

# Report on the July 2023 MBTA Communities Survey

MBTA Communities Working Group

August 29, 2023

## Background

The multi-family housing requirements for MBTA communities come from Massachusetts General Law Chapter 40A Section 3A, (“Section 3A”) which was enacted in 2021. The law requires each MBTA Community (as defined in General Law 161A, Section 1) to provide at least one zoning district where multi-family housing (three or more dwellings) is allowed by right. The district must permit housing with at least 15 dwelling units per gross acre, these dwelling units cannot be age restricted, and the district must allow housing that’s suitable for families with children. Communities may create several sub-districts, but each must be at least five acres in size.

In August 2022 the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development released their final guidance governing Section 3A, which contained specific requirements for each of the 175 MBTA Communities in Massachusetts, including Arlington.<sup>1</sup> The Arlington-specific requirements are

- a minimum district capacity of 2,046 dwelling units,
- a minimum district size of 32 acres, and
- no constraints that the district (or districts) be located a certain distance from transit stations.

While the intent of the law was to have districts located near transit, Arlington has little developable land in the vicinity of the Alewife T station, and the state’s guidance takes this fact into consideration.

Arlington’s Department of Planning and Community Development held public forums about the new zoning requirements in November 2022 and March 2023. During the months of March and April 2023, the MBTA Communities Working Group ran a survey to gather public input and to understand the community’s values regarding what a multi-family district should look like in Arlington. 1033 people responded to the survey, including 2,325 comments from 506 distinct individuals.<sup>2</sup> This feedback helped shape the first iteration of district maps, which were presented at a public forum, held on June 8th.<sup>3</sup> While the June 8th forum was well-attended (over 125 attendees), the MBTA Communities Working Group wanted to provide participation options for residents who were unable to attend the event in person. To that end, the Working Group created a second survey, based on group activity materials used during the June 8th meeting.<sup>4</sup> This survey ran from June 12 through July 17, 2023, garnering 549 comments from 213 respondents. The Working Group also set up a display table in the front room of the Robbins Library, where library patrons could learn about these efforts, leave sticky notes on a map, and write comments in a notebook. This report presents public comments received via the second survey, and the Robbins Library display table.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/multi-family-zoning-requirement-for-mbta-communities>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/65987/638236619962500000>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/66177/638253545770100000>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/65760/638219201448730000>

## Feedback Received from the Second Survey

This section provides a high-level summary of feedback received from the second survey's three questions. There is a topical analysis of comments in Appendix A, and Appendix B contains the comments themselves. Feedback received from the Robbins Library display table appears in Appendix C.

Question #1 asked "What size/scale buildings are right for Arlington, and where should we allow for these different sized buildings?" The locations receiving the most support were along Mass Ave and Broadway; other locations cited were near Alewife and along Pleasant St. There was support for six-unit and larger apartment buildings, and for building heights of around 3-5 stories.

These results are generally consistent with the various map iterations produced so far. The draft maps have followed a corridor approach centered around Mass Ave and Broadway, a by-right height of four stories, and options to go to five stories on parcels abutting Broadway and six stories on Mass Ave via bonuses and incentives. While the six-story maximum is higher than preferences expressed in the survey, members of the Working Group felt this was an appropriate height for Mass Ave given the width of the street, and numerous existing buildings that are six stories or taller. The Working Group has also preferred allowing four stories by right, since buildings of this height require elevators and can provide an opportunity for seniors to age in place.

Question #2 asked "How should our MBTA Communities Districts relate to our commercial and industrial districts?". The strongest points of agreement favored placing new multi-family housing near commercial districts, along with preserving the commercial districts themselves. A point of disagreement involved the question of whether to put multi-family housing *in* the commercial districts. Of the respondents that mentioned "in commercial districts" the ratio of support to opposition was nearly 2:1. Similarly, among respondents that mentioned "in industrial districts", positive and negative sentiments were almost evenly matched. Responses to Question #2 also showed support for mixed-use buildings, with housing above ground-floor commercial.

Members of the MBTA Communities Working Group feel that we've gotten a clear direction from the Arlington Redevelopment Board with regard to excluding business- and industrially-zoned parcels from the multi-family district, and each of the maps produced has adhered to this directive. The proposed multi-family districts have been located in general proximity to the business districts, with the goals of allowing residents to access these amenities without a car and providing more foot traffic for businesses. Additionally, the Working Group has recommended bonuses for the inclusion of ground-floor commercial (i.e., mixed use buildings) on parcels abutting Mass Ave and Broadway. Prior to August 17, 2023, communities were not allowed to require mixed-use with ground-floor commercial but were permitted to incentivize it. While that recent change in the guidance may provide communities with more flexibility in this area, the Working Group has chosen to focus on areas of Town where it felt incentives for mixed-use was the most appropriate strategy.

Question #3 asked "What additional comments do you have for us?". This was an open-ended question with a wide range of answers. The most common themes focused on the need for affordable housing and the need to improve transit (each was mentioned in approximately 7% of the responses to question #3). There were divided opinions on whether to strive for minimum compliance, and some opposition to

placing the multi-family district in existing neighborhoods. Finally, there were concerns about traffic, parking, more residents, and more students.

Throughout our various outreach and public engagement efforts, the Working Group has heard generally broad support for a proposal that helps to address the region's housing shortage in a meaningful way, rather than doing the bare minimum. However, we understand this is a point of debate that will likely continue up to (and including) Town Meeting. We also recognize that the question of whether to place the multi-family district in residentially- or commercially-zoned districts is also a point of debate. Members of the working group have heard broader support for avoiding existing commercial districts. Balancing that with the community's desire for housing in proximity to commercial districts, the Working Group recommends multi-family housing in the adjacent residential areas. We believe this is a "smart-growth" approach that can encourage non-automotive trips, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled and transportation-related emissions.

## **Appendix A - Comment Analysis**

The June/July MBTA Communities survey contained three questions, and respondents were free to answer them in any way they chose – some responses were short and concise while others were lengthy and detailed. There were 549 distinct comments from 213 survey respondents.

Members of the working group coded these comments to identify (a) preferences, concepts, and ideas that respondents were expressing, and (b) whether the preference, concept, or idea was being expressed in a positive or negative manner. Comments that expressed multiple preferences, concepts, and ideas generated multiple codes. Coding allowed us to perform a more quantitative analysis of the public comments and identify a set of general themes for each question. Questions (1) and (2) were fairly specific, and comments were only coded to the extent that they were responsive to what was being asked. This constraint was not applied to question (3), which was much more open-ended.

This Appendix summarizes the main themes from the responses to the survey. The codings have a “long tail”, with many of the themes being raised by a single respondent. Consequently, this analysis only includes items that were mentioned two or more times. Appendix B contains the comments themselves.

# Q1: What size / scale buildings are right for Arlington? And where should we allow for these different sized buildings?

(193 responses)

| Theme                      | Positive(+) | Negative(-) |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| along mass ave             | 30          | 3           |
| 6 units                    | 25          | 0           |
| along broadway             | 20          | 0           |
| 3 stories                  | 16          | 0           |
| 4 stories                  | 13          | 2           |
| larger apartments          | 6           | 3           |
| 3 units                    | 8           | 0           |
| 4-5 stories                | 7           | 0           |
| near alewife               | 7           | 0           |
| 3-4 stories                | 5           | 1           |
| 3-5 stories                | 6           | 0           |
| 5 stories                  | 4           | 2           |
| 5 stories along mass ave   | 6           | 0           |
| along pleasant st          | 6           | 0           |
| 3-4 stories along mass ave | 5           | 0           |
| 2 stories                  | 4           | 0           |
| 3 stories in neighborhoods | 4           | 0           |
| 3-4 stories along broadway | 4           | 0           |
| 4 stories along mass ave   | 4           | 0           |
| 4-5 stories along mass ave | 4           | 0           |
| in commercial districts    | 3           | 1           |
| near mass ave              | 4           | 0           |
| near transportation        | 4           | 0           |
| town houses                | 4           | 0           |
| 2-3 stories                | 3           | 0           |
| 3-4 units in neighborhoods | 3           | 0           |
| 5 stories along broadway   | 3           | 0           |
| 6-12 units                 | 3           | 0           |
| along summer st            | 3           | 0           |
| in dense areas             | 1           | 2           |
| in east arlington          | 1           | 2           |

| <b>Theme</b>                  | <b>Positive(+)</b> | <b>Negative(-)</b> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| in neighborhoods              | 0                  | 3                  |
| preserve commercial districts | 3                  | 0                  |
| preserve solar access         | 3                  | 0                  |
| 10 stories                    | 2                  | 0                  |
| 12 units                      | 2                  | 0                  |
| 3 units in neighborhoods      | 2                  | 0                  |
| 3-4 stories in neighborhoods  | 2                  | 0                  |
| 4-5 stories along broadway    | 2                  | 0                  |
| 4-5 stories on mass ave       | 2                  | 0                  |
| 4-6 stories along mass ave    | 2                  | 0                  |
| 4-6 units                     | 2                  | 0                  |
| 5 stories along warren st     | 2                  | 0                  |
| 5-6 stories                   | 2                  | 0                  |
| 6 stories                     | 2                  | 0                  |
| broader area                  | 2                  | 0                  |
| different sizes               | 2                  | 0                  |
| everywhere in arlington       | 2                  | 0                  |
| in arlington heights          | 1                  | 1                  |
| in residential neighborhoods  | 1                  | 1                  |
| mixed-use                     | 2                  | 0                  |
| near broadway                 | 2                  | 0                  |
| near minuteman                | 2                  | 0                  |
| near route 2                  | 2                  | 0                  |
| step down in neighborhoods    | 2                  | 0                  |

The following table summarizes height preferences, independent of any location given. Ranges were broken out into individual story heights. For example, a preference of “3-5 stories” was translated into a preference for three stories, a preference for four stories, and a preference for five stories.

| <b>Height</b> | <b>Positive(+)</b> | <b>Negative(-)</b> |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 2 stories     | 7                  | 0                  |
| 3 stories     | 47                 | 1                  |
| 4 stories     | 60                 | 3                  |
| 5 stories     | 40                 | 2                  |
| 6 stories     | 4                  | 0                  |
| 10 stories    | 2                  | 0                  |

## Q2: How should our MBTA Communities Districts relate to our commercial and industrial districts?

(180 responses)

| Theme                         | Positive(+) | Negative(-) |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| in commercial districts       | 27          | 14          |
| near commercial districts     | 37          | 1           |
| preserve commercial districts | 36          | 0           |
| mixed-use                     | 30          | 2           |
| in industrial districts       | 14          | 13          |
| preserve industrial districts | 11          | 0           |
| expand commercial districts   | 8           | 0           |
| above one-story commercial    | 7           | 0           |
| above ground-floor commercial | 5           | 0           |
| between commercial centers    | 5           | 0           |
| preserve business districts   | 5           | 0           |
| in business districts         | 1           | 2           |
| near industrial districts     | 3           | 0           |
| in central business district  | 0           | 2           |
| outside commercial districts  | 2           | 0           |
| outside industrial districts  | 2           | 0           |
| provide customers             | 2           | 0           |
| support commercial districts  | 2           | 0           |

### Q3: What additional comments do you have for us?

(176 responses)

| Theme                               | Positive(+) | Negative(-) |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| affordable housing                  | 12          | 1           |
| improve transit                     | 13          | 0           |
| minimum compliance                  | 7           | 5           |
| in neighborhoods                    | 1           | 10          |
| along broadway                      | 10          | 0           |
| draft maps                          | 5           | 3           |
| along mass ave                      | 5           | 2           |
| near alewife                        | 6           | 1           |
| near transit                        | 6           | 1           |
| density                             | 2           | 4           |
| parking minimums                    | 2           | 4           |
| traffic                             | 0           | 6           |
| bigger area                         | 5           | 0           |
| green space                         | 5           | 0           |
| more students                       | 0           | 5           |
| in commercial districts             | 1           | 3           |
| more residents                      | 0           | 4           |
| commercial in residential districts | 3           | 0           |
| displacement                        | 0           | 3           |
| front setbacks                      | 3           | 0           |
| larger apartments                   | 1           | 2           |
| mbta communities                    | 0           | 3           |
| mbta communities working group      | 0           | 3           |
| 15% affordable                      | 2           | 0           |
| 6 units                             | 2           | 0           |
| along medford st                    | 2           | 0           |
| along summer st                     | 2           | 0           |
| clarify maps                        | 2           | 0           |
| ensure adequate parking             | 2           | 0           |
| expand business districts           | 2           | 0           |
| explain regulations                 | 2           | 0           |
| heat islands                        | 0           | 2           |
| in 2 family neighborhoods           | 0           | 2           |

| <b>Theme</b>                  | <b>Positive(+)</b> | <b>Negative(-)</b> |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| in dense areas                | 0                  | 2                  |
| limit to mass ave             | 0                  | 2                  |
| mixed-use                     | 2                  | 0                  |
| more businesses               | 2                  | 0                  |
| more housing                  | 1                  | 1                  |
| near minuteman                | 2                  | 0                  |
| near parks                    | 2                  | 0                  |
| nimbyism                      | 0                  | 2                  |
| on-street parking             | 0                  | 2                  |
| pass compliant district       | 2                  | 0                  |
| pollution                     | 0                  | 2                  |
| preserve commercial districts | 2                  | 0                  |
| preserve community character  | 2                  | 0                  |
| preserve industrial districts | 2                  | 0                  |
| small town feel               | 2                  | 0                  |
| sustainable transit           | 2                  | 0                  |
| take more time                | 2                  | 0                  |
| tree canopy                   | 2                  | 0                  |
| urban canyons                 | 0                  | 2                  |
| wider district along mass ave | 2                  | 0                  |

## Appendix B - Survey Responses

This section contains the answers submitted to each survey question. We include these for completeness, and to provide an opportunity for members of the community to see what their fellow residents have said.

### Q1: What size / scale buildings are right for Arlington? And where should we allow for these different sized buildings?

| # | Size and scale of buildings  |
|---|--|
| 1 | 6-12 units, to allow for IZ affordable units. While 12+ would be great for IZ, this might create too much population density in one area.  |
| 2 | I am happy with 3,4,5 story buildings with the caveat that the stories above three be set back some. I'd also really like a little bit of setback at the sidewalk if that is at all possible. Or maybe just inset doors, something to make it a little less wall-like.   |
| 3 | I think multi-family housing with ~3-6 units per parcel would fit best with Arlington's current density/low building heights. More than that likely won't fit well on existing parcel sizes without building too high for our town.  |
| 4 | Along the subdistricts, I think mixed use mid-rises would be great.  |
| 5 | Six-plexes for affordable housing.   |
| 6 | We need to significantly increase density along Mass Ave and Broadway. We should not be afraid of buildings 10+ stories in some key places along these routes.   |
| 7 | No higher than three stories. Arlington should mostly build housing that can fit families of four people. Side by side situations (like townhouses) work best for most families. In the centers (Capitol, Center and Heights) we could allow for the elevator buildings with smaller apartments for childless people and older people. |

| #  | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|----|--|
| 8  | <p>The built-in premise of the Working Group, that the only thing that matters is where the high-density district(s) go, entirely ignores the other zoning issues that are far more critical to Arlington.</p> <p>The 3A guidelines almost entirely ignore the uniqueness and variation among MBTA communities that make them unique. Beyond the different degrees of “adjacency” to MBTA train and subway stops, it is a largely “one size fits all”, which ignores what is best for individual communities and imposes “build build build” requirements which will continue to drive up the cost of housing and which will primarily benefit real estate developers.</p> <p>Examples: Arlington needs more affordable housing, not more market-rate housing. Since Arlington is built out, almost all new construction in these high-density districts will require the purchase and demolition of existing residences, for a substantial construction premium that will large cancel out, if not entirely overwhelm, the reduced per-unit land cost that comes with higher density. Ditto, the simple fact that, by definition new construction is far more expensive than existing housing supply. Why should any developer even bother to contemplate such an expensive proposition unless he/she can charge top dollar for housing? It is entirely possible that few if any new units will result, because even the cost of the units to be demolished is so high.</p> <p>Meanwhile, 3A prohibits more than 10% affordable.</p> <p>Arlington needs more commercial/industrial growth to increase the share of the property tax levy that comes from business/commercial (roughly 4-5% both 25 years ago and now). Those property owners have been waiting for decades to be allowed to build on their property. Arlington’s mistake is in allowing that, in failing to firmly tell them, “it’s your land, but it’s going to be business”. And the Economic Development and Planning Dept. hasn’t lifted a finger to facilitate business there.</p> <p>Arlington needs to get off fossil fuels. 3A prohibits get-off-fossil-fuel measures in high-density districts. Ironically, those communities that comply -may- be eligible to join a statewide pilot of a fossil fuel program intended to accomplish exactly what 3A prohibits.</p> |
| 9  | No greater than 4-unit buildings along Mass Ave. Up to 6-unit buildings along Broadway and in East Arlington.  |
| 10 | Arlington should remain a suburb and not transform into an urban space. I’d like to see 3-family zoning replacing 2-family zoning rather than the greater upzoning that our planning department seems to favor. East Arlington within 3/4 of a mile of Alewife seems like the best place for the upzoning. Overbuilding on congested Mass Ave and pretending that the infrequent, overcrowded 77 bus qualifies as dependable mass transit is a mistake.  |
| 11 | I am in favor of four-story buildings with elevators.  |
| 12 | large apartment buildings of 6+ units (ideally 12+) along existing commercial routes of Mass Ave and Broadway with particular focus on Capital Square and Arlington Center areas as they are already meant for this and would support local economy  |
| 13 | 4-6 unit buildings within 1/4 mile of Mass Avenue and larger 4 story apartment buildings in the residential areas of Mass Avenue and Broadway (not in the 3 centers)   |

| #  | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|----|--|
| 14 | Multi-family dwellings should be located on Mass Ave, Broadway, Pleasant St (near Mystic intersection) even Summer Street - scale should not exceed 4 stories, we are not Cambridge.   |
| 15 | I prefer smaller multi-family homes - 3 and 4 deckers, along with 3-5 story row houses and apartment complexes. I also like the design some larger apartment complexes in the Mass Ave Corridor, particularly the buildings at 135, 206 (Capitol Theatre), 224, 230, 252, 260, 287, 389, 661 (Associates Block) and 840 Mass Ave.  |
| 16 | I'd prefer buildings that are (a) large enough to trigger inclusionary zoning, (b) large enough to trigger passive house requirements in the enhanced stretch code, and (c) tall enough to need an elevator. For Arlington's context, five stories is a good height (though my personal preference would be for much taller buildings).  |
| 17 | <p>(1) My favorite recent housing developments in Arlington are the townhouses at Mass Ave and Mill Street and just north of the bike path near Buzzell Field. They are attractive and well built, complement the surrounding housing stock, don't overwhelm regular houses with their scale or height, and seem to be owned by the people who live in them rather than greedy landlords. By the bike path between the Center and the Heights, there is tons more under-used industrial land that seems ripe this kind of housing development of clusters of 2-family, 2-story town houses.</p> <p>(2) The stretch of Mass Ave between Stop and Shop and Dunkin is pretty dismal. It would make so much sense to replace the empty parking lots, single-story semi-occupied buildings, and a maybe one or two of the 8 jillion gas stations with three- or four-story apartment buildings. Similarly, Arlington Heights itself has a lot of really run-down unoccupied single-story commercial property that could be replaced with a three-story building with businesses on the ground floor.</p> <p>(3) We should limit the rest of Arlington Center and Arlington Heights to single and two-family houses, the way it is more or less right now. There are already more than enough opportunities for large projects on Mass Ave and in that area between the bike path and Mass Ave. We do not need to open up Paul Revere, for instance, to multi-family housing. It's already mostly two-family houses occupied by families and empty nesters (other than the new two-family buildings that the developers are starting to throw up).</p> |
| 18 | Rolling building elevation along Mass Ave and Broadway with short spurs/extensions at major intersections (Park, Brattle, Pleasant/Mystic, Lake). Highest elevations at Mass/Pleasant ... Middle plus at Mass/Park, Mass/Lake and surroundings ... Middle minus at Brattle/Mass, Highland/Mass ... Lowest in between those areas and along Broadway  |

| #  | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|----|--|
| 19 | <p>I have no problem with 4 and 5 story multi-family buildings in Arlington, but they need to include some restrictions so developers don't have 100% free rein to build whatever they want. Specifically, we need to require that street-front trees be preserved and that set-backs from the street are maintained to allow for some green space. With climate change and the increasing issue of "heat islands", we need to preserve trees and green space.</p> <p>I also have an issue with the exclusion of the Jason / Academy / Pleasant streets area from the new zoning. I know that portions of these streets are designated as historic, but we can still create new multi-family housing while staying within historic guidelines. For instance, it may be possible to convert houses on Jason or Academy Street to multi-family dwellings while maintaining the historic exterior. This area fits the walkability / transit access requirements perfectly, and it sends a really bad message to the rest of our town when the wealthiest area of town is excluded from having to do their part in alleviating our housing shortage.</p> |
| 20 | <p>For the locations proposed in the draft map (and similar areas along major corridors &amp; commercial/industrial zones, like other areas near Mass Ave, Park Ave, Broadway, Pleasant, and Summer), buildings of up to about 5-6 stories seem appropriate. Although most folks seem worried about height, I think a key consideration is also the width; having one really long building with just one storefront makes a building seem massive even if it's not especially tall.</p>  |
| 21 | <p>I think we should allow 5-story multifamily residential which would work well with the 5-story buildings allowed in business districts, maybe 6-story mixed-use buildings with commercial on the first floor as an incentive to include some commercial space for cafes/markets/etc. that would reduce the need for car trips. (I could see going taller, since we already have some taller housing near these areas, but that seems potentially too unpopular.)</p>  |
| 22 | <p>I would like to see the parts of Arlington where I live, near Alewife Station, zoned to allow it to become a fully walkable community. For that to happen we would need to legalize the cornerstone of the modern walkable community - 5 on 1s. I would like for it to be legal to build a 6-story building with ground floor retail, 5 floors of housing, and no mandatory parking, preferably single stair. I think this should be legal everywhere with an easy walk to Alewife station, particularly in the triangle created by the bike path, mass ave, and our border with Cambridge.</p>   |
| 23 | <p>The legislation allows for 3-family homes to comply with this ridiculous law - so why aren't we looking at that? The consultant says 3-families are not cost-effective - I seriously doubt that builders will not show up in droves for this boondoggle. The discussion was trying to push over-compliance and steering the public in a particular direction - why? We should build 3-families and nothing more. Continuing to build ugly high-rises that directly abut sidewalks (ie the new buildings next to and across from the high school as well as several others throughout town) up and down Mass Ave will decrease our tree canopy and green space, worsen traffic and parking, contribute to school overcrowding, and do nothing for truly affordable housing. We should not OVER COMPLY with this one-size-fits-all law. We are already very dense and do not need to exceed the compliance levels. Enough with the push for high density! I'm extremely disappointed in the Working Group.</p>  |

| #  | Size and scale of buildings  |
|----|--|
| 24 | I think building 4- or 5-story buildings on Mass Ave, Broadway and maybe a few other locations like areas of Warren St is okay. I think it is important to reserve first floors for business use only otherwise we will soon have no business or industry in town. It's also important to respect neighboring property and no let buildings be built to the curb and property line.  |
| 25 | I would think larger buildings would be better placed walking distance from Alewife. So greater density in East Arlington. The worst place would be in the Heights which has lost several bus routes and no longer has good mass transit options.  |
| 26 | A mixture of small 6-12 unit four-story or so apartments and three-story rowhouses would make for excellent additions to the housing stock here in Arlington.  |
| 27 | We need 6 family housing, in order to allow for affordable housing. Allow the units to be as small as 1000 square feet. Set a 3-story maximum height and keep existing setbacks to allow for trees.  |
| 28 | The current plan strikes me as unambitious. We're deep into a housing crisis yet are placing restriction after restriction on higher density housing. The Mass Ave corridor should be zoned for 10+ units, and zoning of 2-4 units by right extending several blocks further than currently planned. In addition, the town should reconsider if inclusionary zoning is having the desired effect - if developers don't build because of the affordable unit requirement, we won't address the housing shortage that is driving the high costs. |
| 29 | Affordable 6-family housing, keeping in style and size of the existing housing.  |
| 30 | MBTA Communities housing must be sited OUTSIDE of our commercial and industrial districts by a parcel or two. 6 family affordable style  |
| 31 | Multi-story buildings must be allowed, but not skyscrapers or towers. 4 floors or 5 would be okay.   |
| 32 | Please protect existing businesses and promote commercial interests.   |
| 33 | Single- and triple-deckers as well as 6-unit apartment buildings. We also need more affordable starter homes. Should not be allowed where it will throw out local businesses.  |
| 34 | 6-family or larger dwellings will enable more affordable housing in Arlington. They should be built along corridors that have short walks to mass transit stops.   |
| 35 | 6-family housing allows one unit out of six to be affordable   |
| 36 | Put up larger apartments in several neighborhoods. Larger buildings are required to meet Affordable Housing criteria.  |
| 37 | 3-4 story buildings in neighborhoods.<br>4-5 story buildings on and adjacent to major corridors<br>No individual buildings should be too *wide* or appear to be too wide; a more granular streetscape is more interesting and has more destinations.   |

| #  | Size and scale of buildings   |
|----|---|
| 38 | I think the size and scale depends on location and setback. For instance, the assisted living facility in Arlington Heights is very out of scale for that location. I would hate to see that situation all over town.   |
| 39 | Make “missing middle” easier to build. Three- to eight-unit buildings, a type that we already have many of and integrate quite nicely into existing 1/2F neighborhoods. We should allow these everywhere in town.   |
| 40 | Multi-family dwelling should be allowed as broadly as possible, but especially near commercial centers and transit lines. Triple-deckers or 2-family housing can usually be built on existing lots without being much taller or having a much larger footprint than existing single-family houses. My understanding is that “apartment” zoning was specifically designed to prevent any more being built. Those districts should be expanded. In particular, opportunities for 6+ unit structures that would require affordable units should be explored. |
| 41 | There is no one-size-fits-all, so some larger buildings (4-5 stories) could be built on some larger lots near other larger buildings. Sensitivity should be given to limiting the size of new buildings adjacent to existing 1 and 2 family houses on smaller lots.   |
| 42 | It depends what type of buildings we are talking about, on what size lots, and in what neighborhoods.   |
| 43 | Mostly 3- and 4-family seems right. Occasional larger buildings perhaps   |
| 44 | multiple community surveys have found that people prefer 3 to 4 story maximums, and that they value green spaces. doing away with open space requirements and allowing 5 stories with no setbacks will not be in keeping with these preferences. the overlay districts should be along main corridors where there is a possibility of mass transit, in keeping with the original intent of the Act,   |
| 45 | 4-5 stories max along Mass Ave, with setbacks and trees required. 2-3 stories in residential neighborhoods. No repeats of the hideous buildings at the corner of Lockeland and Mass Ave. Travesty   |
| 46 | 5 stories in general; higher if possible in some places.  |
| 47 | larger buildings along entire Mass Ave corridor and on major connectors: Lake and Pleasant Sts, Park Ave. Allow 2-3 family subdivision anywhere we currently have 1-family only.  |
| 48 | Transportation MUST occur first. If people cannot access ALEWIFE Station then they will not be intertwined in living in Arlington.  |
| 49 | At least 6 units to provide some low-income housing. A variety of heights - not 3 or 5-story in a row, creating a ‘wall-like’ effect. Up to 4 stories (?). And maybe not all right along Mass Ave. and Broadway. There are other parts of Arlington with access to bus lines; I don’t think we need to keep ‘fancier, more residential’ neighborhoods sacrosanct.   |

| #  | Size and scale of buildings   |
|----|---|
| 50 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The document says “create a zoning district of at least 32 acres”, but doesn’t make it clear whether this has to be a single, contiguous space or can be distributed. This is confusing.</li> <li>– Three-family homes may not be cost-effective to a developer starting from scratch, buying land and putting up a new structure. However, it may well be worthwhile for the current (or future) owner of a two-family home to expand into an attic or add another floor.</li> <li>– Larger structures rightly belong in proximity the main corridor through town (Mass Ave). (One theoretical exception might be the Poets Corner property, which could hold a larger multistory building right next to Route 2, but that’s a potential lightning rod, given the recent issues.)</li> <li>– As indicated, these don’t necessarily need to be right on Mass Ave, just adjacent to it</li> <li>– The downside of this is the “canyon effect” that can be created</li> <li>– Some attention should be paid to setbacks, both from the street (to avoid massing) and from adjacent residences (re: trees, light, shadows, etc.)</li> </ul> |
| 51 | 6 family housing is most amenable to affordable housing provisions while preventing overdevelopment of gentrified multi-family units.   |
| 52 | 6-12 units, but I wouldn’t be averse to 4 at edges of zones or in some areas where a bit smaller made sense   |
| 53 | Multifamily units up to 4 units per lot should be allowed anywhere in the town.   |
| 54 | Large. Within the I-95 belt we have a housing shortage and it hurts the Boston area economically. Many people attend the great universities here but leave when they see real estate prices. Those who remain, like us, push up prices. Arlington and other communities should encourage building a lot of housing to absorb this demand, which will allow prices to stabilize and more people to enjoy the area.   |
| 55 | I can only speak to Capital area where I live. There are already 5-story buildings in or close to capital square area, more of those would fit in with the neighborhood so I am in favor of that. Or at least 6 units to make sure we get 1 “affordable” one.   |
| 56 | I prefer that new buildings in the town match the scale of existing buildings.  |
| 57 | The size and scale should vary to blend into existing neighborhoods. Whatever the size, there should be access to community space, green space, garden space, and playgrounds, build within and outside of the buildings. Incorporating green balconies as requirements of design, with plant life provided by local landscapers, would be a great way to increase biodiversity, decrease heat islands, and provide access to micro gardening. There should be incorporation of solar panels, charging stations, heat pumps, and other electrified commodities replacing gas commodities. It’s also incredibly important that local business and contractors are employed to build any MBTA homes, drawing on the expertise of local residents, and keeping the incentives benefiting Arlington residents.  |

| #  | Size and scale of buildings   |
|----|---|
| 58 | <p>These districts look good to me and I appreciate the thought that went into them! I think two things we should pay attention to going forward are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. allowing and encouraging mixed-use buildings, with commercial and housing together on different floors. I am not sure how this proposed plan uses those?</li> <li>2. Parking! Always an issue, I know...</li> </ol>  |
| 59 | <p>New housing should be near the main corridor of Mass Ave and Broadway, where the MBTA bus lines run. We need permanent affordable housing. Permanent affordable housing requires 6 family units. Builders will need those units to be small in order to be financially viable developments. They should be 1000-1250 square foot living spaces, with 2 or 3 bedrooms for families. Stacked side by side, they could fit into our smaller existing lots as 3-story buildings, with 2 units on each floor.</p>                                   |
| 60 | <p>New housing should be near the main corridor of Mass Ave and Broadway. We need permanent affordable housing. Permanent affordable housing requires 6 family units. Builders will need those units to be small in order to be financially viable developments, given the size of the lots. They should be 1000-1250 square foot living spaces, with 2 or 3 bedrooms for families. Stacked side by side, they could fit into our smaller existing lots as 3-story buildings, with 2 units on each floor.</p>                                     |
| 61 | <p>2-3 bedroom permanent, affordable units on or walkable to Mass Ave. NO towers, ~3 story buildings in line with the character of existing buildings in Arlington.</p>   |
| 62 | <p>4-5 Stories, but Sun shading should be considered when the buildings are near smaller homes.</p>   |
| 63 | <p>Only directly along Mass Ave and Broadway</p>  |
| 64 | <p>3-4 story buildings everywhere; 4-5 stories near or on mass ave;</p>   |
| 65 | <p>I think this is site specific, in a very granular way. So, a mix, but I'm uneasy in just letting the market decide how that mix is distributed. I'm specifically concerned about siting parking (both biz &amp; res): on small lots, is the sidewalk experience going to be a parking garage? We can ease parking minimums (and I'm for that), but until the T gets its act together new construction will come with cars. This is the more true the farther away from Route 16. And BTW why not more upzoning on Broadway east of Harlow?</p> |
| 66 | <p>The four stories listed in both scenarios seems quite reasonable (I think you could go up even higher than that, but others may not agree). I also don't think there needs to be a maximum number of units per acre (so Scenario 2 seems preferable since it allows for more housing). The four districts highlighted all make sense, although I still find it odd that there isn't anything right around Arlington Center, which seems like one of the most logical places for denser housing.</p>  |
| 67 | <p>3-5 stories with required front setbacks from the sidewalks with trees, shade, benches and other amenities for the passersby</p>   |

| #  | Size and scale of buildings  |
|----|--|
| 68 | <p>Given that industrial and commercial parcels are excluded. Extremely difficult to understand how the overlay parcels will interact and complement the com/industrial parcels Hence ... It would be great if a fly-over perspective reflecting (1) Existing build out along the relevant main and adjacent impacted streets (2) Full build out with existing zoning (sans MBTA) over that same area (3) Full build out of all existing comm/industrial plus new MBTA overlay zones over the full impact area</p> <p>And for (3) please model MBTA impact at both low, med and high density levels</p> <p>Finally .. Model a more granular density version (versus each district at a single height) that provides a 'rolling' density 3-4 stories vs 3-5 stories vs 4-6 stories along the corridors in question ... Highest four/five business cores and reduced in between</p> <p>WITHOUT THIS SET OF VISUAL TOOLS ONE SIMPLY CANNOT HOPE TO VISUALIZE THE THREE DIMENSIONAL IMPACT FROM A COMPLEX TWO DIMENSIONAL (FLAT) MAP</p> |
| 69 | I think buildings up to courtyard buildings can work in Arlington, if used judiciously.  |
| 70 | 4 story buildings. They should not be clustered together like public housing project ghettos but scattered around town and accessible to transportation.   |
| 71 | Given the current scale of apartment buildings in town along Mass Ave, it would be perfectly appropriate to allow 7-8 stories in areas where the combining of contiguous lots gave a large enough lot size to accommodate a mid-rise building (maybe around 10000+ sq ft). For smaller lots the regulations should allow for at least 4-plexes, so allowing 4 stories or more would be appropriate. For the sake of efficiency, building footprints should be allowed to cover a large portion of the lots with minimal setbacks, especially at the front.   |
| 72 | Larger apartment buildings in the Commercial areas (a few blocks from the centers) and smaller buildings off Mass Avenue and Broadway.   |
| 73 | (Comment withheld at the respondent's request).  |
| 74 | Much larger buildings in East Arlington. Bulk of buildings should be there and be large  |
| 75 | I encourage dense, multifamily housing anywhere in Arlington. I have no issues with tall buildings. I do not like large single-family houses that take up a lot of space.  |
| 76 | I think the scale of buildings should permit by right at least 6 units (to encourage affordable housing) in all of these subdistricts.   |
| 77 | 6+ unit buildings on Mass Ave and on Broadway in the residential zones; 3-4 unit buildings on the side streets.  |
| 78 | On Mass Ave & Broadway, up to 4 housing stories plus ground-floor commercial. No more than two stories on back roads that are currently mainly residential.  |
| 79 | It depends on the location, but 2-3 stories unless on Mass Ave or Broadway.  |
| 80 | Limit to townhouses only. Of any size.   |

| #  | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>  |
|----|---|
| 81 | <p>I think we should allow at least 6 units as-of-right anywhere in the town. Given that this is politically infeasible, I'm content to suggest that for this project, we allow at least 6 units in all of the proposed new zones, ideally even a bit more than that. There is an urgent need for more housing to deal with the crisis of high housing prices that is turning the whole Boston area into a place that puts huge stress on all residents.</p>  |
| 82 | <p>Arlington is a Town, not a city. All of our zoning should reflect the sense of neighborhood in the context of living in a town.</p> <p>On the wide Avenues with bus routes and commercial activity allow for taller buildings &amp; higher density, stepping down in height/mass to be good neighbor with residential; generate and review cross-sections and shadow studies through proposed districts; max height 4 stories with bonus 5th story (incentive - see below); North side of wide corridor vs. South side; consider zoning for set-backs and courts for tall buildings; no cavernous corridors - we are a town not a city; 3-fam in low density (next to R1 or R2,) transitioning to 4-6 family in medium density (next to B and existing R3 in some cases), up-zone 6/12 family to get 15% affordable units. Bus routes - Mass Ave &amp; B'way plus some near Park Ave Extension, Mill St near Summer, Mystic Street near Summer and other "nodes" of transit where there is already existing density and a mix of commercial/residential.</p> <p>The newest iteration of the zoning map drafted by Utile now includes Broadway, but why not have a sub-district between North Union and Silk Street? Why not allow for a mini-node of commercial to support the residents and residents to support the businesses?</p> <p>The 6-27-23 meeting concluded with a study of 6 story buildings on the Avenues and 4 story buildings elsewhere, including right next to existing 2 ½ story residential zones. I strongly object. We are a town (not a city) of low-rise stock with few exceptions (built in the 60's-70's.) 6 stories is too high, period. Allowing 4 stories next to a 35' max house does not maintain the character of the Town or respect the context of the majority of Arlington's neighborhoods.</p> <p>I do not support designating the R1 blocks in East Arlington to become 4 story MBTA districts. If the MBTA Zoning in those R1 lots allows 4 DUs within a 2-½ story appropriately massed structure to fit within the existing context, I would support such a proposal.</p> <p>If zoned uniformly within a sub-district, I do not support having the districts extend as far back from the main corridors as shown, for example the South side of Wildwood Ave. and generally +6(?) lots deep in East Arlington unless those lots are zoned in size and scale and massing to blend with the 2 ½ story existing abutting structures.</p> <p>Open space and useable open space should have ARB site review to determine set-backs, massing, parking, etc. on all MBTA district properties.</p> <p>In summary - we need a variety of sizes/scales, depending on the context and neighborhood with an upper limit for heights (~48' for 4 floors; 60' max with 5th floor bonus) and massing that mimics smaller scale structures if they are to be large complexes adjacent to residential feeder street lots. The town would be best served by having a finely detailed map indicating where we allow higher density within a sub-district and where we want to limit the size and scale of buildings to blend with our existing housing stock.</p> |

| #  | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>  |
|----|---|
| 83 | <p>We should limit development to 3-4 story buildings. Massive structures look out of place (this is no urban center and most of us who live here don't want it to be), and taller buildings will block abutters' solar panels. We say we want to be energy efficient and sustainable, so we need to protect investments in just those things. Homeowners spent serious money getting solar panels involved, and it would be disgraceful to allow developers to destroy those investments.</p> <p>In addition, most of us want light and air in our homes, and looming tall buildings would destroy that. We need light to grow gardens and trees, light to prevent the need for artificial lighting, light for psychological benefits. We should not allow developers to steal that from us.</p> <p>Finally, we need to ensure that there is plenty of open space around all new buildings – they should meet our zoning setbacks at the very least. We need greenery – we can't afford to pave over our planet, one block at a time. We just experienced the hottest day on the planet in 125,000 years. It is time to stop fooling ourselves that balconies are open space and that trees don't matter. The hideous apartment building next to the HS and Stop &amp; Shop is a great example of bad building with inadequate setback and no trees. We should never allow that again.</p> |
| 84 | 3-4 stories along Mass. Ave. and Broadway.  |
| 85 | Arlington should allow for denser development to promote more affordable housing.   |
| 86 | <p>Encouraging four-plexes in residential neighborhoods is excellent. But there are already many multi-unit building along Mass Ave (&gt; 10 or 20 units). Why are we not matching the scale that already exists along most of this corridor.</p> <p>Duplexes and fourplexes should be encouraged throughout East and Central Arlington.</p>  |
| 87 | Larger apartment buildings allowed by right on Mass Ave and Broadway - perhaps 5 or 6 stories. Buildings of 6+ units allowed by right everywhere in the district (including on side streets!) to maximize inclusion of affordable units.  |
| 88 | As indicated in our Master Plan, and the AHNAP, residents prefer bldgs under 5 stories along main corridors, with 4 stories being favored. We are not a small city; we are a town. The wildly successful Arlington Brewery event at the Res was courtesy of a start up that chose to locate here bc they "liked the small-town vibe." Four to five stories, WITH stepbacks, along Mass Ave, parts of Broadway, maybe parts of Warren St, would be acceptable. Turning Arlington into a smaller version of Watertown, Somerville, Cambridge, etc. by allowing taller bldgs and in more areas is not the direction we should be heading in.   |
| 89 | As indicated in our Master Plan, and the AHNAP, residents prefer bldgs under 5 stories along main corridors, with 4 stories being favored. We are not a small city; we are a town. The wildly successful Arlington Brewery event at the Res was courtesy of a start up that chose to locate here bc they "liked the small-town vibe." Four to five stories, WITH stepbacks, along Mass Ave, parts of Broadway, maybe parts of Warren St, would be acceptable. Turning Arlington into a smaller version of Watertown, Somerville, Cambridge, etc. by allowing taller bldgs and in more areas is not the direction we should be heading in.   |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 90  | Can you please show the heights assumed in the latest conceptual plan? Understanding the height assumptions made in the plan will help answer the question.  |
| 91  | I think that we should build higher and bigger near the main corridors and then scale back as we move into residential areas. Along the main corridors I think we should make sure that anything we build is big enough to activate inclusionary zoning so that we get something guaranteed affordable out of it. In neighborhoods we should build 3-4 family homes with varied designs that are more residential looking like triple-deckers and fourplexes, townhouses and courtyard buildings etc. I also think we should be building along the RT 2 access roads like Cambridge has successfully done. |
| 92  | I don't have strong feelings about this, but just want to share my support for increasing multifamily housing of different sizes and price points.   |
| 93  | I think we should allow for up to 5 story buildings anywhere along the Mass Ave corridor. I don't see that one area is more appropriate than another.  |
| 94  | ~10 stories in Arlington center. ~4 stories further away   |
| 95  | Not on side streets in East Arlington, building zone should remain unchanged. Only on mass Ave or main roads in Arlington where added volume can be accommodated. It will ruin the side streets and should not be allowed 4 houses in on side streets.   |
| 96  | Not sure but the "scope creep" on how the rezoning/up zoning is too much. 4 stories in all these locations is also a bit too much and too dense for the town. It doesn't even feel like Arlington anymore, how much more if we make the main corridor of mass Ave feel even more like Somerville?  |
| 97  | We should have buildings that encourage inclusionary zoning. I know that 3 story/family aren't dense enough for our needs. I'd like us to consider 4-5 story buildings.  |
| 98  | Only on Mass Ave. Keep our neighborhoods small and personal. There's a reason many of us don't live in Cambridge or Boston   |
| 99  | There is a desperate need for affordable housing. I'm in favor of larger buildings that trigger inclusionary zoning and require elevators. So four stories and at least 12 units. These buildings should be close to bus lines or alewife for easy public transportation access.   |
| 100 | Only Single family – do not change zoning  |
| 101 | 2-family buildings   |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|-----|--|
| 102 | <p>It really all depends on the location. Many of the proposed streets within these districts are very small and short and are comprised of all multi-family homes that are fitting to the size of the street. Given the size of some of these streets, the fact that most of the homes are already two-family – these small streets are already working pretty hard towards the goal of providing access. Moving up to and fitting four-story buildings within some of these small streets really seems like a stretch for already very tight spaces. While I realize the point is to have access to public transit, adding more units will add more cars, more visitors, more dumpsters needed, etc. Some of these streets can hardly handle the vehicles of current residents and spaces for trash and recycling. Some of these streets are so tight that cars driving in both directions at the same time encounter a tricky situation – someone often has to pull over to let the other car go by! We already have rodent problems in many areas and trash is spread around by rodents. It seems this could also destroy the existing green spaces on some of these small streets – these small yards that are still abundant with beautiful trees are important to the ecosystem. They’re not the beautiful parks of these towns, but they are important. Again, given that many of these proposed streets are very small, it seems that longer, wider streets are better suited to accommodate for many reasons. Why not focus on less tight streets that have more breathing room for an additional story or space? Why not on main streets such as Mass Ave that hold more building space opportunities and bring residents even closer to public transportation and the ability to walk to local businesses?</p> |
| 103 | Do not need more up zoning. Already congested and MBTA not reliable this far out.  |
| 104 | The size we’ve had for decades. Two story homes.   |
| 105 | <p>I do not believe we need to allow 2 families to be built into 3-4 family units at this time. Perhaps the old apartment buildings built in the 50s, 60s, 70s could be revamped to be more efficient instead.</p>   |
| 106 | Keep it how it is - if anything instead of building giant apartment buildings like the one behind the DPW that should have been kept commercial/industry to help keep taxes down   |
| 107 | <p>The largest size and scale of units on or abutting Mass Ave, Broadway, and on Pleasant St and Summer St. At least 6 stories with at least 6 units to trigger inclusionary zoning (if not more units). As you move away from these main parcels, the size/scale should be “one step” less as you move away. So, for example, the adjacent lots off Mass Ave, Broadway, Pleasant St, Summer St from the 6 story buildings should be 5 story buildings. Then the next two lots over could be 4 story buildings with required 6 units minimum. Then 3 story connected triplexes for example (which would be 6 units). 3 story double triplexes (a 6-unit building) could be a standard a block or two away from these main roads to require that inclusionary unit. This assumes the lot sizes can permit this. As we move even further away, you could zone for 4- and 3-unit buildings.</p> <p>(Depending on what number of stories ends up being allowed adjacent to the main roads, scale this proposal proportionately. But again, I support more height and units.)</p> <p>Add incentives for at least the buildings on the main streets and probably at least one block away to add one extra story if they build mixed use with commercial on the first floor.</p>  |
| 108 | We need to preserve Arlington which means small businesses, family-based housing and the quaintness that Cambridge and Somerville do not provide.  |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 109 | Family house (two stories)   |
| 110 | 1-2-family buildings in residential areas. 4-story buildings only along Mass Ave and Broadway.   |
| 111 | I think the proposed map for MBTA communities Zoning Districts will alleviate much of the housing problems without overwhelming the rest of the town.  |
| 112 | Mass Ave corridor / Broadway corridor - close to Alewife.  |
| 113 | I am strongly in favor of multi-family housing. I believe it is better for the community and better for the environment.   |
| 114 | Only along Mass. Ave. and Broadway.  |
| 115 | 2 stories or less, occasionally some 3 story buildings, but only along Mass Ave  |
| 116 | Depending on the area. Areas directly adjacent to single family or 2 family should likely not be 12+ units. So allowing for some buffer. E.g. right on main corridors allow for 12+ units with decreasing with size as you get closer to single family.  |
| 117 | 4-story on Mass Ave only. The proposal to allow 4-story buildings 4 lots in from Mass Ave will destroy our neighborhoods in East Arlington. It will also create additional parking problems, where we already have insufficient parking both for residents and shoppers, which will lead to more empty store fronts. |
| 118 | We should allow for 3-4 stories on MA Avenue and Broadway.   |
| 119 | Near transportation and necessary shopping is important, especially for those without cars.  |
| 120 | I think we should allow buildings up to 10 stories.  |
| 121 | Up to 5 story buildings, no problem, anywhere along Mass Ave. Up to 10 stories in East Arlington for large sites with appropriate setback opportunities.   |
| 122 | Four story on bus routes, three floors one in from them, then two floors everywhere else.  |
| 123 | I do not think any size building or neighborhood should be out of bounds for building affordable housing. It is a mistake to avoid building up – we need more housing, and building up is how we get it most effectively.  |
| 124 | Depends on the region, but I think generally up to 6-7 stories in height. In downtown, larger more skyscraper esc buildings could work well to make a nice environment!  |
| 125 | Three or at maximum four story apartment buildings are fine for Arlington but on Mass Ave and Broadway only.   |
| 126 | Arlington shouldn't be rezoning two-family houses in neighborhoods into multistory buildings. This would just be a boon to developers and hurt our communities. The commercial districts that are one-story can be rezoned for multistory like how Newton is doing it.   |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings   |
|-----|---|
| 127 | Larger buildings should be along Mass. Ave., not in neighborhoods that already have 2-family houses.  |
| 128 | As a resident of Plymouth St. I am particularly concerned about the size of buildings that would be constructed on Wildwood Ave. 3 stories I believe should be the maximum size of a new building, and/or not to exceed the size of the buildings already on Mass. Ave., which might end up being 2 stories on Wildwood Ave. since Wildwood Ave. is on a hill above Mass. Ave.  |
| 129 | I am a real estate appraiser and have lived in Arlington for 30+ years and feel strongly that allowing 3 and 4 story new construction in areas that are currently entirely single- and two-family homes is a bad idea that would have an adverse impact on the value of surrounding homes as well as destroy much of the appeal of Arlington as a town with true neighborhoods. New buildings along the main roads, i.e. Mass Ave and Broadway, is already taking place and make much more sense to maintain the integrity of the community.  |
| 130 | I think that mostly 4 story and some 5 story buildings directly on Mass Ave. and 3 story in the units adjacent to Mass Ave. would be best for Arlington. It would be ideal to develop existing business areas on Mass Ave. to be mixed use (similar to the new development approved for corner of Lake St. and Mass Ave.) and not create 3-5 story developments in Mass Ave. adjacent areas.  |
| 131 | <p>Focusing taller elements along the Mass Ave corridor should be prioritized. The ability for developers to build with enough scale to create affordable units should be considered and this focus should be along Mass Ave. From there, the blending and stepping down in scale will be important to maintain the neighborhood context of the cross streets. It seems unlikely that a preponderance of development will replace existing 2 family homes to generate an additional unit, but an increase to 4 stories may see an increase in multi-family homes that are about to turn over.</p> <p>We already see a number of single-family homes that are in need of repair sell and turn into two family properties, allowing additional height as you near Mass Ave and/or Broadway would allow for similar conversions of two-family properties in the future.</p> <p>The map that has been outlined is thoughtful and well crafted. Additional “blending” into the neighborhood may be helpful to ease a transition from taller elements to the familiar neighborhood context.</p> |
| 132 | I am opposed to any changes in Arlington zoning laws. We currently have too many dense housing developments.  |
| 133 | We should allow for a lot more buildings of different sizes in different areas. Having more affordable multi-family homes in less commercial areas would be really great for Arlington!   |
| 134 | Allow three to four story buildings but only on Mass Ave or Broadway. Allowing developers to build these bigger buildings in residential neighborhoods makes no sense.  |
| 135 | 4 or more stories   |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|-----|--|
| 136 | <p>Convention and precedent of existing multifamily homes on the Mass Ave corridor serve as a good example and historical context for expanding more access to affordable housing in the growing Arlington Community.</p> <p>Different sized and density building should be allowed in areas with existing or anticipated traffic networks in two ways: 1) multi-family housing should be allowed and encouraged in areas in close proximity to public transportation routes, such as the 67,77,79 as public transportation friendly site locations can maximize per lot affordable housing by minimizing need for unproductive parking spaces 2) multifamily housing should be allowed and encouraged immediately surrounding the minuteman bikepath in areas not already zoned for natural preservation (ie existing zoned for restrictive single family detached housing) for similar reasons of commute and travel effectiveness, and also for justification of public good of access to available green spaces within the Arlington community; denser family housing situation can help maximize the collective good of these spaces if they're made available to more people in our community - and not just family's with the good fortune to have bought property at the right time and enjoy an otherwise cloistered benefit that's inaccessible to many members of our community. Zoning should extend based on professional urban planner guidance and wisdom, though a border are of .25 mile (or a 5 minute walk) feels appropriate to maximize convenience to communities surrounding these shared public resources.</p> |
| 137 | Keep it within the zoning we already have, screw the state do what is good for Arlington. If it is a multi family district or along mass ave fine.   |
| 138 | Keep height limit to 3 stories. Allow six units per 3 stories. This would incentivize smaller (presumably more affordable) housing.  |
| 139 | <p>It would be great to have larger (taller, with more affordable housing) on some of the major thoroughways (Mass Ave, Broadway or Summer St) as long as there is some space in front of the building and some green area. We need trees and greenery throughout the town to help with climate change, We also do not want buildings that are too tall too close to wetlands. Finally, we want to make sure that industrial and commercially zoned areas remain that way and that larger buildings are CLOSE to the larger streets but do not interfere with commercial and/or industrial uses of buildings. But the further we are from the larger streets, perhaps a 3 family would work better since that would fit aesthetically better with Arlington's neighborhoods.</p>   |
| 140 | We should limit rezoning to allow for 3-family houses, the minimum required by the MBTA law. We do not want to add more large buildings to Arlington.  |
| 141 | Depends on the street. Along Mass Ave and Broadway, up to 6 stories. Zero setbacks. Commercial first floors.   |
| 142 | No more than 4 stories allowed anywhere, including areas zoned for single families. Why is the current proposal only increasing density in the areas already dense? Why are you not spreading the density throughout the entire town? Why burden those areas while leaving 90% of the town untouched? That is hardly equitable.  |
| 143 | Smaller scaled buildings are best for Arlington. We are a town NOT a city.   |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 144 | 6-12 unit buildings. Preferably 12 on Mass Ave, in existing residential on the street today, lower moving away.  |
| 145 | 6 would be great. I'd like to see some 3-units allowed in Morningside, the parcels are large enough for at least that. And in the Bracket and Dallin districts as well, if this Mass Ave idea doesn't work out.  |
| 146 | The Bigger the better, on Mass Ave. 4 to 20. We need to move to on-street parking, to allow people places to live. The first floor of these buildings shouldn't be dedicated to tons of asphalt.   |
| 147 | We should comply with the law's intent: locate zones close to Alewife. Do the least damage: upzone with lowest units per acres of zoning. Save existing Arlington affordable housing rules! Avert massive structures.  |
| 148 | New building dimensions should comply with Arlington's existing laws.  |
| 149 | Buildings with 6 or more units that HAVE REQUIREMENTS FOR SETBACKS AND OPEN GREEN SPACE are OK. Any buildings that do not have mandatory open green space or are built out to the property line are NOT OK. Residential buildings should be OUTSIDE of existing industrial and business districts because we need to retain (and increase) our business and industrial zoning.   |
| 150 | <p>East Arlington (including the Capitol Sq and Broadway corridors)-which are being zoned for the most additional density and high buildings in town – is already very dense/the densest section of the town. We also are the part of town that has the most renters and by extension the most lower income people and Black and Latinx residents. That means, over-emphasizing density in the parts of town hosting lower income people and that is already quite dense, while ignoring residential sectors of the Heights and the Center –where more affluent homeowners tend to reside (that are usually white) – has racial and racist undertones. This was actually pointed out to Pam Hallett of the HCA during the live Zoom talk hosted by the town's Human Right Commission on housing by representatives of City Life/Vida Urbana back in 2020. Additionally, cramming in density along Mass Ave, sparks environmental justice concerns, as we renters living there are the ones breathing in higher emissions from increased traffic, being denied parking spaces we need as an accessibility, and dealing with noise pollution at highly disproportionate levels compared to residential areas. Not to mention, increasing density with majority market rate (read: luxury) housing will displace lower income people as that increases the cost of living in the overall area. Lower income people are the most likely to depend on and need public transit – so pushing them away from/out of transit hubs defeats the purpose of this plan. So the question should not just be the size and the scale of the buildings, but are they actually affordable to low income people? If not, the town is fostering carbon gentrification, which is something I have written about as an environmental journalist: <a href="https://www.salon.com/2022/02/26/eco-gentrification/">https://www.salon.com/2022/02/26/eco-gentrification/</a>. As for size/scale of buildings, from a carbon standpoint – studies show that low and mid-rise buildings are actually more environmentally sustainable to both build and maintain: <a href="https://theconversation.com/cities-and-climate-change-why-low-rise-buildings-are-the-future-not-skyscrapers-170673">https://theconversation.com/cities-and-climate-change-why-low-rise-buildings-are-the-future-not-skyscrapers-170673</a>. Higher buildings come with adverse public and mental health impacts: <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2017/mar/16/cities-depression-stress-mental-health-high-rises-urban-design-london-toronto">https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2017/mar/16/cities-depression-stress-mental-health-high-rises-urban-design-london-toronto</a>. Building higher not only is more environmentally and carbon intensive –</p> |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|-----|--|
|     | <p>but higher buildings require increased energy use – and cooling needs in the summer (as higher floors = hotter in the summer, requiring more AC and upping emissions, even in LEED certified or so-called net zero buildings). Finally as a disabled person, higher buildings can often be inaccessible for those of us with mobility issues/limitations and/or cardiovascular and respiratory illnesses. I had to move from my rent-controlled affordable housing complex – because I lived on the top floor with no elevator and it was exacerbating my spinal degeneration and hip arthritis. My unit was also excessively and dangerously hot much of the summer, making me moderately to severely ill most of the season. Elevators are far from a panacea to this problem of disabled people’s access needs being compromised by higher floors. My partner, who also lived in East Arlington, lived on a higher floor in a tall building (Minuteman Towers) with an elevator and that elevator was out of order most of the time. When we were looking for an apt on the private market, many buildings with elevators had them out of order when we were looking. Climate change will mean more brownouts and blackouts (so elevators out of service during heatwaves) as well as increased susceptibility to natural disasters. So as a disabled person, I can’t risk living on a high floor where elevators are likely to go out of order in ways that strand me and make me vulnerable to higher injury and mortality risk. And I am not a fringe case. In my affordable housing, almost everyone on the top and second-to-top floors also had chronic conditions that made the staircase a genuine hardship, sometimes responsible for injuries. In my partner’s building, many disabled people were stuck on the higher floors when the elevator was out – including when there was a fire in spring 2019. Fortunately, no one perished. Disabled people are usually ignored when we try to voice these concerns. We’re not a part of these conversations or surveys, which are dominated by the mostly white, upper income, home ownership class of Arlington.</p> |
| 151 | <p>I would favor larger buildings near the main transportation corridors (Massachusetts Avenue and parts of Broadway) and somewhat smaller buildings a bit further away (as a transition to the residential neighborhoods) If the map adheres as closely to the corridors as the current draft, I generally would like to see larger buildings, which are more efficient from an energy perspective. In East Arlington and much of Arlington Center 5 story buildings are not rare. Going up higher than that may present questions of design that make them poorly suited to by right development. However, well designed buildings of 6 or even 7 stories are not out of the question. Broadway near Alewife is already industrial and has fairly tall buildings. (Development on the Somerville side is also big.) I think that that is an appropriate location for Mass Av style of development. West of the cemetery, the current pattern of development is somewhat smaller, and I would probably prefer 4-5 stories. I don’t have strong views on Arlington Heights. This is not a cohesive district: the center around the old railroad station has a definite character but the area west of Trader Joe’s, say, is mostly intermittent, car-oriented strip development. Also, the 77 only goes out to Arlington heights. To me this suggest a bit less density because of fewer walkable and public transit opportunities. I would not be dogmatic about this.</p>  |
| 152 | <p>It would be great that the buildings should be &lt;= 3 stories. It should be within 1,200square feet. Should require a little bit green space between the building and the main road. Such as broadway.</p>   |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>  |
|-----|---|
| 153 | Arlington Heights is a sad, dumpy place. Replacing most or all of the poorly-kept small storefronts with multi-story mixed use buildings might help revitalize this lame neighborhood. (Though we need a branch of the red line coming off at Porter square up Mass Ave or better busses or the new neighbors won't have enough space to park or enough transit to be carless.) Same could be said of everything west of the high school, which is mostly underused. The buildings just need to be not awful cheap pieces of crap like the 60s uggo things that adorn Mass Ave. Like I knew somebody who lived in the little brick thing across from Arlington diner and they couldn't turn their ceiling fan on without shaking the building. TEAR IT DOWN! Also, why don't we add some commercial districts at the top of some of the hills in Arlington? Like the bus that goes up to "turkey hill" is a no-man's-land of ticky tacky houses and could have some life to it if there were a coffee shop or something up there. |
| 154 | The size / scale of buildings which are right for Arlington are those already specified in the Arlington Zoning Bylaw, maximum 5 stories, except no residential in B or I districts   |
| 155 | Arlington can certainly accommodate larger buildings, especially along commercial corridors, and we have a number of these buildings already in town.   |
| 156 | I think 5 stories (or more) is totally appropriate for basically the entire Mass Ave and Broadway corridors.  |
| 157 | I'm no expert on density of units, but I'm not sure we should necessarily put a cap on density as that is how we've ended up with the housing crisis to begin with. Design rather than density might be more important — for example, the fact that there are setbacks required in the blue areas on the map is good. This kind of development should require robust plantings / trees / green space. Town could also consider incentives for green space for more dense developments — if a developer wants to build a more dense apartment complex, could we incentivize expanding the amount of green space between / in adjacent lots? I'm spit balling here. I am certainly no fan of super ugly, luxury apartment buildings (a la Assembly Row), but I think there's a way you can get higher density that doesn't detract from the character of a place. Taking out the centrality of cars / parking lots and ensuring lots of green is one way to help.   |
| 158 | I think these buildings belong along only on major thoroughfares (e.g. Mass Ave, Broadway, Pleasant, Rts 16 and 3, etc) and NOT on neighborhood streets such as is proposed in this revised map. Those are streets that have most MBTA services   |
| 159 | I think the 3 and 4 story buildings are okay for Arlington, however parking, public transport access and safe routes for biking and walking need to be part of the plan. With the current traffic none of the proposed areas are feasible without significant congestion and further danger to pedestrians and bikers. Our intersections are not lit well, most of the paint has come off and mass Ave is used as a highway. More space for living, needs to go hand in hand with more space for moving and it needs to be designed in sync. I'd also like to see more of this around Mystic St, Pleasant street, Medford and Mystic Lakes area. Not just along Mass Ave. If we don't expand other areas and add public transport option to characters of the town will change significant in one area and not the other. I'd like to see more distribution.  |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings   |
|-----|---|
| 160 | Please see my detailed comments submitted by email 7-15-23  |
| 161 | Single story buildings on Mass Ave should be two stories, or three at the maximum. They should be for businesses only, with homes on the side streets. We need more businesses.   |
| 162 | No more than three stories for lots behind Mass Ave and only 2 -3 lots in from Mass Ave should be included. The home owners impacted should be alerted to the potential changes now so they can give feedback before decisions are made. Neighborhoods should be preserved and not packed with 4 story buildings, 3 story max. The triangle between Mass Ave and Broadway should not be included and has the potential to become an island of extreme density. Some larger 6 or 9 unit buildings should be allowed on Mass Ave only or perhaps on Broadway. Setbacks and parking requirements should be preserved.  |
| 163 | <p>Size and scale which preserves solar access for neighbors and which meets existing requirements for green space, essential to sustainability during current climate breakdown. The cooling effect of trees and greenery is a component which I have not seen referenced in materials. Do not put the overlay in existing Industrial or Business zones. The latest map has flaws: targeting businesses on Broadway, Playtime among them, and targeting church yards along Mass Ave. The breathing populace relies on the churchyards, distinct from spiritual solace, for the cooling effects, stormwater absorption, and mental health respite. The Old Schwamb Mill was in another map. This illustrates a shocking lack of knowledge of the value the community recognizes of this institution, The Old Schwamb Mill, the physical building, its artisans, guest artists and musicians, volunteers and its board.</p> <p>Maps presented by the Working Group to date have lacked a holistic view and seem intent on achieving one objective: numbers. The Arlington community is not a vacuum. Yet the community are not being afforded due consideration by the maps to date in this unnecessarily compressed time frame.</p> |
| 164 | 4-5 story buildings , spread out in a variety of neighborhoods. They must include a percentage of subsidized rentals and condos.  |
| 165 | The buildings should not block solar panels on existing homes/buildings and trees and open space should be preserved. Balconies do not count as open space—an awful idea. I can't tell from your map if these items are being considered. Yes, put buildings near major roads in Arlington, but limit the zoning to only meet the 2000+ units required, not to allow more than what's required.   |
| 166 | Maximum 3 stories. Only put them on Mass Ave and Broadway and Grove St  |
| 167 | I am concerned about scale along Broadway, especially in neighborhoods. Five story buildings (and I'm opposed to Scenario 2 - No unit max) would really destroy the neighborhoods in East Arlington. they would create a wall of brick on each block. Why not spread these buildings out throughout East Arlington? Small multi-unit buildings exist comfortably in neighborhoods now. They should not be bunched up to destroy existing neighborhoods.   |
| 168 | I agree with the heights (3-5 stories) and areas (Mass Ave/Broadway) in the draft map.  |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 169 | <p>The area along Mass Avenue already supports 4-5 story buildings and those should be allowed. Taller buildings probably would need to be in complexes separated from the rest of Town. The Symmes property would be an example. So would the proposed Mugar development. The projects in Belmont/Cambridge across route 2 are somewhat taller and are acceptable in their context. I have no real problem with the proposed modified R-2 zoning (as someone who lives at the end of a block of Bailey Road where the other end is included in the new zone). However, increasing the density on those sites probably does not meet the housing need. (My view is that Arlington needs to increase its housing stock at a minimum of 2% per year to account for population growth.) There will need to be more developments such as at the Mirak property and at the Mugar site to reach any reasonable goal.</p>   |
| 170 | <p>I saw this survey at Robbins library.</p> <p>Regarding multifamily housing (new construction), this might be more of an issue in other parts of the country, but I'm concerned about abusive HOA's. HOA's have been used to bully residents, especially racial minorities, acting like an oppressive local government, by citing "infractions" of HOA codes (often stifling reasonable self-expression). HOA's also push out low-income, elderly, and minority residents with excessive fees and fines. Can we pass local laws to protect Arlington residents from abuse from HOA's? (E.g. John Oliver HOA video clip from April 2023.)</p> <p>Areas of Arlington that are FLAT and not steep hills are best for those with mobility devices, wheelchairs, baby strollers, etc. There's so many very steep hills in Arlington that aren't feasible for people with mobility limitations, wheelchairs, baby strollers, etc. That should be taken into consideration for new multifamily housing.</p> <p>Stack apartments and condos on top of Mass. Ave. businesses</p> <p>Near Arlington Heights bus depot and all Mass. Ave. businesses (Heights, Center, Capitol) would be great.</p> <p>Alewife area for close proximity to T</p> <p>Put multi families next to or very close walking distance to all schools so kids have short walk to school! Would reduce traffic during commute hours.</p> <p>We need more 20somethings in Arlington!</p> |
| 171 | 3 stories  |
| 172 | No building should be more than three stories and setbacks with tree planting space must be allowed. Mass Ave and Broadway are already the worst heat island areas in Arlington  |
| 173 | <p>Arlington is already densely populated. Adding 2000+ new units will make the town a more urban place. I don't see how to add that many units without allowing a number of very large buildings. Where would they go though? I would like as much as possible to preserve the historic character of the town, the trees, and green space. Also, it doesn't make sense to have all the new development the existing commercial areas on MA Ave. Why is there nothing on Summer St., or Broadway near Somerville? Or along Rt. 2. Or even Mystic Valley Parkway?</p>   |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|-----|--|
| 174 | <p>In my view, pockets of taller buildings can be tolerated, and even welcomed, in strategic locations, especially in already dense and built-up sections of town. The proposal to allow four- and six-story along large stretches of Mass Ave and into the buffer neighborhoods just behind is ill-conceived and out of character for our historic town. It will create a cavernous, inhospitable, and imposing corridor. Various developers will do as they please, building eye sores like we see at the corners of Lockeland and Mass Ave, adjacent to the high school, obliterating the architectural character of our established buildings and swallowing up green spaces and trees in the process. Do we really want these types of buildings defining the look and feel of our main thoroughfare and thriving neighborhoods? Some of this is proposed to dramatically alter existing neighborhoods which are already supporting two-family and ADUs with lovely yards, trees, inviting architecture, and active wildlife. The proposal will drastically, over time, diminish our tree canopy and open space, clog our streets with more cars and traffic (and with only one parking space required per unit? where are all those cars going to park in our neighborhoods?), over burden our already over-enrolled schools, and likely impact water runoff and flooding. I am not totally opposed to a multifamily housing plan, but the current map and proposal is being rushed without good consideration of all the impacts. Plus, there isn't even any low income/affordable housing mandate and will likely just drive up housing prices. Bus service has been cut since this mandate, and I don't it's fair to overly densify the entire corridor. This needs further review, better communication, and more community input.</p> |
| 175 | <p>Multifamily houses and apartment buildings should be all over town, not just along Mass Ave and Broadway. While large buildings should generally be close to those main transit routes (and the bikeway), they don't have to be all within one block of those roads. Currently it is very difficult to find an apartment in Arlington without being directly on Mass Ave with all the noise that comes along with that location. Another problem is that many of those buildings are taken by people with cars, because there are not apartment elsewhere for people who don't need to be near the bus. It is not like this in neighboring cities. The plan seems to do nothing to change this.</p>   |
| 176 | <p>Do not permit any structures whose size and/or scale will inhibit access for solar or green space, to the structure or to its neighbors, and maintains the existing zoning currently in place for green space requirements.</p> <p>Do NOT under any circumstances put the overlay in existing Industrial or Business zones areas. This directive was made abundantly clear in a previous survey, yet inexplicably the proposal contains numerous properties that are in fact Business/Industrial. Why are you not listening?</p>  |
| 177 | <p>The entirety of Mass Ave should allow for 8 stories of height and buildings should be allowed to occupy the entire plot with no open space or set back requirements. Extensive, accessible sidewalks should be required for all development.</p>  |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 178 | <p>I have lived on Newman Way for 35 years. We have two and three story homes on the street. The three story homes (I live in one) block the light - anything taller than 3 stories would do so to an even greater extent and would definitely adversely affect the quality of life here. (Most of the homes here are 100 years or older as well- I don't know if that would affect possible building options. ) Furthermore, the new four story building on Mass Ave near Stop and Shop/kitty- corner to the high school looks terrible. It does not blend into the existing neighborhood at all. It dominates the landscape while looking very out of place. We have a close neighborhood here, and the dynamics of a four or more story building would change the feel and attractiveness of the street.</p> <p>I am also a recently retired Arlington teacher (Ottoson). The schools cannot sustain the continuing increase in student population. Gibbs is bursting at the seams, the Ottoson is close to the number which led to the 6th graders going to Gibbs in the first place, and the lack of body space/increased demands on teachers is contributing to higher levels of stress and its many negative mental-health side effects. I hope the costs of additional school buildings and salaries for additional teachers is being included in the calculations.</p> <p>If structures that are 4 or more stories have to be built (why?), along Mass Ave seems to be the best spot.</p> |
| 179 | <p>The point of the exercise is to address our housing shortage. Generally I would support Scenario 2 for more capacity. The guidance suggests that six or 12-unit buildings will include affordable units and pencil out. Broadway from Warren to Rt 16 could allow 12-unit buildings. This doesn't increase our capacity as much as going into R0 or R1 areas which would be better. Upzoning R2 to three-family doesn't give us much extra capacity. Tufts and Bates between Mass Ave and Broadway would seem to be a perfect area for such larger buildings. (Focusing on E Arlington since I know those areas somewhat better.) Areas along Summer Street between Forest and Rt 3 should be considered for 6-units as well, particularly those with good access to the bike path and shopping e.g. between Mill and Brattle.</p>  |
| 180 | <p>Allow five story residential/commercial (1st floor) along Mass Ave corridor. Allow triplex stacked multi-family housing in modified R2 zones.</p>   |
| 181 | <p>The size we have is already good.</p>   |
| 182 | <p>We should avoid adding permission for larger buildings solely within the East Arlington R2/R3 districts. These areas already bear the biggest density burden in Arlington and it is time for less dense areas to share the burden of adding housing</p>   |
| 183 | <p>For the blue areas on the map, the proposed dimensional and setback rules are okay. For the green areas, there should be a 4-story max height and a 10' front setback requirement, so that we won't have canyon-creating street walls.</p>  |
| 184 | <p>4 stories</p>   |
| 185 | <p>It's a bit hard to read these maps online and I can't say I fully understand what's being proposed, but in general I would be fine with buildings up to 4 stories on Mass Ave and, for the areas adjacent to Mass Ave that are being considered, I guess I would be fine with 3 stories as a general rule.</p>  |

| #   | <b>Size and scale of buildings</b>   |
|-----|--|
| 186 | <p>Arlington should do the bare minimum to comply with the law, and nothing extra in terms of density or number of units. Already, the MBTA Communities regulations will have a major negative impact on the Town's residents, causing school overcrowding, increased traffic congestion, increased difficulty with parking, loss of our tree canopy and green space, increased stormwater impacts, loss of privacy, and loss of the historic neighborhood character that attracted most residents to live here – all so more luxury units can be built. The Committee should be looking for ways to mitigate impacts on our existing neighborhoods to the maximum extent possible. This means that density overlay districts should upzone with the lowest units-per-acre to comply with the requirements of the MBTA Communities Act. Where larger building massing is appropriate and doesn't overwhelm the neighborhood, the districts should require 6 units of housing per building to trigger Arlington's Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw, which requires 15% of the units to be affordable for people earning 60% of area median income. The overlay districts should also be located close to Alewife, along both Mass. Ave and Broadway, and not spread through the entire Town. I was very disappointed to see that the current map does not include a density overlay on Broadway close to the Cambridge line. It would make the most sense to locate the vast majority of the proposed units in East Arlington, which is closest to the MBTA Alewife station and on the bus routes, especially where it would be a more natural transition to have 3 or 4 story buildings located there, in proximity to more-urban Cambridge. The density overlays should also limit the height of new buildings, so we don't have "canyons" along our streets. The new buildings by Mass Ave. and Lockeland Ave in the vicinity of the High School are awful and show how bad planning already occurs in this Town. The residents who live here do not like those new buildings. Density overlay zones should also limit heights and preserve setbacks to minimize street canyons and the loss of open space. Six stories is too tall and should not be included at all. I am a Town Meeting Member in Precinct 8, and I reached out to my constituents about what the Working Group is currently proposing. They do not want Wildwood Ave to be included in the new density overlay districts. Please remove Wildwood Ave from the overlay area. Rather, the overlays should be located in East Arlington on Mass Ave and Broadway parcels that do not already include commercial properties. The constituents in my precinct are horrified about the current plans, stating that it will ruin the cohesive neighborhood that caused them to buy homes here. The Committee should go back to the drawing board and take more time to figure out where to locate the overlay districts on a street by street basis, with input from people who live on the streets, so that Arlington's plan has the least impact on existing neighborhoods. As a Town Meeting member, I cannot support the current proposal and would vote against it, and I would actively work to encourage other Town Meeting Members to vote against it.</p> |
| 187 | <p>Larger buildings should be on Mass. Ave., not in neighborhoods. Commercial areas should be preserved in special areas on Mass. Ave. as Brookline has done with its village concept. It is highly unlikely there will be expansion of commercial development with shopping being done increasingly on the internet and more residents working at home.</p>   |

| #   | Size and scale of buildings  |
|-----|--|
| 188 | <p>Moderate sized (4 to 6 floors) apartment buildings and housing complexes are appropriate for the parts Mass Ave and other major thoroughfares that are already zoned residential. However, buildings of at least 6 units should be encouraged to create more affordable housing.</p> <p>Smaller multi unit dwellings (housing with 3 to 4 units) are appropriate for most residential neighborhoods that are not zoned as single family only. My own street is R2 and has both 2 families and duplexes; housing with 4 units wouldn't differ much from the 2 new duplexes sited right next to one another.</p> <p>The requirements for build by right denser housing should be near Alewife whenever possible, since MBTA bus service to the rest of Arlington has decreased and it defeats the purpose of the MTBA Communities Act to put new housing in parts of town that aren't accessible by mass transit.</p> |
| 189 | 3 to 4 stories, perhaps with top story set back. Consider bonus floor (ground commercial)  |
| 190 | scale of the building should depend on parking availability for residents and businesses and visitors.   |
| 191 | 2-4 story buildings along commercial corridors and in the non-flood zone areas closest to Alewife and the Minuteman Bikeway or the Alewife Brook bike path. Respect existing historic district and listed buildings. Provide at least a 50' buffer around the Jason Russell house.   |
| 192 | 3 or more units is OK where there isn't already multi-family housing   |
| 193 | 3 stories for R2 zoning. We would love to see mix-used buildings in existing commercial buildings in Mass Avenue /existing commercial zones  |

## Q2: How should our MBTA Communities Districts relate to our commercial and industrial districts?

| #  | Relation to commercial districts   |
|----|--|
| 1  | Buildings with more units should be built on Mass Ave. It is OK for buildings with smaller number of units to go on side streets. I think having buildings with many units on side streets could be a problem for the people who already live there, as it could greatly increase population density as well as noise. Mixed-use development along Mass Ave could allow for more units without over populating the (often quieter) side streets. |
| 2  | I'd like very much to keep the existing bigger commercial areas (ie Gold's Gym area) just commercial and would love to see first floor mixed use buildings on Mass Ave.  |
| 3  | I think it would be great to integrate more housing in our commercial districts, especially through mixed use buildings (e.g., housing with ground-floor retail). This could help support local business as well as being convenient for residents to transit and other amenities.   |
| 4  | The areas with increased transit access would benefit from mixed use buildings with generous height limits. Midrise or more will make those corridors more vibrant.  |
| 5  | Protect the Commercial Districts and Minimize the number of MBTA Communities housing parcels that touch Mass Ave so we can prioritize commercial growth in town.   |
| 6  | Mixed use is preferred, putting multi-family developments directly on the commercial corridors.  |
| 7  | The larger elevator buildings should only be allowed in the existing commercial and industrial districts. Smaller three story buildings could be allowed on mass ave between the centers.  |
| 8  | g  |
| 9  | Your MBTA Communities Act overlay, above, should be pulled back from Mass Ave by at least one parcel to allow for more commercial growth along Mass Ave.   |
| 10 | MBTA communities districts should be kept out of our commercial & industrial districts.  |
| 11 | We need to protect the Commercial Districts and minimize the number of MBTA Communities housing parcels that touch Mass Ave so we can prioritize commercial growth in town. The map seems to show the housing butting right up against Mass Ave, which needs to be changed.  |
| 12 | Should be on commercial districts and/or side streets adjacent to these areas  |
| 13 | If we want our inclusionary zoning to kick in we need more larger apartment buildings on Mass Avenue and Broadway (there are already some there now).  |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts   |
|----|--|
| 14 | I think housing in commercial districts is acceptable as long as within access to bus stops and the environment feels residentially-friendly.  |
| 15 | The MBTA residential overlays should not impinge on commercial and industrial zones  |
| 16 | Siting districts near commercial centers seems like a good option, in order to provide foot traffic and customers. I'd like to see us incentivize mixed use in the MBTA districts (e.g., by giving a height bonus for ground floor commercial), similar to what Lexington did.   |
| 17 | <p>The more housing we build on Mass Ave and the more we replace under-used lots full of rubble along the bike path with housing, the more business will open in our commercial zones to serve the people living in that housing. In addition, people on or near Mass Ave are much (MUCH) more willing to walk to shopping and take the bus, which is the point of the MBTA Communities District legislation. The hills on either side of Mass Ave really disincentivize people to walk anywhere. If you keep the housing near the bottom of the hill, people will want to walk, shop, and take the bus.</p> <p>I also think we should try to encourage development the unused commercially zones land near the bike path for commercial purposes. Look at all the "lab space" being built in Watertown and Waltham. We could be doing that too!</p> |
| 18 | Heights and 'center' (would rename brattle) southern borders and east Arlington n/s borders okay .. Would extend northern borders to bike path .. And include the 'void' in the center to give continuity .. Would also include roadway overlay .. Differences in height to provide usual and density variety along corridors .. Add height etc benefits to promote mixed use applications   |
| 19 | I agree that our commercial and industrial districts should remain in place, as we need these services in town. I have no problem with new development that retains commercial space but adds housing on the upper floors.   |
| 20 | I think the MBTA districts should be relatively close to commercial zones, so residents can walk to shops/amenities and businesses have a larger local customer base. I think it does make sense not to overlap the MBTA districts with commercial zones, which I appreciate in the current draft map. I'm not sure about the relationship between the MBTA districts and industrial zones in theory, although in practice industrial & commercial zones are quite close, so there doesn't seem to be a useful distinction.  |
| 21 | I think putting MBTA-C districts near business districts but not overlapping them might be the best to encourage new development and support local businesses. Our current industrial areas are rather underutilized, but I'm not sure how to best approach that here.   |
| 22 | Fully legalizing 5 on 1s would require ground floor retail to be legal in the zone.  |
| 23 | They should be closest to Alewife - public transportation in other parts of town is difficult at best.   |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts  |
|----|---|
| 24 | We should preserve our commercial and industrial space but allow larger residential buildings near by.  |
| 25 | I would think residential above commercial spaces could work, although a noisy night time business (e.g. restaurant) under a residential space would be tough for the residents. Personally I would find residential space in an industrial area undesirable.   |
| 26 | <p>I notice that none of the proposed areas are near the town center. That feels like a missed opportunity for development that could meaningfully reduce the rate of car dependency in Arlington.</p> <p>Also I hope that the opportunity is seized to incentivise mixed uses for some portion of these areas, particularly those directly abutting Mass Ave. I recall hearing that Lexington had some zones that did not require mixed use, but allowed for buildings to be built an additional storey higher if the first floor is used as commercial space. That type of incentive could turn out really well for these proposed zones.</p> |
| 27 | <p>Protect, preserve, and grow the commercial and industrial districts by keeping the MBTA communities housing out of our commercial and industrial districts.</p> <p>“Commercial” refers to the Business and Industrial zones. So when people say that they want to protect the commercial districts, they mean business and industrial zones.</p>   |
| 28 | <p>I strongly support mixed use zoning for commercial and residential, but am more wary for mixing residential and industrial zoning.</p> <p>We should absolutely build our higher density housing such that it’s not in a car dependent location. Walking and biking as the primary ways to get around for every day tasks will help traffic, safety, and the environment.</p>   |
| 29 | Keep MBTA Communities Districts OUT OF AND AWAY FROM our existing commercial and industrial districts by a parcel or two to allow for future business growth. Do not sacrifice our businesses for housing. There is room for affordable housing AND future business growth.   |
| 30 | Please consider siting the MBTA communities just outside the current business districts - so as not to conflict or risk the preservation of the business and mix that drew many folks to live and visit Arlington.  |
| 31 | the plan cannot displace businesses nor eliminate commercial space. It should require commercial space on the ground floor of tall, otherwise residential buildings. Arlington would be worse off if we gained housing but lost businesses.   |
| 32 | The MBTA Communities should protect our commercial and industrial districts and allow for business growth along with housing.   |
| 33 | MBTA Communities housing must be sited OUTSIDE of our commercial and industrial districts by a parcel or two.   |
| 34 | MBTA Communities housing must be sited OUTSIDE of our commercial and industrial districts by a parcel or two  |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts   |
|----|--|
| 35 | MBTA Communities housing must be sited OUTSIDE of our commercial and industrial districts.   |
| 36 | Do NOT replace commercial/ retail space with housing. Arlington needs a varied commercial/ retail mix.   |
| 37 | They should preserve them and allow for their expansion over time.   |
| 38 | Why not create new industrial and commercial districts in areas that are residentially zoned that are not already densely populated and have more land. I'm sure the people living there would not like it, but neither do the people living in the most densely populated areas of town like the idea of building even more housing in their area for the town to solve the MBTA Communities mandate. This needs to be a town-wide solution, not just using the lower income areas of town and leaving the wealthier areas untouched.   |
| 39 | We shouldn't exclude commercial districts from the MBTA overlay just because we're worried about commercial space. We could very much use more mixed use construction. Suspect we really have more retail frontage than we need. All the single story commercial on Mass ave in the B plots is a lost opportunity. So is the overly granular zoning.   |
| 40 | Don't allow any commercial or industrial areas to be converted to housing. Encourage higher density housing in the near vicinity of commercial districts. I'm skeptical of the mixed-use concept as developers seem to exploit this by providing minimal commercial space.   |
| 41 | <p>By eliminating the option of building in commercial and industrial zones, all new housing means tearing down existing housing. And to build large complexes of more than 6 units, that means tearing down multiple smaller houses to aggregate lot size, thereby changing the character of the whole neighborhood. This is a problem.</p> <p>At the same time, I am disappointed that all the proposed housing on the current map is adjacent to Mass Ave. Why shouldn't other neighborhoods also be considered, as long as they have reasonable access to bus service. Lots along Summer Street, Broadway, Pleasant St. and Park Ave. are some examples that should be included.</p> |
| 42 | We should keep residential out of our commercial and residential districts. MBTA Districts should be adjacent to transportation, prioritizing first mass transit (Alewife) and then bus routes that are still run without reductions in service. If the MBTA is unable to provide non-reduced service, then our commitment under MBTA-C due to bus service should be similarly reduced.  |
| 43 | To the extent that allowing R3 or R4 housing in existing zones across a wide area of arlington gets us there, keeping the commercial and industrial districts outside of this works. But we still permit housing in B and I districts under current zoning   |
| 44 | they should not overlay any of our B and I districts, and in fact should allow some buffer room around these districts for possible future expansion. The v3 map from Utile did this; the latest map from the Working Group does not.  |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts   |
|----|--|
| 45 | I don't understand all the details of the different areas. i think multiunit housing as been done successfully in the past but the eruption of the garbage buildings on the corners of lockeland and mass ave are a worrying trend.  |
| 46 | multifamily housing desired in walking distances of businesses.  |
| 47 | mixed-use nice in theory but doesn't seem to be doing very well in new construction (eg two new buildings near HS which took forever to fill up  |
| 48 | We have very few industrial zones with limited expansion possibilities. With the loss of the Mirac industrial zone, there are fewer.   |
| 49 | Some in commercial districts, as well as on neighboring streets. I'd like to be careful of putting housing in industrial areas if it's going to look like we're 'sticking them in ugly areas'.   |
| 50 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The dearth of commercial and industrial space/businesses in town is well known and (as indicated on the map) the central business district should be off limits.</li> <li>– There have been a number of losses re: commercial/industrial space. The Brigham's development, of course, but also Sunnyside Ave (a worthy redevelopment, but at a cost), Mill Street (large commercial space converted to religious use, so probably off our tax rolls), Mirak property (could have included commercial space - a la 22 Mill St.)</li> <li>– The Lexington MBTA districts include a bonus floor for developers if they make it commercial - a brilliant idea</li> <li>– When considering permitting a commercial space, the approach has been to build the space and then search for a user. A wiser approach might be outreach to potential users (green tech, small bio labs) and build to suit</li> </ul> |
| 51 | MBTA communities must be kept out of commercial and industrial districts, but should be located nearby to allow for walkability. If MBTA districts are placed within business and industrial zones then developers will have legal ability to ELIMINATE those businesses to build residential units. This would spell bad news for Arlington.  |
| 52 | Near them, perhaps some commercial district on Mass Ave could be converted to residential to make a contiguous zone, if we could trade for other residential zoning as commerical closer in to the business district (e.g. the housing right in the Heights business area)   |
| 53 | MBTA communities should not be limited to commercial corridor.   |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts  |
|----|---|
| 54 | Focusing around our commercial and industrial districts makes sense. However, we should also think about neighboring communities, and the area of East Arlington near Alewife is under-developed. While the parks there are great, the area is relatively inaccessible and unsafe at night, and presents an opportunity to build car-free residential property close to a rapid transit station. We should ask the MBTA about building a new head building for entry to the Alewife Red Line station on the Arlington side of the town line (there are tunnels beneath the ground for Alewife Yard). We should also look to what Cambridge is doing near Alewife and consider similar commercial and residential development. |
| 55 | <p>Multi-family housing near and around commercial districts should help these businesses flourish (more foot traffic, more people = more business). I would be in favor of mixed use buildings in these districts as well.</p> <p>But I know folks are sensitive about reducing our already small # of businesses in these districts so we may not want to zone for multifamily housing throughout industrial/business zones.</p>  |
| 56 | We should not be building residential units in industrial zones. Our current mixed used allowance can be used on Mass. Avenue and Broadway.   |
| 57 | There should be the opportunity for small businesses to develop around MBTA communities outside the Mass corridor. There should also be the consideration of protecting residences from noise and light pollution typical around business districts. Good sound insulation within the buildings and replacing bright white streetlamps with 3000k streetlamps could help with this.   |
| 58 | We should be encouraging commercial districts on bus lines and near public transport so that those areas can thrive and bring in shoppers from other areas  |
| 59 | MBTA Communities Districts must remain outside our existing commercial and industrial districts, with a buffer of a parcel or two to allow for commercial growth.   |
| 60 | MBTA Communities Housing Districts must remain outside all of our existing business and industrial districts, with a buffer of a parcel or two to allow for commercial growth.  |
| 61 | Commercial and industrial districts need to be preserved as commercial and industrial, these should not be turned into residential buildings. Arlington needs to GROW its commercial and industrial base, not shrink it.  |
| 62 | We might think about zoning taller buildings (>4 stories) just outside (or between) the major commercial areas, as these new buildings will have no commercial space and we don't want to wipe out our centers. In the centers, we could zone the buildings at 4 stories. IMO, this might incentivize landowners to add apartments on top of commercial space rather than razing the buildings altogether.  |
| 63 | They should include all parcels along Mass Ave and parts of Broadway, excluding town properties and historic districts.   |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts  |
|----|---|
| 64 | MBTA communities districts should preserve current commercial spaces and allow for new ones to emerge, both on major corridors and within neighborhoods.  |
| 65 | Keeping existing commercial clear of the districts generally a good call. It may be appropriate to selectively add to the commercial zones. Done right, commercial use could preserve some historic buildings, maybe. But please assess all the tradeoffs. Does this mean bigger and/or higher MBTA districts? What if you live in a grandfathered house rezoned as commercial and the lots in back of you are developed for denser housing while the commercial space in front of you grows as well – you are sandwiched between.  |
| 66 | Having the MBTA districts alongside but not overlapping the commercial district - as the draft currently has - seems perfect. That way, there shouldn't be concern over losing commercial/industrial space, but there will be walkable amenities for the districts and the potential for increased customers for the local companies.   |
| 67 | A mix of buildings interspersed with existing commercial and residential, however not to lose expansion opportunities for commercial and industrial   |
| 68 | Integrated  |
| 69 | MBTA community districts should be accessible to public transportation, businesses and industries typically used by residents. We need to find incentives for businesses and industry to come to Arlington and stay. The burden of ever-increasing property tax is very bad for longtime homeowners here.   |
| 70 | In general, given the desire to retain existing commercial space and the inability to require a commercial component of MBTA communities sites, it is best to try to avoid existing commercial or industrial zoned areas or lots that are strong candidates to be included in commercial districts in the future.   |
| 71 | Our commercial zoning is a mess. We should place housing where it makes sense – e.g., less dense part of commercial zones.  |
| 72 | <p>I think all people deserve a reasonable-distance commute to their jobs. Commuting by a reasonably short walk, bike, bus/T ride, or car ride would be ideal.</p> <p>We need more restaurants in Arlington. We need more public school staff in Arlington (e.g. bus drivers, paraprofessionals). Those workers should have reasonable commutes to their jobs.</p> <p>The 77 and 67 bus routes are both pretty decent, though both need to run more often and the 67 needs to run on weekends. Perhaps more housing density could be put along the 67 bus route (but walking distance to the 77 for weekend coverage). The current map doesn't take advantage much of the 67 bus. I'm glad the corridor along the 87 bus route was added.</p> |
| 73 | Dense housing next to the commercial districts seems like a good idea, but I'm fine with it anywhere, especially on bus routes.   |

| #  | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>   |
|----|---|
| 74 | Larger buildings should be allowed between the 3 major business districts (East Arlington, Arl. Center, and the Heights). Let's shore up our 3 commercial centers with multi family housing that will support it by providing customers.  |
| 75 | I think housing should be available in commercial and industrial districts. It helps our commercial districts thrive, while still protecting the environment (requiring less driving), if there is more foot traffic from nearby residents. That doesn't mean we would forbid industrial uses, but merely that industrial uses should not exclude housing. Right now, industrial use is acceptable if it is a price-competitive use of land, but housing is more of a priority to avoid a social crisis and real harm to our community well-being. One small additional consideration is that it is wise to make some provision for art/crafts space in the industrial sectors (partly on the merits, and partly to avoid having the active local arts/crafts community in Arlington become a vocal opponent of the new housing). |
| 76 | No MBTA residential in the commercial or industrial districts.  |
| 77 | They should not reduce existing commercial/industrial space and encourage new businesses on the main corridors.   |
| 78 | Do not remove any commercial or industrial districts. Allow potential mixed use on Mass Ave and Broadway.   |
| 79 | The map is terrible because it places almost all of the MBTA zones directly on Mass Ave, preventing commercial development. All MBTA zones should be pulled back from Mass Ave by at least one parcel.  |
| 80 | It is good to have housing near commercial districts so that people can walk to stores and other activities, rather than driving.   |

| #  | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>  |
|----|--|
| 81 | <p>I support clustering the commercial zones as much as possible - swapping some residential lots for mixed-use (with commercial) properties in a few cases - giving the Town the control to have mixed-use in these commercial zones - The Heights, the Center, East Arlington and other smaller 15-minute neighborhoods with commercial space available at these nodes.</p> <p>Restaurants may be nice for discretionary spending budgets and visitors from neighboring towns, but resident T-riders need the basics in walking distance.</p> <p>If you live in East Arlington and you do not have a car, where do you shop for groceries? Stop &amp; Shop on Rte 16 &amp; Broadway in Somerville? Boyle's Market? The Food Pantry?</p> <p>I support 4 story residential buildings on the main corridors with the incentive for a 5th story (with a required 10' set-back) if the ground floor is commercial mixed-use and/or 20% of the units or one additional unit (which ever is greater) are affordable.</p> <p>I support co-operative living and working development and shared-working spaces.</p> <p>I support having Neighborhood Offices and the idea of allowing R districts specific uses like professional office, etc. when the parcel faces secondary roads. I don't see why the allowance should be limited to R1 &amp; R2 districts only, but extend to all R districts when the parcel faces secondary roads listed in the proposal submitted by Working Group member Mette Aamodt. As far as ReZoning the current B-1 parcels and including them in an MBTA district, I caution you to look at the houses being used as offices from an architectural preservation lens, as well as an opportunity for multi-family housing, specifically houses that became office space as a way of maintaining the expenses of preserving the building.* Many of these structures add character and a sense of Arlington's history to our avenues; so I would encourage their re-use, rehab, and renovation into multi-family dwellings and to not lose these buildings to characterless boxes. If Arlington wants to increase its tourism and hype its historical roots, a characterless corridor of multi-family buildings in the current "style" will do the opposite.</p> <p>Arlington's Design Standards were...</p> <p>"created as an outgrowth of economic development goals identified in the Arlington Master Plan (adopted February, 2015) that seek to identify areas of "economic under-utilization". These Design Standards are envisioned as a first step in updating the Zoning ByLaw, and they are tailored specifically to Arlington by focusing on the primary corridors unique to Arlington: Massachusetts Avenue and Broadway, the Mill Brook and the Minuteman Bikeway."</p> <p>MBTA Communities may want to use these existing guidelines and apply a similar version to the overlay districts OR re-Zone the Town to meet MBTA Communities</p> <p><a href="https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/45347/636842906363630000">https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/45347/636842906363630000</a></p> <p>*See Mass Ave examples in memo: Everett and Harlow; Marion and Linwood</p> |

| #  | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>   |
|----|---|
| 82 | <p>We need to protect commercial and industrial districts and not allow housing to encroach on them more than has already happened. The Mirak development should never have been allowed. It would have been a perfect site for light industry, which the town could have actively pursued instead of passively letting whatever happen. Developers prefer residential development because it is more profitable than commercial development, so it is up to the town to do something rather than let nature take its course. I don't begrudge developers making money – that is why they are in business – so we need to plan for the kind of town we want and make that happen rather than wait and hope that it will turn out the way we want.</p> <p>We should not allow what has unfortunately been approved for the Christo's block – virtually zero commercial space for what was once an entire commercial block. The ground floor in the new development should have been entirely commercial, and now there will be tiny commercial spaces.</p> <p>Residential property taxes are crippling to many. Without ensuring commercial development (and without proper support from the town), property taxes here will make living in Arlington unaffordable for all but the wealthiest. The biggest need we have in this state isn't simply housing, it's AFFORDABLE housing. Rising property taxes impact renters as well as owners, and our lack of a commercial base will cause rents to rise dramatically along with the cost of ownership.</p> |
| 83 | integrated  |
| 84 | Denser development makes sense near commercial districts. We should promote walkability.  |
| 85 | I am concerned that the original plan will result in the elimination of large tracts of commercially zoned property. The MBTA Communities plan should add housing to existing housing, not replace commercial and business zoned properties with zoned housing that may or may not get built.   |
| 86 | Allow mixed-use development on Mass Ave and Broadway with additional height allowed to equalize the number of housing units when the first floor is used for commercial space. Allow development of multi-family housing - including mixed-use - on parcels currently zoned Commercial or Industrial that are in or adjacent to the proposed district; there are current one-story commercial buildings that would be well suited to replacement with mixed-use.  |
| 87 | It should avoid including them in the proposed overlay districts, and also allow room for them to expand somewhat.  |
| 88 | As indicated in our Master Plan, and the AHNAP, residents prefer bldgs under 5 stories along main corridors, with 4 stories being favored. We are not a small city; we are a town. The wildly successful Arlington Brewery event at the Res was courtesy of a start up that chose to locate here bc they "liked the small town vibe." Four to five stories, WITH stepbacks, along Mass Ave, parts of Broadway, maybe parts of Warren St, would be acceptable. Turning Arlington into a smaller version of Watertown, Somerville, Cambridge, etc. by allowing taller bldgs and in more areas is not the direction we should be heading in.   |

| #  | Relation to commercial districts  |
|----|---|
| 89 | This question is a bit vague, i.e. the meaning of “relate to” is unclear to me. I would suggest an explicit description from the working group on how the incorporated business districts into the plan, e.g. kept all business and industrial districts the same with no room for expansion in this current plan.  |
| 90 | some but not all of the MBTA districts should be nearby commercial/industrial districts. I don’t think it is fair to impact and involve only those parts of the town that are already quite dense. I would like you to look at building along the RT 2 access roads like Cambridge has successfully done or in some areas of town near the parks. I think incentivizing mixed use development is a good idea.   |
| 91 | I support integration of commercial and residential areas with commercial space on the bottom floor and apartments – especially those accessible by elevator for an aging population – on floors above.   |
| 92 | While I love the idea of a 15 min walking community close to our commercial districts. I’d like us to consider re-zoning along Frontage road, especially near the church and Park Ave heading toward Lexington. I know there are requirements to keep these new areas contiguous but I think we are missing an opportunity. The area is unattractive (good to redevelop over time), has bus route, bike to Belmont. Admittedly harder to access Arlington commercial districts due to hill. |
| 93 | I am in favor of housing in all zones including commercial and industrial if it’s necessary. It should at least be within walking distance of commercial.   |
| 94 | No comment  |
| 95 | There are many decrepit commercial locations that aren’t well taken care of and possibly not adding much value to towns. For example, the old Gold Gym location in Arlington Heights. Why not use a large parcel like this to create a multi-use space with a cared-for business and housing together? Many buildings on Mass Ave already have commercial space on the first floor and residential above that. Why not add another story to these spaces that are proving to already work?  |
| 96 | We always need businesses   |
| 97 | Now you’re just making up terms for our neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods should remain largely as they are.   |
| 98 | Since Arlington is tough on new businesses (i.e., hard to start a new business, get a permit for existing chains - just look at the empty restaurants and store fronts on Mass Ave) - I don’t think we particularly need more people to live in Arlington. The traffic is bad enough and the busses already don’t serve the community well.   |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts   |
|-----|--|
| 99  | <p>This is a tricky question. I would ere on the side of not putting the MBTA Communities Districts in existing commercial and industrial districts. Because mixed-use cannot be mandated by the MBTA Communities Law, it would risk harming our already precarious business community. I have heard some who don't want MBTA Communities Districts on any parcels adjacent to Mass Ave, so as to allow for re-zoning and consolidation to make larger commercial parcels. IF the Arlington Redevelopment Board has a proposal to re-zone some parts of Mass Ave from Residential to Commercial, then they should submit those proposed zoning changes this year in parallel with MBTA Communities Districts, to show the scheme and motivation. Otherwise, any existing R parcels on Mass Ave without a specific reason for not including them in the MBTa Communities Districts, should be included in them.</p> |
| 100 | <p>The MBTA is an unreliable system. It cannot support the current residents of Arlington. It is laughable to believe that building more housing along it will give us a viable source of transportation . It is "nice" that there is bussing but as a resident of East Arlington I can realistically say that the system is unreliability. I have children that rely on the bus for in town transportation and it is awful. We don't need to tax the system any further by building housing on an inadequate mode of transportation.</p>  |
| 101 | Existing infrastructure  |
| 102 | <p>Building off Mass Ave and onto side streets only will increase congestion in neighborhoods that are already crowded. If you wish to build upwards, then do it along Mass Ave where the new buildings already look ridiculous, and leave our neighborhoods alone.</p>  |
| 103 | <p>New residential units should ONLY be built along Mass Ave and Broadway and other existing commercial &amp; industrial districts, not on side streets. The proposed map that sees large buildings bleed in 4-5 houses away from Mass Ave/Broadway is ill-conceived. Instead, if those additional units are required or desired, the incentive proposed to let developers build an extra 1-2 floors by designing a mixed-use building (commercial on ground floor, residential above) in an existing commercial or industrial district seems like the right way to go. It will make Arlington more hip, increase the commercial tax base (which will hopefully reduce the residential tax burden) and make the town more walkable.</p>  |
| 104 | <p>This will be tremendous help to bring more business to the local stores and commercial businesses located in Mass Ave.</p>  |
| 105 | <p>There is currently a long Facebook thread happening (The Arlington List) on this topic: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/groups/160644117397/?hoisted_section_header_type=recently_seen&amp;multi_permalinks=10160701218287398">https://www.facebook.com/groups/160644117397/?hoisted_section_header_type=recently_seen&amp;multi_permalinks=10160701218287398</a></p> <p>Here is a copy of one resident's opinion from this Facebook thread:</p> <p>The MBTA "Communities" act is a state-level law that the attorney general has determined we have to comply with. It has nothing to do with the MBTA service and</p>   |

| # | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>nothing to do with improvements. It says that communities within half a mile radius of Alewife or other subway and railway hubs must have 15 units/acre density. Arlington already does, but the developer-friendly law doesn't count single and two family zoning, requiring zoning to be upzoned to 3 family and apartment building zoning. They've decided at the state level Arlington must create zoning for 10% more homes (!) in our already 2nd highest density town - and 9th or 12 most dense community, if you include cities. The goal of the law is to put the density as close to Alewife as possible to minimize the pollution, traffic and congestion caused by all these new units.</p> <p>The Town's planning department and the MBTA density overlay working committee is a quasi-public meeting body made up of people who are on the record as mostly up-zoners, YIMBYs and density promoters. Unfortunately the Planning Department and the working group have decided the mandate to build the 10% of units near Alewife might be expanded to density up and down our major streets. The density overlay threatens commercial/retail businesses if applied on top of them. The density overlay doesn't respect our town has existing affordability laws, and the MBTA law would not necessarily preserve these. (Towns can take additional steps to preserve their affordability rules, which the state says it 'may approve'.)</p> <p>Things to remember about this:</p> <p>The MBTA density overlay is not about fixing the MBTA or MBTA service. It's about adding density to towns that are near the subway and commuter rail hubs. It's a state law being implemented by a vocally pro-density working group under a planning department that has spoken about their interest in using it to add lots of density.</p> <p>The MBTA density overlay doesn't promote affordability - in fact it restricts affordable housing in it, and might remove our existing affordable housing rules (15% of apartment buildings, starting with the 6th unit). It will result in lots of high priced luxury condos, though, leaving that number only limited by the building masses and the number of floors our working group allows - or the number of units per property they approve.</p> <p>The density overlay was supposed to be by Alewife to mitigate the number of cars and traffic that comes with adding 2046 new units to such a built out town. Currently the working group is not considering this goal, saying that they are 'untethered' from that requirement – and that they want to 'overcomply', to make more up-zoning than required.</p> <p>The density overlay could kill our commercial and business zones if it's applied to our existing business blocks- the overlay forbids and retail/commercial requirements language, so would likely convert businesses over into residential everywhere it's applied. This will raise the rents and taxes of Arlington, since business tax payers don't use schools or other services, but pay the same. Also, we'd lose our struggling businesses, unless the overlay doesn't include the business properties.</p> <p>There are a series of public meetings coming up. At the first in-person public meeting, the public were basically put into little table discussion groups and not allowed to provide whole-hall comments or ask whole-hall questions. Therefore your best bet is to attend and to ask questions where they allow them and to write to your Town Meeting Members and your Select Board members.</p> |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts   |
|-----|--|
| 106 | I like incentivizing mixed-use buildings, with a business on the first floor and residences upstairs.<br><br>Most places in Arlington are walkable to Mass Ave, so I don't think there needs to be a super-narrow corridor.  |
| 107 | They should not. Arlington has never been a heavily commercial town.   |
| 108 | Build stuff along Mass Ave   |
| 109 | I think having it close to commercial districts make sense. I would not replace commercial or industrial since we need more places for companies or employers in this town.  |
| 110 | We should not allow housing in industrial zones. Housing in commercial zones should require that the first floor allow for commercial.   |
| 111 | the zoning should be mixed to allow for commercial use to bring restaurants,shops,bars,offices etc to encourage community in the neighborhood and to reduce trip times.  |
| 112 | This is too large of a question to answer in a single survey response.   |
| 113 | Stop wasting taxpayer money fighting the Mugar's who want to build needed new housing within walking distance to Alewife subway/bus station as rapid-transit subway is the most preferred MBTA mode. Then prioritize more housing near commercial districts. Industrial districts should be for noisy businesses, not housing.   |
| 114 | We need walkable neighborhoods to create business. By keeping commercial/industrial locations so limited, we force the majority of Arlington residents to rely on cars, which negates the appeal of local businesses. Community Districts in walking distance of commercial/industrial districts will contribute to walkable communities– but allowing mixed use throughout Arlington is far more sustainable. |
| 115 | We should put housing in locations with commercial shopping opportunities  |
| 116 | Commercial and industrial is the place to refine to multistory. Not in two family house neighborhoods.   |
| 117 | Development should be along Mass. Ave., not in neighborhoods that already have 2 family houses. The developments at Mirak and 1025 Mass. Ave. should be the type and locations for more development, not the side streets that already have 2-families.  |
| 118 | I think it's a good idea to build housing closer to Mass. Ave. to make walking to a store more accessible to residents, and to make taking a bus a reasonable solution to their daily travel options. On that subject, I would suggest making the Mass. Ave. bus free to encourage people to ride it when they go shopping, etc.   |
| 119 | The business districts on Mass Ave. are the perfect ones to develop into mixed use buildings, with businesses on first floor and housing above.  |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts  |
|-----|---|
| 120 | <p>The MBTA Communities Districts should generally follow and be supporting of the commercial districts we have today. The most successful development of both commercial and residential improvements will be where it is most integrated. Utilizing cross streets that stem off of Mass Ave and Broadway as a way to slightly elevated scale and density will support further development along Mass Ave.</p> <p>Having commercial opportunities in larger developments along Mass Ave will be important to the activation along the corridor. Ground floor commercial space will need more density than what is above it to succeed and a webbed approach to density will also allow for a balance of uses.</p>  |
| 121 | The question isn't posed properly, as it assumes everyone agrees that these districts "relate" to our town's interests.   |
| 122 | It would be better and more cost efficient to have more multi-family homes further from the industrial/commercial districts. But having them in a variety of districts is best.   |
| 123 | They can be in the commercial and industrial districts or walking distance from them  |
| 124 | <p>Arlington is a fantastic community with many amenities that residents continually discover and enjoy the longer that they live here. Having walkable access to core services like the post office, town hall, Fox and Robbins libraries, green spaces, and grocery stores make it feasible for many weekly errands to be done in town without need to hop in the car to travel minimizing environmental impact and keeping more dollars local in the community. Today, most of these services are available on or adjacent to Mass Ave and the center of town.</p> <p>An opportunity exists to expand commercial and industrial zoning for greater flexibility of mixed use to promote a greater integration of commercial spaces on ground level of new building construction similar to the existing precedent of businesses directly on Mass Ave. Compared to other surrounding areas in the Greater Boston Metro, there are less options for choice in dining compared to Cambridge or Boston. Industrial zoning is more nuanced as noise power and pollution associated with these heavier industries could negatively impact harmony and residential feel of neighborhoods, through aspects like increased traffic and freight traffic on densely settled streets that could hold additional hazard risks to bikers and pedestrians.</p> |
| 125 | They should be within the commercial districts along mass ave.  |
| 126 | Allow residential units to be built on top of commercial properties.  |
| 127 | We do NOT want to reduce our commercial or industrial zones - we should put zoning allowing larger residential homes near to areas that already allow for many folks to walk to shops/parts/movies/etc. But we do want housing like this to be walkable from the T. The MBTA service in Arlington has declined dramatically in the past few years, making it MORE difficult to induce folks who will NOT use cars to relocate to Arlington. We need a diversity of kinds of shops so that folks can really shop in Arlington and not feel they have to drive to get what they need.   |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts  |
|-----|---|
| 128 | The new districts should all be near Alewife, the only real mass transit in our area. We should not build near our minimal and shrinking bus routes. We should rezone only our existing residential areas and not cannibalize any of our retail, business, and industrial space.  |
| 129 | Put people near commercial districts. Increase number of houses with 15-minute walk to restaurants & stores.  |
| 130 | We should support businesses.   |
| 131 | Residential on Mass Ave is fair game. Commercial properties outside of the 3 main business districts - the blocks around Capitol Square, the Center and the Heights down to Foot of the Rocks, also fair game. Leave the industrial parcels alone.  |
| 132 | People should have ample residential options in between our 3 main areas. People live nearby, and can walk to amenities.  |
| 133 | Leave out commercial space in our big shopping areas. Don't touch the industrial parcels. Otherwise, case by case in the areas in between   |
| 134 | Protect businesses especially those along Mass Ave in east Arlington but all along Mass Ave in general. The density overlay should not be applied to our existing retail and commercial properties. If the overlay includes Mass Ave store fronts, those businesses will be lost.   |
| 135 | Commercial and industrial districts should be maintained, not crowded out. Maintain opportunities to provide jobs in Arlington that do not require a commute.   |
| 136 | Buildings with residential units should NOT BE LOCATED WITHIN business or industrial zones. In fact, there should be a one or two parcel buffer between new housing and existing business and industrial zones, so that in future we can EXPAND our business and industrial zones. People should be able to work within walking distance of their homes, which means we need to RETAIN and EXPAND our business and industrial zones.  |
| 137 | I don't know much about this aspect of it. My concerns might be that if say, food establishments are housed in the same dwellings as residential, there might be an uptick in rodent issues/infestations residents then have to deal with – again renters. My other concern is again, the way mixed use buildings will contain majority high end market rate units, increasing COL for the area, where even the so-called affordable housing units created by inclusionary zoning earmarks will be out of reach for most BIPOC, disabled and low income people (including voucher holders), because many of them seem to be priced for people making at/around 80% AMI, which is more than double the AMI for Black and Latinx households in the Boston metro area and higher than vouchers can access. |

| #   | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>  |
|-----|--|
| 138 | Denser housing should be located in areas within walking distance of shopping opportunities. I would favor preserving business zoning where we now allow it (and ultimately simplifying the bylaw and allowing more commercial development along the main streets. I also favor commercial with residential above it and am skeptical of sizable pure commercial buildings in Arlington. I note that almost all of the area between Broadway and Massachusetts Avenue is within a 15 minute walk of Capitol Square, Arlington Center, or both. (I live outside that area, just barely, and can easily totter to Quebrada and Kickstand both in 12 minutes or less). If we were to allow multifamily by right in this area, probably 6-8 unit buildings would be preferable, getting bigger near the edges of more intense sectors nearer to the avenues. |
| 139 | I am not sure about this one. But please don't build highrises here.   |
| 140 | Mixed use buildings are not a great idea. The townhouses at Mill and Mass are more appealing because they create a mini compact neighborhood next to a bunch of things. Having larger business building and separate residential buildings is ideal. I already live in an apartment building. I'm glad there aren't stores in the lobby. It is more safe and secure to not have as many strangers coming and going. Better for peoples kids, too. Places like Dudley street seem ripe for renovation with more buildings that make good homes. Why not allow more businesses with frontage on the bike path? Why not encourage more duplex conversions in all these boring neighborhoods full of nothing but houses? Especially on some of the bigger streets like Park Ave or Lake Street or Mystic Ave?  |
| 141 | The MBTA Communities Districts should relate to our commercial and industrial districts by keeping out of them. They should follow the law and find a way to locate them within 0.5 miles of a major transit station (in this case Alewife).   |
| 142 | I would encourage the committee to include at least some commercial parcels in the MBTA communities (for example, some of those outside of the 3 main "squares" around Lake Street, Arlington Center and Park Ave). Having additional housing along commercial corridors will promote vitality and support for retail uses on existing corridors, and many of the existing uses on certain parcels are not storefront/pedestrian oriented (for example, the bank parcels on Mass Ave, the RCN building, the Lahey building on Broadway, etc).  |
| 143 | Strongly support mixed use along Mass Ave and Broadway. Ground floor commercial with upper story residential benefits everyone!  |
| 144 | I think they should be closely related if not integrated. High priority should be for taller, mixed-use zoning in commercial areas especially (not necessarily sure I think the same for industrial). For example, high priority should be to include housing above shops/restaurants in biz districts along Mass. Ave. Town should also consider altering the parking requirement for such multi-use units. If we had those along Mass Ave, and in some future world the bus is more frequent (or replaced by another faster form of mass transit), allowing for more density and fewer cars would be good for climate—and for local businesses too.  |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts  |
|-----|---|
| 145 | I would rather see new developments in industrial and commercial districts than expanded into existing neighborhood streets as proposed in this map.  |
| 146 | I'd prefer more commercial than Residential. Think about small offices, small start ups, lab incubators and a<br><br>Start ups and shared working space. If we dont choose to offer this, it will be a serious loss of opportunity. Thr town should reflexr the eider Cambridge and Somerville area   |
| 147 | The businesses are being run out of town. This is bad for everyone. We need jobs in town that people can go to. Do not put housing where the businesses are. If Playtime closes because of MBTA, it is not fair to the crafters in town. Leave the the businesses alone. My massage therapist is on Mass Ave and she might have to close, too. It isn't right. There's plenty of room for housing away from the businesses on the side streets. |
| 148 | Commercial districts should be protected and building residential on top of them should be allowed and incentivized (I realize it cannot be required).  |
| 149 | Meet the mandate as described and put forth by the state, no more. Do not diminish Arlington's commercial and industrial districts. Do not urbanize Arlington. Allow for what makes the physical community appealing, neighborhood green spaces, tree canopy, architectural history. Provide at this stage 100% compliance no more. There will be future opportunities.   |
| 150 | The new housing should not replace current retail, commercial or industrial buildings.  |
| 151 | You have left no room for expansion of existing commercial and industrial space, placing the new districts right behind existing zones. This is not in the best interest of the town. I oppose this—do you need all these areas to satisfy the new requirements?  |
| 152 | No housing in commercial and industrial districts. Encourage businesses to move in to those areas.  |
| 153 | They should be close to these neighborhoods so that people can walk to work/services. I'm not opposed to the districts being in Ind/Comm districts, as long as Ind/Comm are given priority. Vague notions of creating first floor commercial space would need to be rejected in favor of more specific kinds of commercial spaces. Residential builders should not dictate the kinds of businesses that Arlington houses.                       |
| 154 | Proximity to the commercial districts allows for a more walkable community where residents can run errands without driving.   |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts  |
|-----|---|
| 155 | <p>While it would be nice to have more commercial and industrial development (particularly at a scale larger than small Mass Avenue shops), I cannot see where this would go. Also, I cannot imagine the hubbub that would occur if someone wanted to build a biotech lab in town. If market forces want to come in and propose a development, we should be open to that but I am skeptical. So, one possible example would be to replace the DCF building in Arlington Center with a larger facility while retaining space for DCF, or replacing the Verizon building on Pleasant Street with something more fully occupied. However, no one seems to be clamoring to do this. We need to get the housing situation fixed, which is much more in our control.</p>  |
| 156 | <p>Is there a danger of house-flippers or investors buying up a bunch of houses and then sitting on them? Is there any way to prevent that? Houses are vacant in Arlington right now due to developers sitting on them. There's so many people trying to get into Arlington (good location, schools), it's not fair to everyone trying to get in if empty property is just sitting there when it could be used by someone.</p> <p>I'm worried this survey might just get a bunch of NIMBY responses because the FAQs sounded very NIMBY (and weirdly anti-Camberville and anti-children).</p> <p>Maybe this is already being done.. Can you specifically survey middle-and-low-income workers in Arlington and find out what they need?</p> <p>Mass Ave is already so congested. Can we get the 77 to run more often? The 77 is always so so so crowded, it's hard for people with wheelchairs, blind, elderly, to get a seat and that's not right.</p> |
| 157 | Industrial districts and commercial should stay that way to allow more business growth  |
| 158 | Large housing projects should be build near Alewife, a major transit hub  |
| 159 | <p>We should not sacrifice our commercial districts for more housing. And we shouldn't just assume that development only goes where the existing bus service is. Presumably bus service will go where it's needed. Since this is transit oriented development why are we planning for cars? This is not forward looking. It seems to me that the allowance for cars should be minimized. Is it possible to zone for small units and no cars? Maybe with zip cars nearby? That way the target can be met with the smallest footprint and the least environmental impact.</p>   |
| 160 | <p>I think some creative thinking may be in order to address the vacancies in our downtown storefronts, and perhaps some collaboration with MBTA communities districts would help improve existing properties, and provide incentives to attract business tenants. Our commercial and industrial districts seem to be good options for developing multifamily buildouts. They are already well-suited to multifamily and mixed-use in their locations, but the traffic density will still be a factor. The fact is, the T bus service is terrible. One can only try so many times to make the bus commute work before resorting to driving independently.</p>   |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts  |
|-----|---|
| 161 | Mixed use is great in a town like Arlington that is not usually up late. Buildings should either be in/near these districts (and close to buses and the bikeway) with no car parking, or further away with car parking. We should not take up space in the prime areas for car parking, which keeps car-free individuals from living there.   |
| 162 | Do not reduce, effect, modify nor impact negatively the amount of dedicated Business/Industrial zoned properties in Arlington. For over 50 years the Town has been struggling to build business and attract it to Arlington. Allowing residential development in existing Business zones will destroy any chances of success at further business building. Furthermore the people of the Town are overwhelmingly opposed to allowing residential development in Business districts. There should not even be a single proposal which relies on that concept.  |
| 163 | Residential and commercial/industrial uses do not mix well for the most part. Any plan of this scale is incomplete until Arlington develops a plan for zones that provide only commercial/industrial use with appropriate buffers..   |
| 164 | The MBTA should continue to follow the past practice of locating expansions within .5 miles of Alewife.   |
| 165 | Since these buildings will have no commercial space in them, we would want to make sure they don't displace the vibrant commercial space we have in the centers. I'd love to see our current 1-story buildings in the centers add more floors of housing, but that isn't possible under this program.   |
| 166 | Mixed use should be allowed in a number of places, including/especially on Broadway between Warren (Eli's) and Rt. 16. This can't be a part of the compliance zone but with some traffic amendments (bike lanes, better sidewalks) would make for a lively neighborhood that is walkable.   |
| 167 | Larger multiunit buildings should be allowed along Mass ave and Broadway.   |
| 168 | Do not change zoning for businesses. Small businesses cannot survive if you add the MBtA housing. We need businesses.   |
| 169 | Do not remove small businesses from Mass Ave! It's what makes this a town with diminished use for cars & why some of us without cars can live here. It counters environmental needs. Also, we need more business in Arlington. We want affordable housing but high property taxes (without other resources for revenue) makes it unaffordable for many of us who live here (and have for a long time - both owners and renters!). Without local stores, this becomes a suburb that requires more driving, & more automobiles. And diminishes the community - diminishing places to meet & gather - and by foot! |
| 170 | MBTA C districts should not overlay present commercial and industrial. In addition, you should consider not putting MBTA C districts directly on Mass Ave, where current R zones are interspersed with business zones, thereby preserving the future option to rezone more of Mass Ave to business.   |

| #   | Relation to commercial districts   |
|-----|--|
| 171 | Commercial space should not be replaced with housing. Perhaps 1st floor commercial space with apartment above.   |
| 172 | I may have misunderstood, but what I've been told is that the working group proposed – and that the current plan – is that we not allow mixed use in commercial/industrial areas, but instead we're planning to focus larger residential development on the side streets. THIS IS A TERRIBLE IDEA!!!! If we need to zone for 3-4 units on side streets near Mass Ave/Broadway, it should be IN ADDITION to present commercial districts like Mass Ave/Broadway, not instead of. We should be building more on the main drags FIRST before encroaching into neighborhoods. I'm not saying as a NIMBY response; I honestly think it's the logical thing to do. We should have more mixed use apartments/condos on Mass Ave so that, if and when MBTA gets their act together and provides decent public transportation to Arlington, the folks living in those units will have easy access. What I heard is that this thinking as far as wanting to push development onto side streets was to somehow “protect” the existing commercial businesses, but I think that's nonsense and completely wrong-headed. We keep hearing that just because the zoning is changed doesn't mean that every single family wll get turned into a 2- or 3-fam nor every 2-fam be turned into a 3- or 4-fam. Same goes for our current commercial/industrial spaces. Just because an owner CAN build something bigger, doesn't mean they're going to. But if we need more housing, we really should let them put more in our current commercial/industrial areas – Mass Ave in particular. |
| 173 | The density overlay should not apply to our existing retail and commercial properties. If the overlay includes Mass. Ave. or Broadway storefronts, those businesses will likely be lost in favor of residential development. The Town should maintain its limited number of commercial and industrial tax parcels.   |
| 174 | Again, employ the village concept on Mass Ave with designed commercial areas and designated residential areas. Since Mass. Ave. is 3 1/2 miles long there is enough room for both.   |
| 175 | Existing commercial and industrial districts should not be zoned residential, because it's likely that commercial space will be replaced by purely residential buildings. Theoretically, incentivizing developers to build mixed use buildings is a good idea, except the results of that have not been impressive so far (see comments). The end result has been that commercial space was lost and that businesses that were supported by residents either closed or suffered the expense of relocating.<br><br>Have housing on side streets near commercial districts would be fine, as long as building height doesn't leave abutters in shadow. It would be hypocritical to encourage Solarize Arlington, then a few years later allow developers to block the sun from other rooftops. See below fro comments about setbacks.  |
| 176 | Do not exchange commercial/industrial sites for residential ones. The built residential locations are unlikely to be replaced in the foreseeable future, so this will only cause the town to further lose commercial tax revenue and resident convenience.   |
| 177 | The locations of the bus stops should not block the windows and signage of the businesses already struggling to get attention.   |

| #   | <b>Relation to commercial districts</b>  |
|-----|--|
| 178 | Encourage adaptive re-use of significant industrial buildings such as the old brick buildings on the Mirak car lot or at the mill complex near the WorkBar. Encourage re-use of existing residential buildings but allowing for increased density via additions or additional buildings on the lot. A lot of commercial buildings are one story retail spaces. Identify any really significant ones, but allow for redevelopment of the ordinary ones for increased density. Allow for creative first floor uses, not just retail when we are having a hard time filling existing retail spaces. Encourage restaurants, active recreation like gyms, entertainment spaces, food and convenience stores, cultural spaces like art galleries, and professional offices, etc. |
| 179 | Large housing should be more encouraged in the commercial areas than in residential  |
| 180 | We would love to see mix-used buildings in existing commercial buildings in Mass Avenue /existing commercial zones   |

### Q3: What additional comments do you have for us?

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|----|---|
| 1  | The draft map is excellent and exactly what I envisioned when I filled out the initial survey. It checks all the boxes for me.  |
| 2  | I very much agree with the concept that most if not all new multi housing should be along Mass Ave AND Broadway. Why is Broadway not part of this?  |
| 3  | Please keep higher density zoning in and around main commercial centers/transit hubs, rather than in low density neighborhoods where it would be out of place.  |
| 4  | A bike, pedestrian, and bus-first Broadway corridor with mixed use/commercial space would be excellent for connectivity to nearby squares in Somerville and Cambridge.  |
| 5  | Please stop trying to eliminate commercial growth opportunities. We need more businesses, not less!   |
| 6  | I hate the idea of increasing the population density of Arlington, and I thank you all for thoughtfully working on how best to work within the guidelines we've been given so it can continue to be a great place to live.  |
| 7  | Why are there not zones to include existing multi family housing locations, ie, Mill St ( former Brigham's site), the new units at corner of Park & Lowell (by gas station), and those at the Symmes site? Notable that two of these locations and businesses nearby are served by the 67 bus, though infrequently.. The Lowell St at Park Ave units are very walkable if not more so than the units included in the draft at Watermill Place which has a further walk to bus stop at either Appleton or Park).   |
| 8  | I think the planning department's proposals are ill considered. The proposal submitted by Don Seltzer seemed much more in keeping with the original intent of encouraging development near mass transit. Alewife station is the only real mass transit in/near Arlington. Pretending that the shrinking bus network is a reliable option is a mistake.  |
| 9  | ENSURE ADEQUATE PARKING for all housing!  |
| 10 | From both an environmental and affordable housing perspective we would be best served to allow for large apartment complexes of 6-12+ units along our commercial avenues of Mass ave and Broadway. We can also allow 4 unit buildings on side streets adjacent to these commercial units. By doing so residents will have more access to public transportation and minuteman bike path for commuting thereby reducing carbon emissions. Finally, the capitol square and arlington center districts are already half primed for such changes so taking in these recommendations would cause the least change in terms of the current state of our town |
| 11 | Let people speak at an open forum. Let people hear from their neighbors.  |
| 12 | Do not limit housing to Mass Ave, include other streets -   |
| 13 | I'm sending a map of two large districts I believe will produce a better distribution of multi-family homes along transit (MBTA bus) corridors.   |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|----|--|
| 14 | Would like to see part of the district situated along Broadway.  |
| 15 | We need to actively *prevent* developers from knocking down modest small houses that might be affordable for a regular family and replacing those houses with condos that are insanely expensive. This increases density, I suppose, but the people who buy these condos are definitely not riding the 77 bus. All of them have at least two cars per unit, and most of them seem to be bought by landlords and rented out to yuppies. The developers are taking advantage of Arlington's push for density by snatching up real estate that might be affordable and replacing existing houses with cheaply constructed hideous 2-family buildings that do nothing to meet the spirit of the MBTA communities project.  |
| 16 | <p>There are a number of moderately priced multi-family apartment buildings in the area currently recommended for the new zoning. I have an issue with including these parcels in the new zoning, since it would make it easier for developers to tear down these relatively affordable units and replace them with new luxury housing. I would strongly urge you to take an inventory of existing moderately priced apartment buildings along the Mass. Ave. corridor and remove those parcels from the new zoning area. This would help protect the moderately priced housing we already have. These parcels could be replaced by new parcels in the Jason / Academy / Pleasant street area as I suggested above.</p> <p>I would love the opportunity for further discussion with any or all of you on the issues raised above. Thanks!</p> <p>John Hickman (Town meeting member, precinct 19)</p> |
| 17 | I was surprised that there weren't any MBTA district areas right in Arlington Center or along Broadway, which are both major commercial & public transit areas. It seems like there should be a fourth (possibly contiguous) subdistrict that's the Center subdistrict, with what's currently called the Center subdistrict being Brattle (or some other name). I also wonder about the possibility of extending the Capitol Square subdistrict further northwest toward the Center and to Broadway. Also, thanks for your work on this; I'm sure it's very challenging!   |
| 18 | <p>I think we should consider additional districts along other transportation corridors, particularly Broadway but also maybe Medford Street, Summer Street, Park Ave, and Mystic Street. I think it's important to ensure a variety of housing types in each school district and each part of town, so I worry that concentrating development only along Mass Ave will interfere with that and overly restrict opportunities for building much-needed housing.</p> <p>Also, just to be unnecessarily picky, the "Arlington Center" district is hardly near Arlington Center (presumably to avoid the historical districts) and as a neighbor to that district I think it should be renamed the Brattle Square district. ^_^</p>   |
| 19 | I live in that zone and I love living here. My landlord would probably build a 5-on-1 if he could, as would the neighbors. Being able to continue living in this neighborhood with my community and also live in a fully walkable community would be amazing.  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|----|---|
| 20 | This entire process is a travesty. The new state regs are being imposed upon us as if we had any open space at all. The town should do what's required to comply and nothing more.  |
| 21 | Arlington should encourage business and industry to be located within its borders.  |
| 22 | The draft map shows the possible areas, but doesn't say how large these buildings could be, or the trade off between size and area affected. The links to additional materials show the handouts given at the presentation, but not the responses or notes.   |
| 23 | <p>I am heartened to see that Arlington is taking serious steps in the face of these requirements to meaningfully increase density in parts of town, creating opportunities to meet the growing housing demand that we see both locally and throughout the Greater Boston region.</p> <p>I haven't heard as much discussion of transportation impacts, though. These zoning changes and the accompanying potential for redevelopment offer an opportunity to prioritize scalable and sustainable modes of transportation like walking, cycling, and transit that can substantially reduce the number of residents that need a car. I worry that if proactive steps are not taken on this front, that increasing density could turn the town into a parking-garage-ridden traffic nightmare that makes everyone miserable, irrespective of transportation mode.</p> <p>My thanks to the committee and everyone working on this issue for all their hard work.</p>  |
| 24 | <p>At the 6/5 Arlington Redevelopment Board Meeting, the Chair of the ARB said, "I'm certainly glad to see that we are minimizing the number of parcels that touch Mass Ave so we can prioritize the commercial growth in town." She was talking about Utile's version of the map that allows for commercial growth by setting the MBTA Communities housing a parcel or two away from the Mass Ave commercial corridor.</p> <p>You can watch the 6/5 ARB meeting and hear what the Chair of the ARB says here: <a href="https://youtu.be/pJQrCqm9vhY?t=1071">https://youtu.be/pJQrCqm9vhY?t=1071</a></p> <p>ARB member Gene Benson said that including the MBTA Communities Housing in the commercial and industrial districts is a non-starter.</p> <p>Note: The ARB will have to vote on the plan before it goes to Town Meeting. Please produce a plan that Town Meeting will be able to pass this fall. You can do that by keeping the MBTA Communities housing OUT of the commercial and industrial districts.</p> |
| 25 | Be more ambitious! We need more housing!  |
| 26 | Please consider the impact on local businesses and how developers are motivated - often in conflict to business and existing residents desire to shop, be entertained and dine locally.   |
| 27 | one out of six units must be affordable - actually affordable.  |
| 28 | Affordable housing should also be a goal for the MBTA Communities.  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|----|---|
| 29 | New housing could be “affordable” by building 6-family affordable housing.<br>6-family housing allows one unit out of six to be affordable to a couple in town who have local jobs like preschool teacher or landscaper. Arlington needs more affordable housing and more local business. Please do not erode or eliminate local businesses. We need them!  |
| 30 | To preserve and increase the commercial vitality of Arlington, please do not allow MBTA Communities housing to be developed inside the town’s commercial and industrial districts. Second, any new housing in those MBTA Communities should be 6-family “affordable.”   |
| 31 | MBTA communities should encourage the use of the MBTA. They should also encourage people to live AND work in town. That means not putting housing where businesses are allowed to go unless you also rezone to allow businesses where housing is now. Keep commercial and industrial districts for commerce and industry!!  |
| 32 | Maintain diverse usage in Arlington and do not change it even more into a bedroom community.  |
| 33 | Do NOT remove commercial/ retail to build more housing.<br>If Arlington is cooperating with this housing increase – The MBTA must increase the transit service to Arlington.  |
| 34 | Why is all the new housing located in the areas that are already the most dense? Those locations already bear the burden of high density. Why not choose locations with more land? Just look at the map and see all the areas untouched. It is the majority of the town. I feel like this map is just fine for the people who don’t live in those densely populated areas, and would like to keep their space the way it is. That is hardly equitable. As for the argument that it is close to public transit, our public transit is sorely lacking at the moment. And I am not convinced that building more housing near our supposed public transit is going to encourage people to use public transit. People don’t use it because it is unreliable, and I do not see that changing for a very long time. Same for thinking people will walk to the few businesses we do have if they live closer. I have never seen evidence of that. We are a car-centric culture. |
| 35 | Walking a few blocks to public transport or shops is quite doable for most. I’d be expansive in the concept of “transportation corridor”.   |
| 36 | Spread out the areas for expanded density as much as possible.  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|----|---|
| 37 | <p>I live in the Heights neighborhood (Peirce St), which is in a designated area. Our street and adjacent streets already host several Housing Corp buildings (of 3, 4 and 6 units each). Their new development near Downing Sq. is also nearby, but is not designated... why shouldn't affordable housing be spread out around other neighborhoods as well?</p> <p>I think the blocks were colored in quite arbitrarily, without looking at the actual housing and other uses that exist. For example, the Old Schwamb Mill on Mill Lane looks like it is included in blue. That historic site should not be included, and there may be other such properties that should be carved out of the districts for historic, cultural or environmental protection.</p> <p>The planners should meet with neighborhood groups (perhaps Town Meeting members) in each of the three areas to get more information about local conditions.</p> <p>Mill Brook should be shown on future maps, along with adjacent flood-prone areas, as well as areas within 200 feet of the brook, which are unbuildable per wetland regulations. Any designated development should be eliminated from those areas.</p> <p>Overall, I am quite disappointed in this first proposal.</p> |
| 38 | <p>Until we are able to accurately capture new growth as part of subdivision and redevelopment, which we do not correctly and accurately do today, we should be changing any zoning to encourage development. Doing so will increase cost of services without increasing revenue beyond the 2.5% cap set by Prop 2.5. First, fix our new growth calculations so that redevelopment with increases zoning doesn't trigger unfair, unequal tax increases for everyone else in the Town.</p> <p>Second, the maps appear to encourage residential construction directly along Mass Ave rather than set back adjacent to Mass Ave. You should overlay the current footprint of commercial and industry to evaluate how much will be lost under this proposal by incentivizing redevelopment with increased residential density. I don't want to lose commercial businesses that are currently outside a commercial district, which seems extremely likely if this map moves forward. Please quantify the expected commercial losses if this plan succeeds in encouraging residential redevelopment with increased density.</p>   |
| 39 | Consider what other zoning changes might complement the MBTA changes. Also flexible zoning (that say, permits business in R zones) could also be good   |
| 40 | businesses and residents can live together.   |
| 41 | Restore MBTA routes that were eliminated or make MBTA refund millions of dollars that was saved by eliminating those routes. Why does Arlington pay the MBTA 3 million dollars a year and NEVER ask for the money saved when service is decreased?  |

| #  | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>  |
|----|--|
| 42 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– If the housing tends towards smaller units, attractive to singles and small young families, perhaps that’s a good thing and they might function as “starter homes” on the way to purchasing in Arlington.</li> <li>– You apparently had a more robust response to the meeting than expected and I was at the larger overflow group in the room at the end of the hall. We had perhaps 15 people. Understandably, time was lost in solving the problems that posed, but the facilitators were creative and responded quickly. Kudos. People were excited and interested and we immediately broke up into 4 to 5 smaller discussion groups. So my experience may not have reflected the other, more tightly-run tables, with fully engaged facilitators. In my professional life I attended dozens of meetings of this sort and ran a few of my own. Discussion time was way too short, given the challenges and complexity of the issues you’re grappling with (thank you!) Asking people to commit even larger blocks of time is challenging, but there is a huge amount of interest (and misunderstanding) about the MBTA Communities project and people might be willing. A sign-up process would help to prepare.</li> <li>– For next time: More clearly define our proposed districts vs. “MBTA district.” Many people did not understand what the “5 acre” issue was, what it meant, how to think about it.</li> <li>– It was mentioned in the presentations (but only in passing) that the zones need to be created, but not built on immediately. This was not understood because even in the first “big-room” there were still questions about it. Though it may be obvious to the committee members, it is a vitally important matter for getting people to support the project. It frames things for listeners, and I suspect that many/most didn’t understand this. This should be made clear and emphasized right up front to get buy-in. It can get lost in the issues of building scale and location. Based on our table, I can tell you that there were folks who visualized immediate tear-downs and massive construction and that’s what I’ve heard outside of the meeting.</li> <li>– There was little attention paid in the presentations to lived-in environmental issues, open space, etc. Perhaps this is not a primary issue for the committee, focusing instead on meeting the state’s requirements. However, it is important to many people in town and part of what makes Arlington a desirable place to live. I’ve heard talk about “Manhattanization.” It would be worthwhile to include environmental issues in the discussion and planning.</li> <li>– Thank you for your work on this challenge</li> </ul> |
| 43 | We need to preserve our existing business and industrial districts. We need more space for local businesses to grow and thrive.  |
| 44 | If there is not enough time to properly develop this for a Fall TM in order to make the deadline for this Fossil Fuel Pilot, then let’s put off the Fossil Fuel Pilot - the chance to do that will come again (the pilot will become the norm). I don’t want to see this rushed with little outreach, little time to get loud buy-in/co-support from the ARB and other groups (like Fincom, Conservation, etc) (which will be a criticism used to oppose this by some).  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|----|--|
| 45 | Incrementally increasing housing capacity is a stop-gap measure, eventually more housing will be required, motivating development sooner by allowing for development anywhere in town will be better in the long term.   |
| 46 | The Working Group is running a wildly biased “process,” stifling actual resident input. No questions were allowed at the meeting. No maps were put out in advance. Only a single proposal has been offered to the commoners. Shame on each and every one of you, especially the chair.   |
| 47 | The MBTA Communities zoning law presents Arlington with minimum requirements for building more housing. We should not strive for the minimum. Arlington is a desirable area with good transit links, in a metro area with extremely high demand and therefore high prices. My family has known a number of people who lived in town and had to leave due to high prices, and in the Boston metro area this problem is not unique to Arlington. It results not only in high prices and displaced families, but the proliferation of sprawl further outside the city. Arlington should look to the new zoning law as a minimum requirement that we can significantly exceed. |
| 48 | We are already one of the most densely populated towns in the state. Why can’t we simply zone the required area near Alewife 3 family?   |
| 49 | The current zoning is too restrictive and should be varied. Yes the current zoning provides access to business and public transportation along mass ave. But there should be options to live in quieter more residential areas with access to parks and and local business. Improved bus lines and dedicated bike paths would help connect the neighborhoods.  |
| 50 | We need to bring more good businesses into town. Leave the residential areas for housing, especially affordable. Arlington Center and the Heights look sad. No more nail salons, pizza places, etc. sorry to lose NYAJ’s, but Tatte is a start. Donut Villa not so much, but the extended hours are appealing. No more banks!!! we need businesses that will attract people to come to Arlington. We may need requirements that guide businesses to have a certain appealing frontage.   |
| 51 | Please lean on the urban planning expertise of the town’s urban planning consultant, Utile Design. Listen to the public. Stop trying to push a narrow agenda and do what the community is asking for so we can pass a compliant MBTA Communities Housing plan at Town Meeting.   |
| 52 | Please lean on the urban planning expertise of the town’s urban planning consultant, Utile Design. Listen to the public. Stop trying to push your own narrow agenda and do what the community is asking for so we can pass a compliant MBTA Communities Housing plan at Town Meeting.  |
| 53 | MBTA Community requirements do not necessitate sacrificing commercial and industrial districts!  |
| 54 | I’m very happy we are adding more diverse housing, but my main concerns are blotting out the sun for smaller houses nearby and the possible elimination of our pedestrian-friendly commercial centers.   |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|----|--|
| 55 | stay out of existing two family neighborhoods  |
| 56 | Consider limiting by-right development to lots with less than a certain amount of frontage, and eliminating minimum lot requirements. Buildings are more human-scaled when they are narrow and tall, or at least when they have the appearance of being composed of many smaller pieces.   |
| 57 | I am very pleased to see that the general contours track the broad promise of the Master Plan: density on the transit corridors to create a more urban experience, within walking distance of many residential neighborhoods largely left untouched.   |
| 58 | I would like to see even more use of Broadway, shifting some of the East Arlington density from Mass Ave to Broadway. And what about using parts of Medford Street and Summer Street as well - so we're not building a wall along Mass Ave. This would allow some of the buildings perhaps to be three story as you're coming into the town. The larger units could be nearer the larger buildings of the present industrial zones - particularly along the eastern part of Broadway and the northern part of Medford. If we're looking for more affordable housing, it would make sense for there to be a sizeable unit on Broadway near the Stop and Shop. The prices at that Stop and Shop are substantially lower than at the Arlington Center one, and you could walk to it easily from Broadway. |
| 59 | I really appreciate all the time & effort of the working group & planning department and especially appreciate the updated draft map that adds in a Broadway district. It's clear you're listening to community members, although I know nothing will ever please everyone. But your work is valued!!  |
| 60 | Because heat will only get worse with climate change, we must not allow more heat islands to be created, but instead require as part of any redevelopment the addition of shady green refuges for people and dogs walking by and for the wildlife of the town.   |
| 61 | Why are there non-zero parking minimums per unit on multi-family zoning that's intended to support use of public transit and discourage use of single-occupancy vehicles?  |
| 62 | I am overall in favor of the plan, though there are some beautiful old buildings on Broadway that I would hate to see knocked down and turned into modern multiplexes. I also don't understand why there are parking minimums. If we are re-envisioning housing in Arlington, with goals of sustainability, walkability, and relying on public transit, we should require much less than 1 space/unit, perhaps even not requiring parking at all.  |
| 63 | We need to support actions on the state level to support affordable housing such as passing of the bill on transfer fees and increase state budget for maintenance of public housing.  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|----|---|
| 64 | Spreading the zones out across town like indicated in the map is an appropriate approach, but if greater density is contemplated in some areas, then areas near existing grocery stores would seem to be the best candidates since they are likely the most walkable.   |
| 65 | (Comment withheld at the respondent's request).   |
| 66 | 4-6 stories works for me.   |
| 67 | Thanks for organizing this!   |
| 68 | The MBTA Communities zone should extend one more block than shown off Mass Ave and Broadway. On Broadway, can the zone extend to Rt 16? Historic districts and buildings should not be in the zone – and not in flood-prone areas. Allow extra height and units on Mass Ave and Broadway in the residential zones for mixed-use buildings. Require trees to be planted in front of the buildings.   |
| 69 | All new construction should be required to increase the tree canopy and provide more public open space - mini-parks, etc. All existing households in the draft zones should be contacted before the vote - many who will be impacted do not know about the proposed changes to their communities.   |
| 70 | This seems to be going in the right direction with potential housing near the most frequent transportation on Mass Ave and Broadway. I saw some maps with “Ted Fields” in the title that seem crazy - one creates over 10K new potential units! I hope those are disregarded in favor of the current draft map.   |
| 71 | Pull all Mbta zones back from Mass Ave by at least one parcel. To place them directly on Mass Ave will interfere with expansion of commercial development.  |
| 72 | The draft map doesn't have any actual proposed zoning (are we talking 6 units? 20 units?) so it's kind of hard to react to. That said, I appreciate that you added the Broadway corridor following the initial public comment. I believe the Broadway corridor is a lovely place to live (I live there myself) and I would love to see more people able to live along it.   |
| 73 | <p>Update our own Zoning By-Laws to allow more multi-use &amp; affordable development. The Town should control any residential development above and beyond minimal compliance with the State.</p> <p>Please explain. Why go over the req'd 2050 DU number? What's wrong with minimum compliance?</p> <p>How permanent is the map or can the Town augment/revise/update it once it has been submitted?</p> <p>Sec 3A Compliance Guidelines:</p> <p>“After receiving a determination of compliance, an MBTA community must notify DHCD in writing of any zoning amendment or proposed zoning amendment that affects the compliant multifamily zoning district, or any other by-law, ordinance, rule or regulation that limits the development of multi-family housing in the multi-family zoning district. DHCD may rescind a determination of district compliance, or require</p> |

| # | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>changes to a multi-family zoning district to remain in compliance...”</p> <p>Aren’t the requirements going to change over time? 50% contiguous district? Mixed-use? Affordable DUs?</p> <p>If we up-zone an extra R1/R2 block and one or two property owners build a 6 story building next to a predominantly two-family neighborhood and then we remove that district we’ll be left with two “towers” in an otherwise lower-density neighborhood where these neighbors have formed a community. This is not a way to build community, but rather a commuter suburb of Boston.</p> <p>Why is the Watermill Condominiums apt complex excluded and the residential parcels surrounding the historic Schwamb Mill parcel included in the Heights sub-district?</p> <p>Why isn’t Arlington 360, Colonial Village, Drake Village &amp; Chestnut Manor (Public Housing), Village at Cutter’s Mill (Street) Apts, Mill Brook Apts, Cusack Terrace and Parkway-Mystic Apts, Mystic Tower Condominiums (!) etc. included in any of the sub-Districts? I would like developers and the Housing Authority to have the opportunity to construct neighborhood friendly lower scale apartment complexes where several of the tall out-of-scale apartment towers now loom.</p> <p>The housing at the former Brigham’s remains zoned commercial? The apartments facing the Russell parking lot are in the commercial zone?</p> <p><b>MBTA SERVICE &amp; MBTA Communities</b></p> <p>As part of the Baker (now Healy) Administration and State Legislature’s Complete Neighborhoods Initiative, MBTA Communities aims to increase the stock of multi-family housing near mass transit to both address the “housing crisis” and the climate crisis.</p> <p>Locating higher density housing near transit, jobs, and services could and should result in a reduced need for single passenger vehicle trips and the associated detrimental environmental impacts of an increased reliance on passenger cars.</p> <p>I know that the issue of T-service is beyond the scope of this MBTA Communities Working Group or the ARB; however, because +175 towns served by the MBTA have been required to add multi-family housing capacity to retain residents in the Commonwealth, the State must provide adequate funding to make the MBTA both an appealing means of reliable &amp; affordable transit AND a well-paying attractive employment opportunity.</p> <p>MBTA service is TERRIBLE and this MUST be addressed by all affected MBTA Communities to make goals of this statute* at all viable!!!</p> <p>Arlington is already a densely populated suburb where land is at a premium and providing multi-family units at a minimum density of 15DUs/acre cannot also accommodate 15 or more cars per acre. Parking ratio requirements in Arlington’s zoning bylaws must be reduced as the town up-zones, and this lower percentage of parking spaces can only work well for both residents and businesses if mass transit is frequent and reliable. The Town cannot up-zone for more DUs AND more parking at the current ratios. We simply don’t have the space (for either surface or structured parking) and adding more passenger vehicles and congestion to our town would be antithetical to Arlington’s sustainability goals. We are trending towards more multi-modal transit use locally, which is great, but people of all ages (children to seniors) still</p> |

| # | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>need to get to work/school on time, travel in inclement weather, and carry groceries!</p> <p>In 2021, the Town of Arlington officially declared a state of Climate Emergency wherein all Town projects are to take climate impacts into account. The Town has a 2050 Net-Zero Climate Action Plan (Roadmap link: <a href="https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument?id=55139">https://www.arlingtonma.gov/home/showpublisheddocument?id=55139</a>) that emphasizes three sectors for emissions reduction, the top two CO2e contributors in Arlington being Buildings and Transit.</p> <p>Stroll along Massachusetts Avenue and a Section of Broadway.</p> <p>Google Street Screenshot Photos on Mass Ave and B'way<br/>(link)<br/><a href="https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1bClemI79T7TbhW09XL5p5ayoahqvEFb9?usp=drive_link">https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1bClemI79T7TbhW09XL5p5ayoahqvEFb9?usp=drive_link</a></p> <p>See existing examples - good and not-so-good of what is currently on our major corridor.</p> <p>See my commentary on the photos.</p> <p>*<a href="https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleVII/Chapter40A/Section3A">https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleVII/Chapter40A/Section3A</a></p> <p>“The Department of Housing and Community Development, in consultation with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, is required to promulgate guidelines to determine if an MBTA community is in compliance with Section 3A of the Zoning Act.”</p> <p>“The purpose of Section 3A is to encourage the production of multi-family housing by requiring MBTA communities to adopt zoning districts where multi-family housing is allowed as of right, and that meet other requirements set forth in the statute.”</p> <p>LINK to my response document to give feedback on the question “What size/scale buildings are right for Arlington” here:<br/><a href="https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lcCTdqRusohfMKZODqapi1dHfTb_IAQP6xkV_Yuw3AJs/edit?usp=sharing">https://docs.google.com/document/d/1lcCTdqRusohfMKZODqapi1dHfTb_IAQP6xkV_Yuw3AJs/edit?usp=sharing</a></p> |

| #  | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>   |
|----|---|
| 74 | <p>This map doesn't even deal with the Alewife T station neighborhood that is required by the MBTA law. It seems to promote residential development in all kinds of places that make no sense while ignoring the one area that is required.</p> <p>It includes at least 4 churches as developable land, and there is zero indication that those churches are actually available.</p> <p>It includes housing which is de facto affordable now, such as the apartment buildings on Broadway, which suggests to me that the working group would encourage demolition and rebuilding of those buildings by developers, thereby eliminating some of the only moderately affordable housing we have in town.</p> <p>It disregards historic neighborhoods, which should be protected and which most people living here want to protect. (Our past matters.)</p> <p>I'm horrified by the way in which this process seems to be designed to overachieve on the state mandate, at a huge potential cost to the quality of life of many people who have lived here, in some cases our whole lives. This is not the Arlington we chose and this is not what most people want for our town. We can achieve 100% compliance and still maintain the quality of life that most of us want here.</p> |
| 75 | <p>This plan is a great start. Town staff has done an excellent job with this and I commend them for all of the work to get to this point with a very good draft plan.</p> <p>But I sincerely hope that you will go further! We have a housing crisis and Arlington needs to do more. Why does the zone only extend 3 or 4 blocks off of mass ave in East Arlington? I live on Brooks Ave. and there's no good reason we also couldn't have three- or fourplexes by right.</p>  |
| 76 | <p>Expand the district to include parcels near the Bikeway approaching Alewife (east of Spy Pond). That area is ideal for people to walk or bike to public transit. Conversion of parcels to 6+ units instead of 1-2 units each could be accomplished without affecting existing open space</p>   |
| 77 | <p>I strongly suggest that we begin with 100% compliance, rather than 3 X compliance as some are proposing. Let's see what the response is from builders, what further changes come from DHCD, etc before we go further. We can always add to these overlay districts.</p>  |

| #  | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>  |
|----|--|
| 78 | <p>UTILE has published two maps, but the description of the rationale other than listing survey results is not clear. I think more explanation of the plan would help the community understand the logic. E.g. the plan remains along main corridors, it keeps the business districts in tact but with not expansion room etc.</p> <p>Also, it's unclear how the existing town zoning laws are applied to the plan, e.g. Usable Open Space. Does the bylaw regarding UOS stand in this plan? Setbacks? etc.</p> <p>I would be very transparent about other desired zoning changes this WG may like to change as well. This was discussion about rezoning B1 lots for additional space along Mass Ave. A comment was made during a WG meeting this zoning change could go through easier because it would require only 50% TMM voting to approve.</p> <p>I would also be very clear about green / climate impacts or enhancements this new map contains, and mitigating strategies being planned.</p> <p>In summary, while UTILE has produced two maps, the context and assumptions used are lacking. There are many open questions that I think the town / UTILE should answer so folks can become more comfortable with the maps.</p> |

| #  | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>   |
|----|---|
| 79 | <p>I am concerned about a possible misinterpretation of the survey data. 1,033 people responded. 60 - 63% agree with the ideas of “encouraging multi-family housing near/along /in commercial corridors/centers” and 76% say they support building “near public transit”. However only 55% percent agree with the idea of “encouraging multi-family housing in all neighborhoods”. People who look at these results might conclude that Arlingtonians do not want to put new MBTA districts in all neighborhoods and instead they should be clustered around business districts and transportation routes. What I am concerned is missing is an analysis of the demographics of WHO filled out this survey and what their possible biases are that led them to answer these survey questions in a way that does not change things where they live and instead asks others to bear that burden. Others who are already bearing the burden and who live, in general, where there is already increased density, smaller lots, less expensive housing, more rentals and where our neighbors of color live.</p> <p>A deeper analysis of the survey respondents demographics and their answers needs to be done if it has not already. What are residents of color saying? What are residents with lower annual incomes saying? What are renters saying? And how do their answers differ from residents who live in R0, R1, who are white, who have higher annual incomes? And think about whose voice gets elevated and whose does not? I ask that if you have not already done this deeper analysis, please do before you decide where to put these MBTA communities to make sure that Arlington is truly hearing from all of their residents and weighing their voices equitably (not necessarily equally), especially if representation is unequal. If this analysis has been done, thank you and I would appreciate knowing where I can find it.</p> <p>In addition, I encourage you to look at building along the RT 2 access roads like Cambridge has successfully done. This coincides with the survey respondents overwhelming support of integrating sustainable principals, encouraging housing near public transit and walkable/bikeable locations and shows up as an option on each of those maps yet is not included on any of the draft maps. Why not?</p> <p>Finally, is it possible to proactively rezone the St Camilla property to R2 or R3 (or whatever is needed) so that when they decide to sell it we will get more multi-family housing?</p> <p>And finally, thank you for all the work that you are doing on this incredibly important project. I appreciate you all.</p> |
| 80 | <p>I really appreciate the team’s work on promoting community engagement and advancing a plan that not only meets the MBTA Communities Act but also helps Arlington play a meaningful role in creating needed housing options.</p>  |
| 81 | <p>Yes upzoning! Let’s add cheaper housing, more customers to shops/restaurants and some opportunity for younger people to live in our community.</p>   |
| 82 | <p>Parking should be required for all new buildings. Please do not allow this proposed change to happen on side streets in East Arlington these streets are already overpopulated and flooding already happening.</p>   |
| 83 | <p>The map needs to be redone. It’s too invasive. People move here for a reason like the small town feel and this totally erases that.</p>  |

| #  | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|----|--|
| 84 | Thank you! I know this work is hard and I appreciate the working groups positive attitude. I enjoyed my in person session.   |
| 85 | Keep four-story buildings out of residential neighborhoods and on Mass Ave and Broadway where they can support retail and take advantage of public transportation  |
| 86 | We have to anticipate how to help the families who rent in these zones find a new place to live. Kids are going to the Arlington public schools and finding a new rental is impossible with a normal salary.   |
| 87 | Providing access is certainly important, but so is ensuring the comfort of residents (existing and potential new residents) and respecting the parameters of current spaces and streets and what they can really handle and accommodate.   |
| 88 | This is an awful plan and will prompt me to move.  |
| 89 | Need to figure another plan. We are already too congested in this town.  |
| 90 | This zoning plan would be a nightmare. It's already crowded here. Every time an inch of land is sold, some developer wants to come and build some massive structure on it. Double the number of cars and people in this much of town, and you fundamentally change the quality of life for all of us for the worse. The ARB and other town government bodies should be helping to improve our quality of life, not destroying it.  |
| 91 | There is already scarce overnight parking in Arlington. I don't think having larger buildings would help this issue.   |
| 92 | We have very limited MBTA access so to consider these changes we need better access  |
| 93 | We should strive for something bold and forward-thinking, beyond the bare minimum requirements given by the state. We want to actually generate new housing for a diversity of folks, from single people, to couples just starting families, to elders who want to downsize and age in place in town. To do that, we need to zone capacity for a wide array of sizes and scales of housing. No matter what, if this zoning passes, it will still take decades for new buildings to be produced, in a gradual manner. |
| 94 | We are a town and not a city. We do not have the adequate funding within our tax system to fund more housing or more students within our schools. We need to realize as a town that we do not have to accommodate everyone who WANTS to live here. If it is not feasible than people need to make other arrangements and find other housing.   |
| 95 | Please do not tear down my apartment building on Broadway. It is a 9 unit building and I've lived here for 12 years. I have autism and I can't bear the idea of living anywhere else. Is my building likely to be torn down? I included my email below, if you could please respond and clarify.   |
| 96 | Do not change current family zone areas. Increase property tax.  |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|-----|--|
| 97  | If you want to continue to develop Arlington in a way that makes our TOWN a congested, dirty, claustrophobic place to live with extra large class sizes in schools and no parking, then maybe you should consider filing the paperwork to turn Arlington into a CITY. That way we can at least get the funding needed to offer more free & affordable activities through the schools, fix the schools to accommodate all these people you want to cram into every square foot, pay our teachers better, fix our roads, and offer more to our community!  |
| 98  | This is a tough process, so thank you for your transparency.   |
| 99  | Adding density by encroaching into established residential neighborhoods (Wildwood, Bartlett, Newman Way) is wrong. There is so much room for improvement and additional density on Mass. Ave. The Mass Convenience Store, The RCN building, Mirak's properties, the parking lot across from RCN. Build up those with nice looking thoughtfully designed mixed use architecture. Leave the neighborhoods alone.  |
| 100 | I think this proposal is great   |
| 101 | Being pro-density without consideration about impact is as bad as being not pro-density. A balanced approach and middle ground can be found.<br><br>Where are the values around the consideration of environmental impact & greater pollution with more traffic, more people and more resources needed for buildings?<br>Where are the values around the consideration & impact on public schools – class sizes and hiring teachers in Arlington when the town builds over 2k units which may include more families and school aged kids?<br><br>Is the committee untethered from these concerns also? |
| 102 | Please don't be swayed by scare tactics about maintaining neighborhood character. It's just fear and racism.   |
| 103 | This Plan will never solve the housing crisis. (More 'kicking the can down the road theory.) Build more housing outside the route 128 corridor.  |
| 104 | stop upzoning all of the other quiet streets and neighborhoods.  |
| 105 | I like the maps so far. i think good balance and with nuanced regulation on sizes to not overwhelm neighborhoods we can balance more development with maintaining our desirable characteristics  |
| 106 | Do not allow 4-story buildings to be built along the Mass Ave side streets.  |
| 107 | We should allow for the minimum necessary to meet the MBTA law requirements. We are already the 12th most densely populated municipality in the state. Historic districts should be excluded.  |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|-----|--|
| 108 | I am thrilled there will be more affordable housing in Arlington. It reflects action to address rising housing costs, rather than simply nice talk. Any “not in my backyard” objections reflect an assumption that those in need of less costly housing are in someway undesirable. Where do those who provide our needed services as workers and first responders live now? Far away from where they work. Let’s improve that and become a truly inclusive community. |
| 109 | Can we ban the properties from having any on-street parking ever, like Somerville has. I liked that Arlington had no on street parking and If we increase density i hope we maintain it, so we can use the streets as needed.  |
| 110 | Breaking out the various questions listed in the “additional information” would have been much easier for the average Arlingtonian to respond to. IMO, the questions above will make it challenging for the Town to categorize and quantify the responses.   |
| 111 | Get us out of MBTA membership. They keep raising the fee to the town while lowering the service. People can find a way to get to Cambridge or Somerville to then use the MBTA. Save \$3.5M/year. Between walking, bicycling, BluBikes, Uber, Lyft, eBikes, and cabs, residents can get to Alewife station without using infrequent buses and the Ride.   |
| 112 | My biggest concern is that the MBTA communities districts will simply rely on places with existing dense housing to meet requirements. This would be a mistake – we must look at creating NEW housing opportunities that actually meet community needs and significantly increase housing stock. Anything else is a failure to act in a real housing crisis.   |
| 113 | Make sure there’s good transit and bicycle access to these new facilities to prevent further traffic. Protected bike lanes and bus lanes near these projects will help, as well as parking maximums and transit incentives.  |
| 114 | In particular, allowing any apartment buildings on Wildwood Ave near the High School - completely a residential area - makes no sense and will greatly and adversely impact the neighborhood. Keep them on Mass Ave or Broadway, please. Keep neighborhoods as neighborhoods in Arlington. It’s what makes us so special. Losing this small-town feel would be awful in terms of quality of life, home values, and many other factors.                                 |
| 115 | This draft plan if implemented would be detrimental to the entire community.   |

| #   | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>  |
|-----|--|
| 116 | <p>I am very concerned that the July 11 map intrudes much further into the 2-family neighborhoods off Mass. Ave. in pct. 14, specifically on Mt. Vernon, Walnut, and Menotomy. This seems like an incentive to tear down 2-families and erect larger apartment buildings. Why is this rezoning focused on areas that already have 2-families instead of areas with single family zoning? We should be preserving the 2-family housing stock, not viewing it like it's expendable so that a 3-family or larger could take its place. I also take issue with the idea that the rezoning of the pink "Arlington Center Subdistrict" is to encourage walking to the business districts. It is a mile to the Center and a mile to the Heights from Mt. Vernon St. People still drive from this neighborhood because there isn't much to walk to (aside from Stop and Shop). This section of town has been neglected and has none of the vibrancy of the Center or the Heights or East Arl. The neighborhood business zoning around Brattle Square has severely limited the types of businesses. It's become the daycare center zone with preschools at Brattle Sq., Prentiss Rd., and Schouler Court. This doesn't encourage people to walk out and spend money. What's going to go on the ground floor of the huge new building at 1025 Mass. Ave.? This section of Arlington needs thoughtful, comprehensive development that will allow for thriving businesses as well as housing. It seems crazy that a multi-use development like the 50 unit 1025 Mass. Ave. doesn't "count" for the MBTA planning because it's mixed use when it accomplishes the same end: more multi-family housing. Why isn't the original intent of the MBTA law being followed even if not required: encourage housing that's walkable to Alewife.</p> |
| 117 | <p>I see that the word "affordable" housing for the MBTA corridor has been proposed, but am not clear whether this concept would be upheld in the actual implementation of the corridor plan. How will the town make sure that developers don't come in, buy up the houses, and build luxury apartment buildings? Is there a way for architectural design guidelines standards to be developed for Arlington, so that the nature of the suburban look would not be altered?</p>  |
| 118 | <p>Excluding the business districts from development into mixed use spaces is a huge missed opportunity. Building 3-5 stories adjacent to but not on Mass Ave. is a bad idea.</p>  |
| 119 | <p>I am appreciative for this subcommittees efforts. Upzoning is not easy for the community to get behind but this has been a thoughtful approach to what is needed in the Town.</p> <p>The biggest concern people will generally have in these discussions will be focused on parking, which runs counter to the fundamental premise of the MBTA Communities program. Nonetheless, having a proactive way to account for this will be important to lessen the impact of this concern.</p>   |
| 120 | <p>Some of us are happy with the current state of zoning in Arlington. Why target our town with zoning changes and not wealthier towns like Lexington or Concord?</p>  |
| 121 | <p>More affordable housing in general!! Thank you.</p>   |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|-----|--|
| 122 | <p>Question Three:</p> <p>We are moving to Plymouth Street, abutting Wildwood. We are investing in Arlington because it is one of the top places in the country to live for quality of life. What the town is proposing - allowing these buildings in residential neighborhoods - will erode that quality of life. We are a Block Party kind of town and this proposed change, if adopted, would alter that irrevocably. This is not a small matter; Arlington is Arlington precisely because it's a place where neighbors know and care for each other. Apartment buildings are not conducive to fostering this kind of deep connection and community. It is essential to Arlington. It's why we're moving here from out of state.</p> <p>Additionally, we are very concerned about the trees on these side streets.</p> <p>Please keep these bigger buildings on Mass Ave and Broadway where they belong.</p>  |
| 123 | <p>I would like to see even more areas added, especially along Broadway. Keep up the good work!</p>  |
| 124 | <p>My wife and I moved to Arlington in 2018. Though we've enjoyed our time becoming active members in our community, access to affordable housing in good condition in a walkable/MBTA commutable part of town has been a difficult needle to thread. We've had good fortune in our current apartment, but understand we have certain privileges afforded to us being a young couple who are both working professionals with incomes that allow us to afford quality housing that may be outside of the reach of young families, or people on a fixed income, such as folks with disabilities or are retired.</p> <p>The things we'd change, if we could, would be to better integrate non-personal vehicle options to our space to make Arlington safer and more convenient to be outside as pedestrians or bicyclists. By inducing demand on more sustainable forms of transportation, I'm confident that Arlington could simultaneously become a more attractive community for residents and local businesses while preparing for a sustainable future through intelligent design and implementation of mixed used neighborhoods whose services and amenities encourage more local commerce and greater integration and exchange with our neighbors.</p> <p>Green spaces serve an important part in providing a public space for outdoor events like the summer Jazz series, community action events, walk for affordable housing, strawberry festival etc. Any consideration for new development of dense housing should and must consider integrated green spaces for activities like parks and community gardens to encourage us to feel connected to the communities in which we live and the neighborhoods of which we are of the common fabric.</p> |
| 125 | <p>Do what is right for Arlington and screw the state. Provide the housing that is right for the neighborhoods. Some people have a fetish for density to try and solve the housing problem that makes no sense.</p>  |
| 126 | <p>The proposed plan looks like exactly what we do not want—more crowding along our congested central corridor, and almost nothing within easy walking distance to the Red Line.</p>   |
| 127 | <p>I strongly support dramatically increasing density along Mass. Ave. &amp; Broadway.</p>   |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|-----|---|
| 128 | I believe we are a very dense community and it is difficult to consider an MBTA Community in the Heights. We are too far from Alewife with unreliable bus service. This will promote more cars, more pollution, over filled schools and a less desirable towns.   |
| 129 | If the Open Space committee just sent you a letter, without ideas about what they would like or suggestions about how to execute, then the Open Space Committee falls into the category of “Useless” - don’t just write letters fill of “We Want this, We want that!” like Veruca Salt in Willy Wonka demanding an Oompah Loompah NOW, actually help out with some ideas.   |
| 130 | This demand to put it all near Alewife seems like magical thinking. It is a dense area already, with small lots, and its a flood plain. Demanding an Alewife plan seems like a stalking horse for saying you don’t want to do anything.   |
| 131 | Important:Arlington town officials should submit required documentation so that our state’s department of Housing and Community Development will preserve our existing affordability laws.  |
| 132 | New units should be 60% owner occupied; rentals should be one in six affordable, not one in ten. Think about how many parents wanted astroturf, because - they said - there is not enough play area in Arlington; how do you get the kids off the screens and out to play, then the fields are overcrowded? you are going to make even higher density? the only way to promote affordable housing is to encourage home ownership - - blindly adding rental property means higher turnover, and ever higher rents. Rents will never go down due to more supply - - - they will go down when the place becomes less and less desirable to live here, and we are no longer an attractive place to live. This is like talking to the wall. depressing. Why the rush? Why are you nearly doubling the state’s 10% mandate? |
| 133 | If we are an MBTA Community, then the MBTA MUST BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE SERVICE to any area in which we build housing under the MBTA Communities law. Demand it. Get our legislators to debate it and to pass a bill requiring it.   |

| #   | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>   |
|-----|---|
| 134 | <p>Yes, first, as you may have seen, the Harvard Housing study just released found that despite historic construction/building efforts at a 50-yr high – it has not at all benefited low income people and has actually increased pricing pressures/harmed us. Yet, nothing in this survey reflects on or takes into consideration these findings. Nothing takes into consideration access needs or challenges experienced by disabled and/or low income people. It’s like we don’t even exist. And as I noted above, as per usual, Arlington is taking input mostly from people who are the most privileged and the least impacted by these plans (other than possibly being benefited by them by boosting their home values for later resale). Even the language used in how the survey questions are formulated and the wording of the companion information sheets show that disabled people don’t even figure into this process (such as – asking about “preferences” when for many of us disabled people this issue is about our access NEEDS – often with serious, if even often life-or-death, implications). It’s also clear that lower income renters like myself for whom increased density of market rate housing means displacement pressures, we don’t matter in this conversation. DO BETTER.</p> <p><a href="https://www.vice.com/en/article/y3w3aj/us-building-more-apartments-than-it-has-in-decades-but-not-for-the-poor-report">https://www.vice.com/en/article/y3w3aj/us-building-more-apartments-than-it-has-in-decades-but-not-for-the-poor-report</a></p> |
| 135 | <p>I have some questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I understand that the state has the law in place for everytown to comply. It is good intention, but not necessarily has the desired results. I wonder if there is any data available that shows by increasing the housing density it helps make the rent more reasonable?</li> <li>2. I thought that you want to build more residential buildings close to public transportations so that people are not using cars. However, town is going to do pilot on overnight on street parking. Are you contradict to yourselves?</li> <li>3. What is this law is flawed? Does town have any say to adjust the error?</li> </ol>  |
| 136 | <p>People can’t move to Arlington anymore from Cambridge because it’s too expensive and inaccessible. Stop prioritizing bike lanes and start getting serious about public transit. Arlington is a one-horse town with nothing interesting in it. Penalize the landlords who keep their storefronts empty. Deal with the eyesore little store fronts in Arlington center (eg corner of Swan street and huge Tango restaurant that’s been empty for many years) and sad mass Ave west of the high school. Get rid of the car dealerships taking up valuable frontage on main streets. How about making a rule that any house that is selling for more than a few million dollars must be split into two families?</p>   |
| 137 | <p>I’d also encourage the committee to consider including MBTA communities within short walking distance of elementary schools and related playgrounds. Walkable access to school and parks has been an important benefit of living in Arlington, especially with children, and this would promote more diversity of housing and people throughout town and in our schools.</p>   |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|-----|---|
| 138 | <p>In addition to larger apartment buildings along Mass Ave and Broadway themselves, I think opening up areas farther from these central arteries to 2 and 3 family zoning could be a great way to incentivize existing homeowners to expand housing on their own property and build wealth.</p> <p>Also, building to the street is a great way to promote civic life so would strongly suggest not putting off street parking next to the street.</p> <p>Lastly - I question whether a one parking space per unit requirement is always necessary when walkability is the focus. Creating so much parking can monopolize public space that could be used in other ways.</p>  |
| 139 | <p>Overall, I think the maps look great and really prioritize the right places to zone for multi-family! Should really incentivize mixed-use along Mass Ave. All those tiny buildings are a missed opportunity.</p>   |
| 140 | <p>Allowing this kind of development in neighborhood streets is going to exacerbate parking issues, and damage and decrease the tree canopy that exists in these areas, e.g along Wildwood near where I live that has significant large, old, healthy trees.</p> <p>Allowing the MBTA to drive development in our town AT ALL is problematic, given how poor their services provided. Is it blackmail to keep what little we have? They've already cut a major bus route (79) that provided direct service to Alewife along the entire Mass Ave corridor. It now takes 2 buses for many of us to get to the closest MBTA station. Two buses, with irregular transfers to go 4 miles?!?! Why should I care about the MBTA's requirements when they don't serve us well?</p> <p>I also do not see anywhere in your documentation anything about increased density town wide, regardless of districts, affecting traffic, parking, tree canopy, and schools population. The town government is DREAMING if they think people will move here without cars, and households usually mean two cars per household. And there is NOTHING about this zoning proposal (unless I missed it) that favors the people in Massachusetts who need housing, those least able to afford it in Arlington, and most likely to ride transit! I am in favor of increasing density, with affordable housing, and with additional transit options, but this is a recipe for worse traffic, over-crowded schools, and harm to the climate with fewer trees and more cars.</p> |
| 141 | <p>Please see my detailed comments submitted by email 7-15-23</p>   |
| 142 | <p>Protect businesses in town</p>   |
| 143 | <p>The Select Board should have made an effort to create a working group that is more balanced, it currently consists of only super pro density members who have no interest in preserving open space, green space, commercial space, setbacks or parking requirements. It is really disappointing and not representative of all Arlington Residents. Additionally, the map drafts offered are way, way above the state requirements and have the potential to disrupt neighborhoods. The working group has also made the decision to reduce parking spot requirements which flies in the face of what the majority of residents want.</p>  |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?   |
|-----|--|
| 144 | <p>The community is being unfairly forced to vote on an inadequately conceived map at a Special Town Meeting. Forfeit our spot in the gas ban race and allow residents to calmly and in a timely manner consider the necessary mandate. Express Arlington's acknowledgement of climate breakdown and extreme heat by weaving into the next map allowances for solar access preservation, tree canopy preservation, and storm water awareness by creating a map sensitive to our municipality's vulnerabilities in the current and succeeding climate crisis. 2023 hottest year to date and coolest of the next four years it is said. <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/jul/07/un-climate-change-hottest-week-world">https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/jul/07/un-climate-change-hottest-week-world</a></p>  |
| 145 | <p>The MBTA must increase service to Arlington - replacing the service that has been cut back in the last few years.</p>   |
| 146 | <p>The impact of climate change must be considered. Protect trees and open space, and the character of Arlington—space around churches, Playtime, Old Schwab Mill—don't allow building here. Why is this being done so quickly? What are you trying to push this through without more public input?</p>  |
| 147 | <p>You are doing a terrible job at protecting the quality of life that current residents enjoy and want to protect. Why should we invest in our homes, install solar panels, retain tree coverage, etc. if you going to put, big, cookie-cutter ugly apartment buildings up that block my solar, remove trees, remove permeable grass/shrubs/soil? Why doesn't the town hire experienced people who spend full time energy on getting businesses to move into Arlington?</p>   |
| 148 | <p>The map needs more explanation. What do the abbreviations AC and DU stand for? Some titles in the graphs are cut off. I'm not sure what the graphs mean. I am also curious about how these draft zoning regulations work with town and state historical preservation regulations. These proposed districts are in historical districts. How do the regulations work together? Can historically designated houses in these proposed zones be demolished for apartment buildings?</p> <p>And while I understand housing needs to be near transit, four and five story buildings should be distributed more broadly throughout town. I read this map as a political compromise that doesn't upset all the single family homeowners in neighborhoods not contiguous to Mass Ave Bdwy. The Broadway area is a neighborhood and would become an alley. Why not distribute the buildings closer to Rte 16 - closer to existing industrial buildings and away from neighborhoods.</p> |
| 149 | <p>Could we ensure that the Arlington existing infrastructure (school systems, public parking, transportation, etc) can all support the increased population especially the school systems.</p>  |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|-----|---|
| 150 | <p>Bringing more families to Arlington means a need for more childcare workers!!! and those workers need a living wage.</p> <p>There is high turnover in the daycare industry. It's not good for the daycare workers, students, or parents to have such high turnover. Stressed daycare workers make an unhappy environment for the kids also.</p> <p>Lack of affordable, nearby, good quality childcare is probably the #1 topic of conversation among working parents. People enroll their kids in daycares (sometimes out of town) they're not happy with out of desperation. Lack of available good quality childcare for children of all ages is a major issue if more families move to Arlington.</p> |
| 151 | There is already enough housing for anyone who can afford to live here. If one can't afford the cost of living in Arlington then their only option is to move. That's life  |
| 152 | Don't turn Mass Ave and Broadway into urban canyons with no green space   |
| 153 | Has the town done a cost-benefit analysis of compliance vs. non-compliance?   |
| 154 | Please don't rush this decision. There are so many ramifications involved and this needs more time, more input, and more thoughtful consideration.  |
| 155 | <p>Zoning changes should consider current and potential future MBTA bus route/frequency changes and how that might open new areas for dense housing. Currently most of the town's area is covered by infrequent bus lines but that could change. There could also be some new community circulators created that might actually function better than the 67, 78, etc.</p>   |
| 156 | <p>While the Commonwealth is trying to control issues of Town governance, the Town should consider not complying with the unlawful mandate. Arlington is the second most dense Town in Massachusetts and has already met its obligation for density. Additional density is harmful to Arlington and this is not being weighed in the construct of these discussions. I maintain that we do not need to add density since we already have the required density metric required by the Commonwealth.</p>  |
| 157 | I can not speak to the size of buildings though I IMPLORE you to keep things in scale with our existing community and build things that are asthetically pretty while also functional. Please leave PLENTY of green spaces, communal spaces, great walking/biking paths to connect these areas of town better, and build things are easy to maintain. Please look to other towns in the area that have done a great job with redevelopment and let's mimick those towns- no need to reinvent the wheel!   |
| 158 | Google records who makes these public comments (google docs) so one could moderate speech, and retaliate against those they disagree with. Please, post the town of Arlington's privacy notice regarding resident information, who has access to it, information sharing, disclosures, etc. for this survey, all town surveys and third-party out-sourcing agreements.  |

| #   | What additional comments do you have for us?  |
|-----|---|
| 159 | I am aware that change is always hard; I am also aware of the problems with the “not in my backyard” reaction to changes needed to meet social goals. Nonetheless, Arlington is already an extremely densely built/populated town, which has managed to keep its less-urban character despite proximity to urban Cambridge and Somerville. Allowing “urban” buildings in areas that are in the general vicinity of Mass Ave will be something that will change the character of the town.   |
| 160 | I’d like to see a version that comes closer to the minimum compliance number. 2600-2700 additional units. I believe a number of TM Members would want that option as well.  |
| 161 | <p>Even under the best of circumstances, people will complain about process. Plain English would be very helpful; the map and this questionnaire fall quite short on this front. The draft map needs an <i>*extremely*</i> clear narrative paragraph to interpret the “scenarios”, which are otherwise bewildering. How are “scenario 1” and “scenario 2” indicated on the map? What’s the difference? The map featured on this questionnaire page doesn’t include the definitions of the zones. What does “DU/AC” mean? What does “District Density Denominator” mean? “See note” – where is it? This is all quite confusing.</p> <p>Also: Please be specific about timeframe and deadlines. Is this map iterated every week? If so, please say so. When does the questionnaire close? “July 17” – does that mean 7/17 11:59pm? 5pm?</p> |
| 162 | On-site parking for one vehicle should be under buildings (1st floor or sub-terranean) instead of additional parking lots. Existing parking lots for apartment buildings (e.g. corner of Mass Ave and Elmhurst) could be converted to additional apartments as long as sufficient parking is contained under the building. Additional higher density affordable housing while maintaining green space should be prioritized (e.g. housing units at corner of Broadway and River street could be rebuilt as taller on same footprint to preserve green space between buildings). I would like to see Arlington attract more diverse population. School populations are going to be a major issue. Would like to understand the plan for expanding school capacity as residential capacity increases.                                       |
| 163 | Less dense areas of Arlington (R0,R1) MUST start shouldering some of the density burden. Most of the multifamily district/s should be within R1 and R0  |
| 164 | Be reasonable! Navigate multiple urgent needs together; not one at a time. I have doubts new housing will be affordable; and is currently manipulatable by developers and allowances the town has made.   |
| 165 | Please consider adding or relocating proposed MBTA C districts to area near and around the Lake St/Minuteman Bikeway intersection, which would allow good access to the bikeway as a direct bike/walking route to/from Alewife T station.   |

| #   | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>   |
|-----|---|
| 166 | <p>It would be nice if the MBTA improved its current services before stepping outside its scope of work and telling people what to do. They have little credibility at this point. Yes, public transportation is a multi-layered issue with a lot of points of view and information to consider. However, any way you look at the current state of the MBTA its not serving the community veery well. Don't seek to increase ridership until you can serve the ridership you already have well and efficiently. If services are threatened due to non=compliance with this plan, the MBTA is really just making itself more irrevlevant.</p>  |
| 167 | <p>Sorry for sounding a bit rattled. I only recently heard about the plan to push development off of Mass Ave and I think that's completely nuts.</p>   |
| 168 | <p>I am disappointed that these decisions are proposed to be made over the summer, when people are on vacation and not around to participate. As a Town Meeting Member, I reached out to people who live on the streets in my precinct that are proposed for re-zoning under the latest map, and my constituents did not have any idea this was going on until I told them. The Working Group's public outreach is insufficient. You should be leaving paper flyers at every single residence proposed for rezoning to inform the people who will be most impacted by these decisions, and such outreach should occur during the fall season. This process should not be rushed, especially when the Town does not have to comply with the law until 2024. Please extend the comment period and decision making process through the fall, and delay any Special Town Meeting vote on MBTA Communities until 2024.</p>   |
| 169 | <p>While the Working Group has been putting a great deal of time into the plan, it has run out of time for an acceptable plan which will effect Arlington for the next 50 years. The WG should have more time and more resident input for a plan to be taken up at spring Town Meeting. As of yesterday no one in my neighborhood had heard of this state mandate. Secondly, the plan should allow the capacity for 2, 048 units and no more.</p>   |
| 170 | <p>It's not the number of units in the building that affect the feel of the town; it's the height and setbacks. No matter the height, all new buildings should be required to have setbacks that mean they are less obtrusive from the sidewalk. The newer buildings near Stop and Shop that were built since Town Meeting passed the multi use zoning are far more obtrusive from the sidewalk than older apartment buildings in town with more floors and more units, because the older buildings have open space and greenery between the front door and the sidewalk.</p> <p>I lived in Cambridge for years before buying a single family home in Arlington. Choosing this community was an intentional choice. If I was interested in living in an urban environment I could have stayed in Cambridge or moved to Somerville. I have no interest in seeing Mass Ave become a canyon (and wind tunnel) of tall buildings. Even urban communities like Brighton and Allston still have many 1 or 2 story buildings on major streets.</p> <p>Arlington has lost too many trees in recent years due to 'improvements' (Town Hall gardens, Whittemore Park, Arlington High School rebuild) and development that takes down existing trees, places oversized buildings on small lots, and hasn't always met open space requirements. Stop allowing developers to maximize their profits at the expense of town residents and require that they actually abide by the requirements that are already on the books.</p> |

| #   | <b>What additional comments do you have for us?</b>  |
|-----|--|
| 171 | <p>I am pleased that Utile’s July 11th map is more refined - distinguishing the density allowed on the Avenues from the adjacent properties on the feeder-streets;</p> <p>however, I am concerned that the overall density is 24.2 DU/AC and the number of units is far beyond the required 2046* unit capacity in both scenarios presented:</p> <p>&gt;&gt;3949 in Scenario #1 @ 30 DU/Acre Max. (+1.930 x 2046)</p> <p>&gt;&gt;8970 in Scenario #2 @ No Limit to the number of DU/Acre (+4.384 x 2046)</p> <p>These are my questions:</p> <p>Why would we want to zone for nearly twice the capacity required?</p> <p>Why would we eliminate all our front-setbacks on Mass Ave &amp; B’way, even for multi-family without ground floor commercial?</p> <p>Why would we make the 5 story building a given on Mass Ave &amp; B’way, not an incentive for mixed-use development?</p> <p>What happens when the model for the taller buildings (both Districts #1 &amp; #3 per the tables) have a 10’ or the current 15’ front setback? Does Arlington still meet the 15 DU/AC minimum?</p> <p>What happens when the front setback is set at 15’ for either district #1 OR #3?</p> <p>What happens when the model for taller buildings (both Districts #1 &amp; #3 per the tables) is generally 4 stories? Does Arlington still meet the 15 DU/AC minimum?</p> <p>What happens when the model for all MBTA districts changes the parking/unit to .75 and the town allows for overnight street parking in these districts?</p> <p>*Note that the required minimum multi-family DU capacity number does not appear on the Arlington’s MBTA Communities webpage:<br/> <a href="https://www.arlingtonma.gov/Home/Components/News/News/12760/16">https://www.arlingtonma.gov/Home/Components/News/News/12760/16</a> webpage</p> <p>Thank you for doing this difficult task.</p> |
| 172 | <p>It is vitally important to retain setbacks, unless we want a Manhattan-like canyon effect on Mass Ave. Good for the lived-in environment, reduce heat islands, absorb CO2.</p>  |
| 173 | <p>What is the link for the proposed legislation? Include local historic districts and National Register-listed properties on the draft map.</p>   |
| 174 | <p>I forgot to suggest that we eliminate the zoning requirement for car parking if within 1/4 mile of bus stop or alewife.</p>   |
| 175 | <p>I live in the Centre/Heights area. I don’t see how this area has much relationship to transit without drastically improving the bus service. I had to wait 17 minutes for a #77 bus in the middle of the day today (Monday)-they used to be every five minutes. Many of the blue areas are already two-family housing. Are we just encouraging knocking these down to build not very transit oriented housing?</p>  |
| 176 | <p>Would love to highlight the importance of proactively planning the town’s infrastructure (i.e., school, public safety, parking, library, etc) to address the increased population</p>   |

## Appendix C - Feedback from the Robbins Library

During June 2023, the MBTA Communities Working Group had a display at the front table of the Robbins Library. Library patrons were invited to leave comments, either by posting sticky notes on a map, or by writing them in a notebook. This appendix contains comments submitted via the display table.

### Comments from Robbins Library Display Table

| #  | Comment   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Would love for mass transit to be faster to get from Heights to Alewife   |
| 2  | Bring back the 84 Bus from the Heights to Alewife   |
| 3  | In the Heights, the crossings over the Minuteman are natural bottlenecks. Any new housing needs to be considered alongside improvements to transit. |
| 4  | Housing not hotels <–   |
| 5  | Bring back the eight original farms from 1635 and raze everything else  |
| 6  | Mystic St sia main corridor where is its densification??  |
| 7  | Why isn't there densification planned for wealthier parts of town?  |
| 8  | Limit conversion to single family mega-mansions   |
| 9  | Yes to higher density, no to luxury apartments no one can afford. I'd like to see Arlington limit AirBnB too! (But the T must work first!)          |
| 10 | Make the T actually work  |
| 11 | Add multifamily buildings in the Center to be close to public transit, grocery stores, etc.   |
| 12 | Why isn't Arlington Center area (Mass Ave & Pleasant Street) part of the Arlington Center subdistrict?  |
| 13 | Mixed commercial & residential is good policy.  |
| 14 | Mixed use commercial / residential space is important   |
| 15 | Preserve open space – it's good to share this town but not if doing so changes its fabric and good qualities  |
| 16 | Put units near T  |
| 17 | Increasing housing density along the Mass Ave corridor is important – but also is preserving commercial space.                                      |

| #  | Comment   |
|----|---|
| 18 | Zoning for multi-family housing is a racial justice issue and Boston has a particularly poor record on this topic. I learned a lot from the book “The Flag, The Cross, and the Station Wagon” by Bill McKibben from this library. The book talks about the author’s expectations growing up down the street from us in Lexington, and how Lexington’s own history reveals a lot about larger cultural and socioeconomic forces at work across America over the last 50 years. We still have the opportunity to do better in the future than we have in the past – and we need to take that opportunity. |
| 19 | I work a decent paying white collar job and I can’t afford to buy in Arlington. Housing prices are crazy even for condos/multifamily. More options please especially for walkable areas! Thanks.  |
| 20 | 2-3 family is a good sweet spot, I don’t want all homes to be replaced by huge residential towers. I think a height limit is a good compromise too, where more housing can be added, but the human-scale of the town is retained.   |
| 21 | I believe Town should have control over where new development takes place. No developer should be able to build “by right.” I do not want to lose Town landmarks or historic homes. I am a renter and do not own a car, but I don’t support “by right” development.   |
| 22 | Building up along the Mass Ave & Broadway corridors makes sense.  |
| 23 | Generally makes sense. Do not change height requirements. Too many abutters have invested in solar. Also Broadway is not a T key bus route. How will bike and pedestrian accommodation be approved?   |
| 24 | Broadway is merely one block from Mass Ave. It’s T accessible for many people although admittedly not all. But here are bus lines, no? I think having Broadway and Mass Ave makes so much sense.  |
| 25 | What about the areas by the high school that are zoned commercial. There could easily be commercial / residential (like in Capital square). The Leader Bank Plaza could still house the bank and folks could live on three floors above it. Similarly for other commercial areas right around there.  |
| 26 | I am in favor of more multifamily and mixed use housing. It makes sense to encourage these along Mass Ave, Broadway, and the other bus routes. I like what the person above wrote.  |
| 27 | More multifamily homes in Arlington please! And with that, the ability to park on the street overnight. Also, better access to the train (shuttles? more buses to Alewife?). The 77 bus lane has been life-changing. I don’t think multi-family housing should be limited to only Broadway or Mass Ave, esp. since these streets have some of the worst air quality and tree coverage in Arlington. – resident at Newton Rd.  |

| #  | Comment   |
|----|---|
| 28 | Love multifamily homes, but please consider street parking on a case by case. Some streets are very large and can accommodate, while others would be awful for the residents living there (Sutherland in the Heights, for example, where you can't fit 2 cars + parking on even one side . . . plus it's a steep hill).   |
| 29 | It would be great to get more housing diversity for those in Arlington (e.g., looking to downsize) and those who want to live in Arlington but can't afford a single family home.   |
| 30 | It seems that Arlington doesn't have enough parking space for the residences we already have.   |
| 31 | Yes to diversity of housing in Arlington, but also yes to improving bike lanes on the Broadway corridor and traffic slowing mechanisms like chicanes, cross walks, raised beds and blinking signage. We need strategies that work on all side streets so that traffic isn't simply diverted. Too many people / pedestrians have been injured / died in Arlington streets. |
| 32 | Yes to the above.   |
| 33 | Multi-family homes, affordable, with parking.   |
| 34 | Could you zone in some large parking structures? I wish the town rented parking spaces that were covered and dense for people who need extra (see Ithaca, NY or Cambridge, UK for use of large municipal structures to deal with parking).  |
| 35 | Please consider "the right to light." 4-5 story building against 1 family home will potentially block their daylight.   |
| 36 | I agree with the above.   |
| 37 | I was dismayed by the Cmte's poor responses to thoughtful question! This "plan" exploits the MBTA Law and embraces gentrification – It implies "working class owners and renters be damned!"  |
| 38 | The plan exceeds the state's act mandate by 500-600% this is unacceptable.  |
| 39 | Why not include RT 2 access streets in your maps? Will spread out housing?  |
| 40 | I think that the subway is wonderful!   |
| 41 | I think that 4-5 stories next to single families is too high. I suggest 3 stories in multi-family districts.  |
| 42 | It would be great if taller building was built only on the north side of the street so they don't block the sun! This would avoid the "urban canyon" feel.  |

| #  | Comment   |
|----|---|
| 43 | This is too much added development, far in excess of the state’s requirement, and will overburden our infrastructure.   |
| 44 | 2,046 units no more. 3 stories by right, 1 “bonus” floor, and only 1, on Mass Ave and Broadway, for developer’s choice of 1st floor commercial or additional affordable housing to ensure a max of 4 floors. Instead of concentrating density along the densest and lowest-income parts of town, already mostly 2- and 3- families, put more in R0 and R1, the least dense portions of town, where the net gain in capacity will be greatest. Commuters don’t realize that to build any of this, developers will have to pay property owners a premium to buy and tear down their houses.   |
| 45 | Too many residents think this will create more affordable housing for middle or lower income. It will not! Land will become more valuable than homes, teardowns of modest singles (1 or 2 stories) will happen to build 4 - 6 plexes of high income / luxury condos. Let’s be careful how many we allow—just the required units to comply with law 2,046 not the proposed amounts over 10,000.  |
| 46 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that we need to aim for compliance ONLY. It’s not possible to get to the whole number without transforming the town in a bad way. My complaints are 1) This will negatively affect tree cover which is counter to net zero 2) only “poor” streets are being proposed for this plan—Mystic, Pleasant, Summer, and Washington all have bus traffic—also Frontage Rd. Why are they not included in the plan? 3) we have LOUSY MBTA service. The one bus we had that covered all of Mass Ave to Alewife (79) has been killed. TWO BUSES for a lot of us to get to Alewife?? MBTA 77 bus has run erratically since pandemic. I often have to wait 30 mins. which is terrible for a KEY bus route. New “Better Bus” may take years to implement due to labor issues—meanwhile we’re adding bodies to town in the name of the MBTA which doesn’t serve us fairly or equally.</li> <li>• The town is too densely populated already.</li> </ul> |
| 47 | The town is too densely populated already.  |
| 48 | We need more time to figure out a better way to comply with the law. Other communities are taking more time.  |
| 49 | There are people who work for the town and can’t afford the rents yet but qualify for housing. People have two incomes and still can’t buy a house.   |

# Map from Robbins Library Display Table

