

Nadia Khan

From: Marc Laredo <laredofamily@rcn.com>
Sent: Monday, November 07, 2016 8:21 AM
To: Nadia Khan
Subject: Fwd: TOD: What the LUC Needs to Know

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Resent-From: <mlaredo@newtonma.gov>
From: Susan Reisler <susan.reisler@gmail.com>
Date: November 3, 2016 at 11:00:42 PM EDT
To: mlaredo@newtonma.gov
Subject: **TOD: What the LUC Needs to Know**

Chairman Laredo:

As promised at the last LUC meeting, here's a link to the article I cited about transit-oriented development and why Washington Place does not meet the criteria for a TOD.

See "Transit-oriented Development: It Does Not Apply to the Washington Place Proposal" at <http://www.betternewtonville.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Transit-Oriented-Development-Final.pdf>.

Relatedly, I was disappointed by the mini-discussion at the close of the last LUC meeting, during which councilors debated Option A versus Option B. To me, the more fundamental question -- the question that must be answered first -- is whether rezoning will yield a *reasonable, attractive, and appropriate* development for this location, to paraphrase Councilor Danberg's statement in the *Newton Tab* about the Mayor's plan for developing the Newton Centre Library.

Likewise, the 2010 *Request for Interest* (for Austin Street) asserted that large development projects in Newton should strive for "excellence in place-making."

To me, that implies a sort of Hippocratic oath -- i.e., first do no harm, keep social costs to a minimum, and don't force unwanted projects down people's throats. When the Newtonville Area Council surveyed residents regarding Austin Street, it found that 82% wanted a development of three stories or fewer, and 80% wanted 40 units or less. The speed with which we have gathered signatures opposing this project (see below), compared to Austin Street, strongly suggests that there is even more opposition to the massive scale of this project. (It also has only half the proportion of SSHI-qualifiable affordable housing as Austin Street.)

No rezoning would yield a three-story building. According to the developer's chart presented at the last LUC meeting, this would allow 103 units. To me, this seems better at mitigating the traffic, parking, housing cost inflation/gentrification, land speculation, overshadowing of a historical district, and other social costs deriving from a larger project.

Why has this alternative been excluded from consideration by your committee? Is it acceptable

that neither Option A nor Option B is a TOD? A three-story building would align with TOD requirements.

Over a period of a few months, about 2900 Newton residents have signed a petition requesting that the City Council deny Korff's rezoning request. (It took Charter Commission advocates eight years to get 8,000 signatures!) Shouldn't the LUC at a minimum debate the issue out of respect for residents?

Sincerely,
Susan Reisler
in conjunction with Peter Bruce

When responding, please be aware that the Massachusetts Secretary of State has determined that most email is public record and therefore cannot be kept confidential.