the situation in which someone might want to develop a project on a parcel in the overlay district and another that is not in the district that are combined. Ms. Ricker said that they did discuss the possibility of a development including one parcel in the Mass Ave or Broadway sub-districts and one parcel behind it in the Neighborhood Multi-Family sub-district, but they did not discuss the possibility of one parcel in and another not in the district at all. She said that she would get an answer to the question.

The Chair asked about why certain dimensional controls were eliminated, including traffic visibility, upper story building step-backs, the height buffer area, and the elimination of corner lots and through lots. Mr. Revilak said that the provision about traffic visibility around corner lots applies to residential lots. The Working Group was trying to incentivize mixed-use development with ground-floor businesses. In an ordinary business district, the traffic visibility

rule does not apply, so they wanted to mirror that to make the inclusion of commercial space more appealing. The inclusion of step-backs on stories above the fourth floor was intended to allow full development of the four stories allowed by right, and only have step-backs take effect on the bonus floors.

The Chair said that at one point, the Board discussed not including all the parcels that touch Mass Ave east of Orvis Road for a future rezoning of that business district. She asked why the Working Group continued to include that area, along with the elimination of the neighborhood parcels behind those areas. Mr. Revilak said that based on public comment, the Working Group decided that the map had become too heavy in East Arlington, so they opted to remove some of the East Arlington neighborhood parcels and relocated them to Arlington Heights. The Working Group discussed the issue of eliminating the parcels along Mass Ave, and they decided to leave that decision to the Redevelopment Board.

The Chair said that after public comment, the Board would need to discuss the parcels along Mass Ave east of Orvis Road, whether the neighborhood height maximum should be four stories (as proposed) or three, and the solar bylaw section, which is currently limited to projects requiring Environmental Design Review, so would not apply to the MBTA Communities overlay district.

The Chair asked whether SITES is the preferred rating system for environmental impact, and whether Certifiable rather than actually Certified is the right threshold for a bonus of a full story.

Mr. Benson asked how the minimum open space percentages of the Alternative 1 Model outputs were derived. Mr. Littell said that the open space is not part of the formal written zoning, but it is included in the model as a substitute for the space created by the required set-backs. He also clarified that for the purposes of the model, open space includes all areas of a parcel other than the building, so it would include paved parking areas as well as landscaped open space. Mr. Benson said that after public comment, he would like the Board to discuss the proposed elimination of requirements for landscaped open space, because this proposal does not necessarily include any green space. Mr. Revilak clarified that the model doesn't handle open space well, and it assumed much more capacity based on parcel size than the Working Group intended. Utile calibrated the parcel size and open space numbers to get a more accurate capacity estimate.

Mr. Benson noted that without the affordable housing bonus, the language of the proposal says that any affordable housing must be eligible for inclusion in the Subsidized Housing Inventory. Since we don't have that requirement in the underlying zone, what's the purpose of including it in the MBTA Communities zone? Can we include it here, since it appears to be more restrictive than the underlying zone? Mr. Newton said that the Working Group intended that the 15% inclusionary zoning in the proposal match the existing inclusionary zoning bylaw covering multi-family housing in the rest of Arlington. If that is not what it says in the proposal, that may be a drafting error to be corrected. Mr. Benson also noted that the state might not allow Arlington to require 15% inclusionary zoning, since the state has only set a requirement of 10%. If the state does not allow more than 10%, we would have to set the threshold at 80% of AMI (area median income), but Arlington's base zoning sets it at 70% of AMI. He thinks that this paragraph will need to be completely rewritten to meet the Working Group's intention.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment. She said that she would call names from those who had signed up to speak. She noted that the Board will not answer questions as they are asked; she will keep a list of questions, which will be answered at the end so as to include as many speakers as possible. If the Board feels clarifications are warranted, they will stop and make those clarifications. She asked speakers to come to the chair in the front with the microphone and introduce themselves with first and last names and their Arlington street address. Each speaker will have up to two minutes to address the Board.

- Jean Fitzmaurice, 231 Mass Ave – She wants to address the low income tax credit affordability program. The rent in this program is below market but is still relatively high. The rent increases based on a formula based on the increase of the AMI of the greater Boston area. From 2022 to 2023, the increase was 5.8%. She also noted that the affordability program requires a maximum of 60% of AMI, meaning that there is a gap between those who earn little enough to have access to the program and those who earn enough to afford rent without the program.
- Linda Atlas, East Arlington – She asked how many people live in a household with no car, and one person responded. She noted that the three groups listed on one of the slides as those who would benefit from greater density are seniors, families with children, and people with accessibility issues. Those are all groups of people

with particular need for a car. We may not know exactly what will be built, but if we do the math, we could end up with streets with way more density than we really want.

- Lygia Grigoris, 370 Park Ave – She is disturbed by the whole process. Everyone she has spoken to in person knows nothing about the process. She asked why the Working Group decided to over-comply. Arlington already has diverse housing options. This plan will lead to high-end expensive units which will have no benefit except to developers. The result will be demolishing and rebuilding throughout the zone, which is inequitable, elitist, and unjust.
- Eugenia Grigoris, 11 Bates Road – She is also disturbed by this process, because most people haven't heard of it. The state is asking for 100% compliance, which is what the Working Group was mandated to do. She doesn't think the Working Group has a mandate for an extravagant plan for 7,000 units. We should comply with what the state is asking. The proposed plan will transform Arlington into something unrecognizable.
- Alex Bagnall, Wyman Street – He shared a quote from Matthew Desmond, a former Arlington resident, now a sociology professor at Princeton and the principal investigator of the Eviction Lab: "How can we at last end our embrace of segregation? The most important thing we can do is to replace exclusionary zoning policies with inclusionary ordinances, tearing down our walls and using the rubble to build bridges. There are two parts to this. The first is to get rid of all the devious legal minutia we've developed to keep low income families out of high opportunity communities, rules that make it illegal to build multi-family apartment complexes or smaller, more affordable homes. We cannot in good faith claim that our communities are anti-racist or anti-poverty if they continue to uphold exclusionary zoning, our politer, quieter means of promoting segregation." Housing is not a zero-sum game. Providing for the needs of our families does not mean denying those possibilities to others. He hopes the Board will support the recommendations of the Working Group.
- Colin Bunnell, 153 Medford Street – He urged the Board to support the Working Group's proposal. This region is in a housing affordability crisis, caused by decades of restrictive zoning practices in local communities, including Arlington, causing construction to lag behind demand. The world is confronting the crisis of climate change, caused by the car culture created by suburban single-family housing. More and denser housing addresses both these crises, and this proposal is a great step in that direction. Denser housing supports commercial development, fosters walking communities, and is essential in reducing carbon emissions. More housing begins to address the radical imbalance that currently exists between housing supply and demand. Declaring "not in our backyard" is irresponsible and selfish and unworthy of a progressive community like ours.
- Nicole Gustas, 89 Marathon Street – She was hoping that Arlington would zone for more, as Lexington has done. She understands that a lot of residents want to do the bare minimum. This is a 50-year plan; it's not going to happen tomorrow or next year. People have asked where the mandate comes from – it's from the Master Plan, the Fair Housing Plan, the Net Zero Access Plan, the Community Equity Audit, the Housing Production Plan, the Sustainable Transit Plan. If we are going to stop housing cost inflation, we need more housing units. In 1970, we had over 7,000 more residents than we have now, so we know that Arlington has the infrastructure. We know that building more housing works to moderate housing costs because two places have done it. Auckland, New Zealand dropped rental prices by 22-35% as a comparison to Wellington, NZ, which did not allow building. Minneapolis dropped housing prices and inflation by building more housing. People were arguing against building there using the same arguments we're hearing in Arlington, but building more housing works and can work here.
- Mike Rainey, 89 Marathon Street – He keeps hearing the narrative that developers are going to come in and obliterate and rebuild Arlington overnight. That isn't the case. This plan isn't a steep climb up a vertical wall; it's a ramp that we need to get on now in order to not fall further behind. Bare minimum compliance results in no net gain of units. If we wait another year, then the ramp will either need to be steeper or longer to get to the same place.
- Nili Pearlmutter, 79 Harlow Street – Her block is impacted on this plan. She's speaking on behalf of Mothers Out Front Arlington. They have drafted a statement in support of the MBTA Communities plan. Massachusetts is experiencing a housing affordability crisis and a climate crisis. For these reasons, Mothers Out Front Arlington supports changes in zoning by-laws that allow greater density in housing near public transit. Mothers Out Front is supportive of the passage of a meaningful MBTA Communities Act that encourages the development of more

multi-family housing and a greater diversity of home types in Arlington. A revised zoning by-law to allow for more multi-family housing will reduce pressure to build single family homes on undeveloped land elsewhere in Massachusetts. This safeguards undisturbed ecosystems and provides real alternatives to automotive commutes in the region, reducing both congestion and fossil fuel emissions. In addition, passing this by-law will allow Arlington to participate in the Massachusetts pilot for communities to build fossil-free homes, thus ensuring that new construction in Arlington supports our net-zero climate goals. Mothers Out Front Arlington respects the public engagement activities that inform the Working Group's MBTA Communities Act proposal. We appreciate that the Working Group is working with the Town to identify opportunities for developer incentives to encourage public open spaces, mitigate heat islands, and increase the tree canopy. Similarly, the Town's commitment to maintaining current (and incentivizing higher) zoning requirements for affordable housing also is important to our group. For these reasons, Mothers Out Front Arlington strongly urges the Arlington Redevelopment Board to accept the MBTA Communities Act plan as proposed by the Working Group.

- Timur Yontar, 58 Bates Rd, Precinct 7 – He supports an increase to housing in Arlington, but he has concerns about the specific proposal because of the impact on schools. The Working Group's FAQ states Arlington Public Schools recommended "spreading the MBTA Communities District over a wide area of the Town." But the map shows that the district is highly concentrated along two narrow corridors – Mass Ave and Broadway. He worries that this will lead to overcrowding at a few elementary schools, particularly Thompson, which is already the largest and most crowded elementary school. He would like to know if the APS superintendent has reviewed and approved the current plan.
- Laurel Kayne, 79 Westmoreland Ave – She wants to know if a more stepped approach was considered by the Working Group so that development would happen in stages, which would allow for built-in feedback mechanisms to learn about the impacts and outcomes. Any big development effort can have unintended consequences, and it may not achieve the desired objectives. She would like to ask that greater consideration be given to a stronger environmental component, especially given the Town's Climate Action Plan. Incentives are built into the plan, but no mandates for things like passive housing or fully electrified buildings. This seems like an opportunity to take greater strides in that direction.
- Allan Tosti, 1 Watermill Place – He's a long-serving member of Town Meeting. He said that if only this proposal goes before Town Meeting with the implication that they have to pass it or be out of compliance with the state, the Board is not giving Town Meeting a choice. He urged the Board to allow for a couple of alternatives to go before Town Meeting. Obviously, many residents would like to see a plan that only meets the minimum. It would be difficult for a Town Meeting Member to add an amendment or propose an alternative warrant article, because this is such a complex issue. He urged the Board to respect Town Meeting's decision-making process and give them real alternatives.
- Josephine Babiarez, 59 Edgehill Road, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 15 – She understands and supports that we need more housing, and she understands that the changes aren't happening immediately. When we look at affordability, we have to understand the impact on the town. Cambridge has an extraordinary record with affordability, but most of their developers won't go over 13% affordability without subsidies. Cambridge has a great deal of commercial and industrial property, so real estate taxes account for more than 65% of the entire revenue, so they can buy down all the affordable housing. In Arlington, affordable housing will primarily be rental property, which will reduce the amount of property taxes owed on those properties.
- Joanne Cullinane, 69 Newland Road – Very few people in town know about the plan. She thinks that thousands of people would like to be at this meeting but didn't know about it. She has concerns about the fact that the plan is overly compliant. It will bring environmental destruction to Arlington; we will lose trees and green space. Having zero setbacks as a bonus for a small increase in affordable units is unacceptable for Arlington because it will create concrete canyons that are not pedestrian-friendly. She has concerns about the fiscal disfunction that this will exacerbate. The imbalance of real estate taxes that the Town takes in will not cover the increased burden on services. Tax rates will go up. It will exacerbate gentrification because most development will be at the highest end of what is in Arlington right now.
- Rebecca Peterson, 31 Florence Ave – This proposal will allow many projects like the massive buildings next to and across from the high school, buildings that are scorned and despised for their ugliness, their lack of green

space, and their size totally out of scale with our downtown corridor. Future setbacks should be as large as possible for shade trees. We've heard about the working group's outreach, but for a change of this magnitude, 1,000 survey responses is not representative of 46,000 people. Deceptive questions hid the true scale of the density. The Working Group appears to operate within an echo chamber, since most members are pro-density design, build, and construction professionals. Where are those who care about the schools, the traffic, the parking, the air quality, the tree canopy, fire response times, and other quality of life concerns? No studies assess the impact to residents and town services. Concerns about the plan's size and scale have been brushed off in order to meet an unrelated, and totally artificial deadline – entry into the state's fossil fuel ban pilot program. If half or more of the 2,046 state-required units have children, we'll add enough kids to fill another high school. This proposal is too dense, too high, too much. When you consider that 176 other towns will be adding housing at the same time, there is no need for this massive overcompliance. We should approve what the state requires and nothing more.

- Matthew Owen, 164 Forest Street – He thanked the members of the Working Group and Town employees who spent so much time putting together the plan. He is in full support of the plan as currently proposed. He would encourage the ARB to pass the plan to Town Meeting. He thinks that four-story is preferable to three-story for the Neighborhood sub-district, for two reasons – one is that the requirement for elevators with a four-story building would increase the likelihood of getting accessible units, and the other is that developments would meet the minimum size needed to come under the inclusionary zoning law and create affordable units. He agrees with the zero parking minimum. Looking at national trends in urban areas, there is a growing realization that parking minimums cause harmful effects and limit opportunities. Space in Arlington is incredibly precious, and taking it up with unnecessary parking spaces would be a shame.
- Beth Melofchik, 20 Russell Street, Town Meeting Member – She agreed with Rebecca Peterson. The plan is too dense and too high, and too little attention to the fact that we're in a climate breakdown, and that we're a Battle Road Scenic Byways community. Arlington will become little more than a speed bump on the way to Concord and Lexington if we don't preserve the historic streetscape and buildings that we have. Three stories is enough in the neighborhood sub-district. The Town asked people to get solar panels – will the Town be compensating people whose solar panels will be blocked by larger buildings? She appreciates the concern about SITES versus LEED. She will vote against this overcompliance because Town Meeting is a deliberative body and should have a choice.
- Carol Band, Bartlett Avenue, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 8 – Town Meeting deserves more choices than this big plan. She loves density, but it should be kept to the public transportation corridors of Mass Ave and Broadway and keep it out of the neighborhoods, unless they plan to let all the residents of the neighborhood vote on the proposal.
- Juliette Avots, 73 Columbia Road – She would like to know if they have conducted or are planning to conduct an impact study. We need more information about how this will affect the community, in terms of density, commercial, the schools, the environment, and we need an outsider to evaluate that instead of guessing.
- James Moore, 69 Columbia Road – He also wants to know about the impact to services, especially police and fire. Our roads are already in bad shape. He understands the need for more housing but is concerned about how the impact will be managed.
- Steve Makowka, 17 Russell Street, Chair of Arlington Historic Districts Commission – He acknowledged the hard work the Working Group has put in, trying to balance a lot of different things. He thinks that's made the process a bit rushed. He wants to make sure we avoid unintended consequences. He's tried to inject consideration about historic and cultural resources into the process. The Working Group has avoided local historic districts, which he appreciates, but other significant historic and cultural resources in town need to be considered.
- Roy Goldstein, 91 Westminster Ave – He thinks we should be closer to compliance rather than going above it. He is concerned about the impact, particularly on schools. We seem to always be playing catch-up with the needs of the schools and other services. We should get the school system taken care of first. This plan will throw a lot of things out of balance. He's also concerned about the environmental impacts. Much of the corridor to be developed is part of the drainage system where a lot of the water ends up from the hills on either side of Mass Ave and Broadway. The more we pave, the less drainage we allow, which could have a big impact.

- Carolyn White, 276 Mass Ave – She grew up in Arlington, has lived in Cambridge and Somerville and worked in Boston and Cambridge. She has commuted by subway and bicycle. She is in the gap of people who make too much money to qualify for affordable housing and too little to be able to afford market rents. She lives in a 670-square foot rental apartment. She enjoys living in a building with 75 units. The building has tenants with Section 8, low income, single parents, children. She likes the idea of additional housing including buildings that are four or five stories on the south side of Mass Ave, because the shade goes toward Mass Ave and not the houses behind them. She is concerned that the proposal contains so many incentives, but no mandates for accessibility, affordability, climate change mitigation.
- Adam Lane, 77 Grafton – He commends everyone present for their passion. Everyone is here because they love Arlington, and we are lucky to live here. We have been given this community by the people here before us, and it is our responsibility to see that we pass on to future residents a town that is just as good. Change can be scary, but towns change. A resident of Menotomy would not recognize West Cambridge or the Arlington of today. We'll all be gone in 50 years. This is for the future Arlingtonians. Capacity is not destiny. We are giving the Board the flexibility to make wise choices about growth, if the area has more capacity and gives us more options. He hopes that this version and future versions of the Board would manage growth sensibly. He is reminded of the passions that surrounded the Mass Ave redo project 10 years ago, when some people got so upset that they left town when things didn't go their way. Mass Ave was redesigned, and it's lovely, and the town works, and the predicted traffic did not materialize. Let us take the temperature down a little and listen to each other.
- Jennifer Susse, 45 Teele St – We are all people of goodwill who care passionately about Arlington. We have different opinions. 50 years ago, Arlington, along with many other suburban communities, shut down multi-family housing production. We are where we are today, with the housing affordability crisis, because of what happened back then. This is going to be a long process. We can't solve the problem overnight, but we do need to begin to make meaningful, small, incremental changes, like the Working Group's plan, to address the problems, so that we don't have an even worse problem 50 years from now. The state did not ask us to do the bare minimum. They proposed what they thought could pass, not because they didn't want towns to step up and do more. Doing the bare minimum wouldn't produce much housing. It wouldn't address the housing affordability crisis. She encourages the Board to keep the big picture in mind.
- Austin Brown, 10 Belknap St – He is concerned about this plan. It will be a feeding frenzy for developers. The financial incentives right now are such that buildings go up very quickly. Around East Arlington at least one new building has been built, and they usually sell for over a million dollars a unit. On his street, two four-unit townhomes built in the past two or three years. One of those is at half capacity because the front is being held up by two-by-fours. The other is unoccupied, because the builders finished about two-thirds of the work when someone realized that it was built out of compliance with the zoning bylaws and building code. He is concerned that if we give so many incentives to developers, more poor building will happen. If we want to allow a plan like this, we need a much larger Building Department to oversee these large projects. We should put the brakes on this a little bit; we don't need to rush to get it approved now. If we do approve it, the result will be a feeding frenzy leading to shoddy construction.
- Nora Mann, 45 Wollaston Ave, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 20 – She appreciates the work of the Working Group. She supports the Working Group proposal. If we are to continue to live our values of equity and inclusion, we need to tear down the remnants of segregation and exclusion. We need to use a broad range of solutions and many ways that communities can grow in a positive and constructive and inclusive manner. We might consider this an opportunity to address more specifically requirements that would be focused on mitigating environmental impacts. We need to consider the political realities of getting this passed at Town Meeting. Her fellow Town Meeting Members will want to hear options.
- Stephen Weil, 35 Bailey Rd – He is a long-term resident of Arlington living in a historic home. If we give the ability to developers to just buy up properties that go up for sale, the developers will be more concerned about profit than anything else. He has made many changes to a home that was built before the Revolutionary War. Every time that happens, someone is monitoring the work, and he has to present plans to the Historic Board before he can do any work. That won't happen with the development resulting from this plan. Nothing in this proposal speaks to the idea of historical representation for the Town of Arlington. Recent developments only

care about square footage and getting people in, and they sell for over a million dollars. He suggests that the Board get the Historical Commission involved deeply in this process.

- Myles Rush, 255 Mass Ave, Apt 1 – A lot of people in the area have felt the disastrous effects of so many decades of restrictive zoning, which is overdue for a change. He read the full proposal, and he found it to be thoughtful and respectful of the neighborhoods. He also commends the use of modern parking reform, which is showing promising results in areas it's being implemented now. The reason the Working Group did all the outreach work is that many of the community members that plans like this are designed to benefit don't always make it to these meetings and this process; please don't forget about them.
- Grant Cooke, 16 Wollaston – He hopes the Board will support the plan proposed by the Working Group. We have more than the burden imposed by the state. We have the burden of correcting a misstep made 50 years ago, a temporary measure nurtured into the status quo, that made apartments hard to create. Many communities did this, amplifying the problem. It's clear that the outcome was exclusionary. He's heard people describe the current plan as "socially elitist." But the initial banning of building apartments didn't spring from exuberance to strike a blow for the common man, and no amount of time can rehabilitate the original intent or the long-term avoidance of breaking from the path we took. If we had let multi-family housing grow along a natural path, we'd probably have this zone in existence today. Creating an appreciable amount of new housing is the spirit of the law. The governor and legislature don't speak of this as a problem where a few tweaks or half-measures are enough. Some people responded to the initial law by saying to do nothing; now people are asking to do the absolute minimum, to delay for some never-attainable level of analysis, as though we can put a number on how much exclusion is enough, how many children we can wall off. We are ignoring the facts right in front of us of housing scarcity and costs. We are asked to defer to future Boards to act further, ignoring the many years we have chosen to do nothing. We are asked to accept these goals as virtuous and wise, but they are neither. They should be seen as the ghosts of the '70s. I hope the town will act in the spirit of the town as described in decades even further back, where Arlington was described as a growing and welcoming community.
- Peter Fiore, 58 Mott St, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 2 – His concern with the plan is the potential volume of debris sent into the waste stream. 2,000 units of housing could be demolished over the next 50 years. On his street, nine two-family homes have been demolished and replaced by duplex condominiums over the last ten years. Not once did he see anything salvaged or recycled by any of the demolitions. In order to support the plan, he would need a guarantee that these developers would have to dismantle and deconstruct all these buildings, brick by brick and board by board, so that the material is recycled.
- Paul Selker, 24 Central St – He is in full support of the plan. Supply and demand require that for costs to go down, new units must be created. Gradual upzoning, which this plan represents, is a win-win-win. It makes the town more financially sustainable. It's also an exciting opportunity for property owners to add units to their own properties and increase their own wealth. He shares the concern that developers will profit from this plan, and incentives are not always perfect. It is a challenge with no easy answers. He would like to see the Board look at best practices for inducing owners to retain ownership and benefit from the options afforded them by this plan. But the perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. This plan is good, and we should get it done.
- Mark Kaepplein, 11 Palmer – His street is between Broadway and Mass Ave. Tall buildings will not make Mass Ave or Broadway more attractive to walk along. He will be voting against this plan. He said that there are non-profits in favor of higher density and higher population, and half of the Working Group belongs to one of them. A statewide non-profit that is working to push this plan through. The goal is to increase the population in order to preserve congressional house seats in Massachusetts. They'll be voting Democratic. In the 2030 and 2040 censuses and redistricting, Massachusetts will lose seats, unless we can keep up with the population growth of red states. Their success from good policies and low taxes makes them attractive places to live. He values quality of living in Arlington; if he wanted density, he would have moved to Boston or Cambridge or Somerville.
- Adam Auster, 112 Park Ave – Change is hard, especially when it's nearby. But it's been 10 years since the Board recommended to Town Meeting that we adopt a Master Plan that does exactly what this plan does. The idea was that we would build housing along the corridors, which would engender interesting retail districts. The neighborhoods would be left intact, and some pressure would be taken off of them for tear-downs and new housing. It was the product of an extensive public process, and it strikes the right balance. We need to do this,

not only to satisfy the law, but also to satisfy ourselves. He hopes the Board will find some way to tell people who think that density and urban streetscape are bad things that they are exactly the point.

- Marina Popova, 255 Ridge St – Arlington is so dense that it already complies with the MBTA Communities legislation. She doesn't understand why this is even called an MBTA Communities Compliance proposal. It is just a very drastic increase in housing density. The proposal is not about affordability whatsoever. She doesn't understand people saying density is good for climate change, because developers will eliminate as many trees as they can. People buying the new luxury homes will bring their cars, which will increase traffic and CO2 emissions. The community input in this plan was minimal. The survey was replied to by less than 10% of the population. Many others have no idea what's going on. The Board should let the whole population of Arlington vote on the plan.
- Judith Garber, 130 Mass Ave, #2 – She lives in a multi-family house and would not be able to live in Arlington if there were not multi-family homes. She supports the plan. She thinks that the reduced neighborhood district on Mass Ave in East Arlington should be kept as the larger district. That area has the 77 bus and a quick walk to Alewife, so more people should be able to live there. In terms of the question of three- versus four-stories in the neighborhood district, we should consider the impact on accessibility, since the fourth story is the cut-off for when developments have to be made accessible. She wasn't sure if all the affordable units were set at 80% AMI or if some are lower. She asked if the Working Group considered incentives for a lower AMI level, not just more affordable units. She also asked what the Board's commercial zoning study area in the Heights is, and when will Town Meeting know what it is.
- Rachel Curtis, 9 Trowbridge St – She has several concerns about the plan. She is supportive of increasing the units of affordable housing in Arlington, but she is less enthusiastic about what looks like a six-to-one ratio of million-dollar condos to affordable units. It's not clear how this approach will support young, middle-income individuals and families finding reasonably priced housing in Arlington. She is also concerned about the idea that the plan will encourage people to use public transportation and own fewer cars. That's much more likely in a truly high density environment like the one being developed by Alewife. Based on the overnight parking pilot underway, she anticipates that elimination of the overnight parking ban will be the town's response to the lack of parking provided by developers. This means that the side streets of Mass Ave and Broadway will be filled with the cars not only of employees and customers of businesses, as is the current situation, but also new residents who have no off-street parking options. Currently, cars are parked on both sides of her street all day, making it hard to drive down the street, especially for emergency vehicles. This will get much worse. Developers need to share a greater share of the burden of parking demands. The fact that Arlington is both hurrying this process to meet the deadline of the fossil fuel ban pilot program and submitting a plan that vastly over-complies with the state requirement should concern us all. Any decision to go far beyond the state's mandate should be accompanied by a more rigorous inquiry and deliberate process.
- Daniel Scarnecchia, 73 Water St – He is in support of this proposal. If Town Meeting needs alternatives, he would urge the Board to go further. Greater density has a quarter of the emissions of lower density housing. He's heard concerns about the schools, climate, and traffic, but consider what happens over the long term if towns don't build new housing. Being in compliance with the bare minimum doesn't add housing. Younger folks are not going to be able to afford to stay. They'll need to move further out, which means they'll need buy second cars to commute to their jobs. The community will gray as a result. Over the short term, property values will increase, but over the long term, as the community grays and the tax base shrinks, the schools will have fewer children and start falling apart because there won't be enough people to pay the taxes to support them. He urged the Board to think about the benefits of increased density. It will mean that younger people can stay, pay taxes, and support businesses. It means that the children and grandchildren of residents can stay and buy in and be here over the longer term, instead of having the community dwindle and perhaps become a shell of its former self.
- Andrew Greenspon, 89 Palmer St – He is in full support of the plan and wishes it were even bolder. He has two friends who have a toddler, who is one of the Arlingtonians who will hopefully be here in 50 years, if they can find a unit to live in. They do not live in or own a single family home, which is what most of Arlington is zoned for. They also don't live in a duplex, which is the next largest zoning category. They live in a two-bedroom unit in one of the few multi-family apartment buildings in town, close to the 77 bus and commercial centers. They love

Arlington and are hoping to buy a property, but there's not enough regional housing stock, especially smaller units that would exist in multi-family zones and be cheaper than most homes in the single-family and duplex zones. This proposal begins a process that will help people like them. It won't be tomorrow, but it's a start. They didn't know about this proposal either, but when they read it, they thought it made complete sense. Arlington has many community members who live in multi-family housing, ranging from triple-deckers to four-story and even eight-story buildings on Mass Ave that existed before the 1970s exclusionary zoning. The residents in those types of homes have every right to be here and contribute as much to the community as anyone who lives in a single-family house. He would love to have more such people be able to live here to make Arlington more diverse. From his understanding, compared to every zoning amendment in recent history in Arlington, this process has been one of the longest, most transparent, with the most outreach to community members that has happened. It's been over eight months with multiple drafts posted every week on the town website. This doesn't mean that everyone knows about it, but it means a large sample of residents have given perspectives to inform this proposal. When he runs into people who haven't heard of it and explains it, many of them broadly state their support. He hopes the Working Group and Board can answer many of people's questions and address their concerns in the coming weeks.

- Aram Hollman, 12 Whittemore St, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 6 – He said that he can explain why the Working Group decided on a rezoning that created three and a half times the housing capacity that the state required. That requires stating the guidelines that really apply to the Working Group, not the ones they told us. The guidelines are: 1) build housing that is as expensive as possible, 2) provide a politically necessary façade of affordability, 3) do not touch the R1 district. The reason to build expensive housing is that Arlington is competing with other towns for high-income individuals, who will pay without complaint the rapidly rising taxes that apply to Arlington housing. As a corollary, that will drive out lower income individuals. Arlington prides itself on being progressive, diverse, and liberal. A token degree of affordability is necessary to preserve Arlington's desired self-image. The R1 district is not to be touched because it is wealthier and more politically powerful. Hence the decision to rezone only what are the densest portions of town, which are less affluent and politically powerful. The Working Group discussed the fact that by upzoning denser areas, the net increase in capacity would be considerably less and could even be negative. Despite that, they continued to decide to do that. The results of this rezoning will be perverse, the opposite of what is intended. It will be high-end, high-cost housing, uniformity instead of diversity, and green instead of green space.
- Nicholas Kriketos, 80 Orvis Rd – He is concerned with the proposed plan, but he's more concerned with the communication about it. He has not received any communications; he did receive the one postcard. He understands that we need to meet the obligations of equity and of the state, but we've gone beyond what's allowed and what's expected of us. It doesn't make sense to compare ourselves to other towns with different tax systems. The cost of this plan will be on the backs of its current taxpayers in the highly dense residential system we have. He is also concerned about the services Arlington offers. There are already troubles keeping up with the school system, with the Department of Public Works, allowing them to do their jobs effectively. The property across from the high school that was recently redesigned has no green space to speak of, and no curb appeal. He appreciates the work that the Working Group has done, but he encourages them to go back to the drawing board.
- Kristin Anderson, 12 Upland Rd, Town Meeting Member – She runs a business in the industrial zone in the Heights. She has attended every Working Group meeting since May, and she can attest that the Planning Department, the consultant Utile, and the Working Group have expended a significant effort in creating the housing plan for the town. Arlington needs zoning for new housing. The current iteration of the new plan achieves that, and it has many good ideas that are worth supporting. However, this has been a planning effort without input from Arlington's Director of Economic Development, as that position has remained unfilled throughout the process. The Director of Economic Development is a crucial seat at Town Hall, especially at a time when changes are being proposed that will affect the future of our town. The plan requires two key improvements: protection for all the town's businesses and allowance for future commercial growth. Arlington needs commercial space for services important to our residents. Businesses provide local jobs and make Arlington a town worth living in; they make our neighborhoods more walkable and reduce reliance on cars. She asks that all existing businesses be protected in this plan and that all parcels where Arlington's businesses exist be removed from the plan. This is important for existing businesses and future commercial growth.

- John Worden, Jason St – This plan has too many problems to address in two minutes. Calling it the MBTA Communities plan is ironic because MBTA service has been cut to an all-time low. Most people in Arlington can't even get to Alewife station, yet we're being punished for having it here. If implemented, the plan would basically destroy Arlington as we know it. It would create waste and heat islands. We should require that all new buildings not be heated by fossil fuels. We should require green space. He's been a Town Meeting member for 53 years, and if these articles come to Town Meeting, it will be the worst thing that he has encountered in his tenure at Town Meeting.
- Kiernan Matthews, 13 Highland Ave – He lives in a two-family home in the Neighborhood sub-district. He has read the full proposal and attended the July 25 public meeting, and he supports the proposal. He asks that the ARB and viewers not let this room mislead them into believing that the majority of Arlington residents are represented in this room. For many families likely to support this plan, coming to three-hour Monday night meeting is a hardship or a nonstarter. As he looks around the room, he does not see the many faces that he and his fellow volunteers deliver groceries to for Arlington EATS. This room is not representative of all of Arlington. No one has put more thought into this than the Working Group. No one talking about this with their friends has consulted more stakeholders and heard more diverse voices than the Working Group. This has been a remarkably inclusive process. For Town Meeting, he'd like the maps to include the entire bounds of the Town of Arlington in order to represent an actual visual proportion of the proposed changes. This is an incremental change, and it is much smaller than the original proposal, and it is a compromise. Perhaps the alternative to Town Meeting could show what an R1 zoning for multi-family would look like. He encourages the Working Group or the Board to note the most misleading and alarmist statements shared tonight and to supply all Town Meeting Members with a plain-spoken Q&A that addresses such misunderstandings for the red herrings that they are.
- Gordon Jamieson, 163 Scituate, Town Meeting Member, Precinct 12, Chair of the Board of Assessors – He thanked everyone for their hard work. He attended the July 25 session and heard similar comments on both sides of the issue. He's read the whole proposal and thinks it's an excellent final compromise. It reflects the smart growth reflected in the Master Plan that he voted for 10 or 12 years ago. He prefers Alternative 1 in the Heights and wants to remind the Board that four stories requires an elevator. At the last meeting, there was a lot of discussion about 10-foot vs 15-foot setbacks. Attendees were told that 15 feet was required for street trees, but not by the Tree Warden, and the Working Group adopted a 15-foot setback. He wants clarification about what a 15-foot setback means. The business district has a zero setback, but buildings are not at the curb. Is it 15 feet from the curb or the from the sidewalk? If it's from the sidewalk, then there's an additional 6 or so feet to the curb, meaning a 15-foot setback is really over 20 feet from the curb. Since a tree only needs 15 feet, he would encourage the Board to reconsider the 10-foot setback originally proposed by the Working Group.
- Matthew Weigang, 276 Mass Ave, Apt 132 – Walk down any street, and you'll find endless rows of homes, each with a family that likely raised kids. Children don't stay that way for long, and there haven't been commensurate homes built for these children for when they become adults. When economic supply and demand curves intersect, it sets the price of a good. The decision of Arlington residents to raise families without a commensurate expansion in the supply of housing that will be demanded by the adult children of those families establishes the price of housing to be exorbitantly high. For many goods, consumers can simply elect not to purchase something expensive. But for housing, the adult children of these families have no choice except to pay whatever price the supply and demand curves intersect at. This cost can be pervasive in destroying a person's ability to live out a reasonable life. He arrived in Arlington in 2015, working for Armstrong Ambulance as an EMT for \$13.20 an hour. He was performing a vital service for the town's welfare and safety, and his rent for a mediocre for a one-bedroom basement apartment in East Arlington was \$1,320. Even when he was working over 40 hours a week, over half of his take-home pay was going to some of the most modest single person housing he could find. It is unconscionable for this situation to have been allowed to develop. He lost all social mobility because it took all his time and money just to buy the next week of his life. His entire contribution to society has been utterly curtailed from what it could have been because of housing costs. He urges the Board to go as big as they can, with as much new construction as they can get people to build.
- Bob Radochio, 45 Winter St, Town Meeting Member – He's lived in town for 83 years. He's been trying to read the details of this plan, but he finds it very confusing and self-contradictory. He thinks it would be easier to read

War and Peace than to go through this. He asked what the default or backup plan is if Town Meeting should reject this.

The Chair closed public comment at 10:00 pm. She paused the meeting while asking a police officer to come remove people who were causing a disturbance.

The Chair re-opened the meeting.

Mr. Lau said he heard a lot of thoughtful and heartfelt comments. He said that the Board would try to address the issues raised as much as they can by putting all the questions in a matrix along with the Board's responses, which they would make public.

Mr. Benson also said that he appreciates all the comments, and all the many emails and letters that they've received. He's read every one that the Board received before 5:00 today. He encouraged those who weren't able to speak tonight to email.

Mr. Benson heard some of the comments as people wishing that we could do more on climate or green buildings. He wishes that too, but the Board is constrained by the state law. However, the Town passed the Stretch Code at the Spring 2023 Town Meeting, so all buildings built in town will be built to very high environmental and climate standards. Many people also made comments about affordable housing. Our current bylaws require one affordable unit at 60% of AMI for each six units that are built in a project. The Town is going to have to convince the state that this is economically feasible, because the state affordable housing requirement has only been 10%, while Arlington has had a higher requirement for a long time. He does hope that more affordable units will be built because of this plan. He appreciates all the work that the Working Group did. He thinks that stretching out the districts along Mass Ave and Broadway creates something environmentally friendly and walkable, which he thinks is in keeping with the spirit of many of the plans of the Town and trying to make the Town as environmentally sustainable as possible.

Mr. Revilak responded to the question of what happens if Town Meeting doesn't pass it. The reason for the current schedule is that in 2020, Town Meeting adopted a warrant article that authorized the filing of a home rule petition that would enable Arlington to ban fossil fuel hookups in new development. Ten cities and towns passed similar things, and rather than granting each of the petitions individually, the state created a pilot program, in which 10 communities would have the opportunity to enact such a ban. In order to qualify to be one of those 10 communities, towns and cities have to qualify in one of two ways: they must have 10% of their housing on the Subsidized Housing Inventory, which Arlington is not even close to, or they must adopt a multi-family district in compliance with the MBTA Communities Act before the fossil fuel ban pilot program. Given the time constraints, the Working Group discussed whether they could do a good enough job to get something adopted in time. They decided that since Town Meeting had created a mandate to move toward a fossil fuel ban, they had a responsibility to Town Meeting to bring something forward in time to qualify for the deadline. He thinks that because Town Meeting made the decision that led to the timeline of this project, Town Meeting should be the ones to decide to delay the project if they choose. Arlington is not required to comply with the MBTA Communities Act until the end of 2024. If Town Meeting feels that this plan is not ready, they can take no action or vote it down and have another year to work on it.

Mr. Benson said that the current Working Group proposal affects 109.1 acres of the town, which has a total of 3,517.5 acres. That's about 0.3% of the town being affected by the plan. It will be a transformation along Mass Ave and Broadway and just off those corridors. At the Board's request, the Working Group did not put any commercially zoned parcels into the plan, in order to preserve the commercially zoned parcels. In addition, the plan allows developers to build mixed-use buildings on Mass Ave and Broadway, with commercial space or offices on the ground floor. So not only are they protecting all the areas currently zoned commercial or industrial, but they are also incentivizing the creation of new, hopefully more modern commercial spaces on those corridors.

The Chair noted that DPCD and MBTA Communities would be present at Town Day (September 23) with information about the plan. Town Day is before the Board will deliberate and vote on October 2.

The Chair listed items that need to be discussed by the Board, some of which may need more research or information:

- Evaluate the SITES rating standard and whether Certifiable or Certified is what they feel is appropriate for a bonus.
- Further discuss parking and whether the inclusion of a parking maximum rather than our existing parking minimums is a new standard that the Board would like to introduce.
- Discuss affordable housing, specifically the Subsidized Housing Inventory requirements, the rounding up on any percentage, and the recommended percentage increases for the two bonus floors to 22.5% and 25%.
- Ensure that the plan includes language regarding the combination of lots, so the Board can preemptively address situations where one parcel is in the overlay district and one is not.
- Review the Site Plan Review requirements. It may be missing information around the number of representatives needed to vote in favor to approve.
- Discuss the list of dimensional controls that were identified for elimination.
- Arlington’s zoning bylaw does not currently have a definition of multi-family housing. It is defined in Mass General Law. Since the warrant article references multi-family housing, so it needs to be added to the definitions section of the zoning bylaw.
- Discuss whether to exclude the parcels east of Orvis on Mass Ave for a business district rezoning, as they have excluded similar parcels in Arlington Heights, which will be discussed in the spring as part of the Arlington Heights Business District review. The Board’s original intent was to begin with Arlington Heights and then address East Arlington soon thereafter.
- Discuss the neighborhood sub-district, specifically whether the Board recommends a three- or four-story maximum.
- Ensure that the solar bylaw section required under EDR is referenced in this overlay district so that it applies to the buildings in the overlay. The Board also needs to decide whether that applies just to Mass Ave and Broadway or also the neighborhood sub-districts.
- Decide how the setbacks on corner lots should work.
- Review the map to decide whether to exclude properties that are on the list of historic properties in the town of Arlington, and whether to exclude churches.
- Decide between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2.

Mr. Revilak said that the Working Group’s rationale for not having parking minimums is that developers will provide some parking, because they need that to get funding, but the Working Group didn’t want to over-require parking.

The Chair noted that much of this will be discussed in deliberation on October 2, but this evening, she would like to identify if the Board wants to request any information from the Working Group, DPCD, or Utile, so that the Board is fully prepared for deliberation on October 2.

Mr. Revilak identified three pieces of information needed:

- What is the change in capacity if the parcels on Mass Ave east of Orvis Road are removed?
- What is the change in capacity if the neighborhood sub-district height limit is reduced from four to three stories?
- What is the change in capacity if the minimum parking requirement is one space per dwelling unit versus none?

The Chair noted that if the parcels on Mass Ave east of Orvis are removed, parcels behind those would need to be added in order to keep the district contiguous.

Mr. Littell said that he would provide the answers to those three questions.

Mr. Benson has some wording concerns that are not substantive, and he will share them later. The Chair said that if any Board members have edits or changes to the language of the warrant article, they should send them to both her and Ms. Ricker, who will make sure they are tracked so that a copy with the proposed changes can be reviewed at the October 2 meeting.

The Chair said that she would write up all the questions asked during public comment and share them with the Board, Working Group, and DPCD to compile answers.

Mr. Lau proposed a meeting with the Working Group to address the questions raised in public comment.

Mr. Benson said that they have too many things to discuss to fit them all into the deliberation on October 2, and he thinks the Board will need another meeting between now and October 2. The Chair said that another date is not available. She asked if he would like to start any of the discussion this evening but noted that they need the new capacity calculations for some of the discussions.

Mr. Benson said that they could discuss some of the issues that would result in capacity changes, and their decision would determine what specific capacity numbers they needed. Mr. Lau said that he would like to see the capacity numbers before discussing those issues, because the plan is so carefully balanced right now that making one small change could change the whole map. He'd like to know what that effect is first.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue the public hearing for the warrant articles for Fall 2023 Special Town Meeting to Monday, September 18, 2023. Mr. Lau so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The board voted and approved unanimously.

The Chair said that the Board needs to add a meeting between October 2 and the start of Town Meeting on October 17, at which the Board can review and approve the Redevelopment Board's Report to Town Meeting. She proposed Tuesday, October 10. The Board members said they could attend on that day, and the Chair asked to have the final decision about that meeting placed on the September 18 agenda.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The board voted and approved unanimously.

Meeting **Adjourned** at 10:38 pm.