



Ruthanne Fuller
Mayor

City of Newton, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Development
1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone
(617) 796-1120
Telefax
(617) 796-1142
TDD/TTY
(617) 796-1089
www.newtonma.gov

Barney S. Heath
Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 8, 2019

TO: Councilor Albright, Chair
Members of the Zoning and Planning Committee

FROM: Barney S. Heath, Director of Planning and Development
James Freas, Deputy Director of Planning and Development
Lily Canan Reynolds, Community Engagement Manager
Rachel B. Nadkarni, Long-Range Planner

RE: **#220-18 Washington Street Vision Plan Draft Two**

MEETING DATE: February 11, 2019

CC: Honorable Newton City Councilors
Planning and Development Board
Urban Design Commission

The *"Hello Washington Street!" Vision Plan* is a City project to define a community-based vision for the future of this important corridor and includes new zoning and an infrastructure investment strategy. Draft One of the vision plan was released in October 2018. On February 11, 2019 the Draft Two plan and zoning ordinance will be released incorporating community feedback and the latest thinking. This second draft will also be followed by a month-long comment period, and a final draft is anticipated April 2019. At that time the City Council is anticipated to review the final draft and consider adopting the plan and zoning for Washington Street. The Draft Two documents show the results of more planning work completed this winter. This draft builds on ideas that originated in the June 2018 Public Design Week, an intensive iterative process with high level of community involvement – and the May 2018 Launch Event. Draft Two further details a vision for the future of Washington Street and a Draft Zoning Ordinance:

Chapter 1. Introduction
Chapter 2. Big Ideas
Chapter 3. Illustrative Site Studies
Chapter 4. Street Repair
Chapter 5. Fiscal Impact
Draft Zoning Ordinance & Zoning Map for Washington Street

The **Chapter 1. Introduction** aims to provide an overview of the principle of the vision plan and zoning recommendation. The **Chapter 2. Big Ideas** is an expanded series of actions and policy recommendations that originate in the community dialogue since May 2018. These actions should be implemented in conjunction with the zoning for Washington Street in order to fully realize the vision developed.

In Draft One several key sites on Washington were presented using three illustrative examples showing what could happen under different zoning scenarios. Draft Two **Chapter 3. Illustrative Site Studies** shows a single preferred vision for each of these sites. It also shows some additional sites that have been developed in recent weeks. In none of the sites was the “market driven” scenario selected as the preferred vision. The feedback received by City Council and the community overwhelmingly rejected the large, boxy buildings designed to accommodate a large amount of parking spaces, which characterized this option. Some will say that the planning process utilized the “market driven” scenario as merely a demonstration or ‘straw man’, and to some extent they did serve as a way to demonstrate a less preferable, yet likely outcome in instances where the City is reacting to project proposals that prioritize building lots of parking and pay less attention to design. These types of projects are a reality in the market today, and in fact Newton community members identified existing projects in neighboring towns as “what not to do”.

Draft Two Zoning Ordinance sets a baseline condition of **promoting incremental development** characterized by multiple individual buildings differentiated by height, width and style as opposed to large uniform building or buildings of the same height and style. This proposal would encourage the development of buildings less than four stories by allowing them by-right, a very strong incentive. It is hoped that this approach would result in more incremental buildings would be built over time. While this approach will work for many property owners seeking to maintain or replace an existing building, for larger parcels a different zoning tool – **courtyard building group** – could be used, which would require these projects to mimic some of the outcomes of the incremental approach. Allowed only by Special Permit (i.e. requiring City Council approval), the courtyard building group consolidates underground parking, requires creation of public open space, and requires variation in height so that projects will not consist of single large block long buildings. These regulations intend to require buildings fit the design preferences of the community in both instances where individual buildings are built incrementally or a courtyard building group.

Chapter 4. Street Repair has updated information of how to test and trial in the short-term some long-term improvements to the safety and functionality of the roadway. Many of the Big Ideas of Chapter 2 relate to the road itself. This Chapter is a jumping off point for future actions. **Chapter 5. Fiscal Impact** includes some order of magnitude estimates of infrastructure improvements as well as fiscal modeling for development scenarios, which will be the subject of a more extensive review with fiscal impact consultant Tischler Bise at the March 19, 2019 City Council Committee of the Whole meeting.

How Does Draft Two Relate to Draft One? What Role Does Community Input Play?

Staff has received questions from the community and from City Council about the role that community input plays in developing the Washington Street vision. The entire 13-month long planning process for Washington Street is designed to include community input in conjunction with analysis of existing conditions, market realities, and planning best practices. Community input is an essential aspect to building the vision for Washington Street and this process has asked people to share their aspirations for building their community now and in the future. The planning process is also recognizes that people with the most resources (literacy, income, access to technology, time, etc.) are often overrepresented and it is important that the process endeavor to include the opinions of everyone, not just those who comment. **Comments received on the first draft help the planning team narrow options presented to create a vision that is grounded in community goals and is aligned with realistic outcomes when zoning tools are adopted, and policies are implemented. The purpose of the Draft One month-long comment period was to allow everyone ample time to read and react to the ideas in the plan, consider questions and tradeoffs, and provide feedback on future development scenarios for several sites along Washington Street.** The Draft One plan endeavored to communicate

the tradeoffs likely in different scenarios so people could understand what investments in public infrastructure (parks, transit stations, sidewalks, roads, etc.) would be likely in the different scenarios. **The purpose of the month-long comment period is not to produce a data set of comments to be analyzed quantitatively.** The open-ended questions asked in the plan have generated creative thinking and interactive dialogue about the future of Newton. This process requires people to consider a complex series of policy choices – a task that does not lend itself to a simplified ranking of choices, yes or no answers, or tallying preferences.

The Principle Group planning team as well as City of Newton Planning Department staff have spent time to read every one of the 2,672 comments received from 317 individual people on the Draft One vision plan and zoning toolkit. Approximately 30 people attended the four Drop-In Office Hours in person in November and December; these comments and discussions are reflected here too. Several themes can be distilled in the comments, which help the planning team revise the second draft plan. Not surprisingly, while there appears to be consensus in some of the themes, there are no cases where absolutely everyone agrees. For many of the topics, there appear to be widely differing views on the best course of action. The remainder of this memo attempts to outline these Draft One themes, and the information garnered by the planning team. Whenever possible, staff has highlighted themes where there was some degree of consensus or a preference was apparent. This document is not intended to provide a word-by-word analysis of all 2,672 comments received; for those interested in that, please refer to the comments themselves, which are all available on the project website.

Theme 1 – Organization, Scope and Process

This section includes direct responses to some of the requests received for changes to the vision plan, and questions about scope and process. A goal of the Draft Two plan is to respond to some of the **organizational and formatting** suggestions that community members provided on Draft One. For example, this draft will have more labels and place names to make maps more readable, it will include a table of contents, and the introductory Chapter 1 aims to act as an executive summary of the vision plan.

Community members expressed that they have **limited time** to review these documents and need a guide to focus on most relevant information. The format of the next draft will attempt to better highlight sub-headings and key information in a more at-a-glance manner. The Draft Two release will include summary pages that will help people who have “10 minutes or less”, “30 minutes or less” and “1+ hour” to spend on reviewing the draft plan and zoning. The Civicomment online platform is challenging for some and a few technical problems were later fixed in Draft One. The planning team appreciates patience with technical problems; like Draft One, the Draft Two documents will be available in print in the library as an alternative to Civicomment. Some commented that the Washington Street planning process is proceeding at a good pace and other comments that the process feels rushed. Similarly, some questioned whether the process is transparent enough, meanwhile some thought the community engagement effort had been effective and accessible.

A few questions related to whether **Newton Corner** is included in this plan and to what extent. During the Public Design Week in June 2018, the planning team and the community researched Newton Corner and began to document ideas, issues, and design thoughts. The second draft vision plan will include these including some sketches for the area, however, they will not be as fully refined as the Washington Street study area that extends from West Newton to Crafts Street. Newton Corner is an important area that will be the subject of future planning work.

Commenters asked about **how the zoning and vision interrelate**. The vision plan shows what Washington Street could look like in ten, twenty, or thirty years in the future if all infrastructure investments were made and all sites were developed according to a preferred scenario. The zoning ordinance defines the tools and rules that regulate changes over time on Washington Street, and mainly pertain to private property. Both documents, if adopted by

City Council, will be used in the review of development proposals on Washington Street and public infrastructure investments.

There were requests for more clarification on how **Zoning Redesign** and Washington Street zoning are related or different. The Zoning Redesign project is an ongoing effort (since 2011) that aims to create a better baseline zoning ordinance for Newton citywide. Since 2018, when *Hello Washington Street* commenced, these two projects have been conducted on parallel work plans and have been managed by the same team of City of Newton Planning Department staff. Zoning Redesign looks more generically citywide and proposes very modest changes compared to what is allowed today; it focuses on updating the basic mechanisms of zoning in Newton. The Washington Street zoning proposal benefits from a much closer analysis and community engagement effort in a smaller study area; it proposes greater changes to these neighborhoods including infrastructure investments like upgraded MBTA commuter rail stations, roadways, sidewalks, and parks. In anticipation that the Hello Washington Street zoning ordinance may be adopted by City Council first, it is drafted to fit within the City of Newton's current Chapter 30 Zoning Ordinance.

Some people asked about whether the opinions of the **residents of West Newton or Newtonville neighborhoods** would receive more consideration than comments of residents in other areas of Newton. The Washington Street planning process is designed to be an open dialogue between the community, elected officials, and the planning staff. This process is not designed to distinguish between different voices or assign different weight to individual comments based on residency. However, the planning team does take seriously the fact that neighbors living nearby do stand to experience any changes over time more than those who live further away. The planning team also notes that nearby residents may stand to benefit the most from any local improvements. The City Council is a body that is elected to represent residents of different wards and is the decision-making body responsible for implementing zoning and planning citywide.

There was a large amount of comments about the **Newtonville Area Council** survey findings especially related to building heights, senior housing, and non-profit developers building affordable housing. The planning team has been attentive to the Newtonville Area Council charrette and survey results.

An overarching theme in the comments is different voices interested in maintaining the **status quo** on Washington Street compared to those interested in **greater change and transformation**. For example, many indicated they welcome change on Washington Street including new buildings and other changes to sidewalks, shops, etc. Several people discussed a desire for more vibrancy in West Newton, Newtonville, and Newton Corner, one person saying they welcomed the *"fun, lively environment"* they saw represented in the draft plan. On the other hand, many commenters expressed a desire for Newton to not experience change and maintain the villages as they are today, for example one person, who is opposed to seeing Washington Street transform stating, *"worst plan imaginable!"*.

Theme 2 – People

The remainder of this memo includes themes of the community input received on Draft One, as well as direct quotes to help illustrate some of the sentiments or particularly salient points.

A. Business

- Many commenters expressed concern about current retail and locally owned businesses surviving, which is consistent with some of the clearest areas of community consensus from the early surveys conducted in spring 2018 for *Hello Washington Street*. Figuring out ways to help existing retailers remain in the neighborhood and afford rents over time was an important theme throughout the Draft One comments.
- Some commenters connected village and business vitality to the amount of people that are nearby the villages, like this person, *"in order for small businesses to continue to enhance the character of our villages, they need people walking by their storefronts."*

- Some people commented that there was not enough commercial space and office proposed in the Draft One plan, meanwhile others were very concerned about overbuilding retail spaces that could sit empty.

B. Homes

- A consistent theme in the comments is a request for more affordable housing. There is less consensus about whether buildings of greater heights (5+ stories) are a good way to achieve more affordable housing. Several people said new affordable housing was the most important issue for the Washington Street vision.
- There are several questions about Newton's Inclusionary Zoning ordinance, and proposed changes to the ordinance considered in 2018/2019 by City Council.
- Concerns that affordable units are not well-suited for seniors who want to age in place because they would have too many assets to qualify. Simultaneous concerns that proposed changes to the Inclusionary Zoning ordinance overemphasizes a new 'middle-income' tier and reduces the amount of low- to -moderate-income tiered units.
- Some commenters are skeptical that new housing would provide a range of affordability saying that most new housing would be 'luxury' prices.

C. Diversity

- Several people commented about increasing the diversity of Newton's population. For example, *"I value increasing the racial, ethnic, and economic diversity of our city."* Most of these comments included a connection with affordable housing and density, such as this person, *"To have a vibrant community Newton needs more affordable units. With land and housing prices rising out of site, our community is losing its diverse character. Our children need to grow up in a diverse world."*
- A few people mentioned a need for more rental units; one person made a comment that renters should be a welcomed part of the community and linked this idea to new housing.

Theme 3 – Buildings and Neighborhoods

A. Open Space & Environmental Sustainability

- There were many questions about change over time and livability/sustainability – there is disagreement among commenters about whether the plan proposes change that will increase or decrease pollution, congestion, or green space.
- Interest in making existing open spaces more vibrant and more well-used and suggestion that new residents will help achieve that.
- Many expressed interest in linking development mitigation funds to improving parks and open space. Others questioned whether development should be linked at all or if existing City funds should continue status quo maintenance.
- Questions about whether open spaces in the "courtyard" style buildings would be accessible to all members of the public or if they are more designed for residents of the buildings, as one person said, *"this courtyard appears to be private - no access by the public unless they're dining at the restaurant."*
- There is a divide among commenters about whether growth over time should be concentrated in fewer buildings to allow for more concentrated larger parks and open spaces or not. Some said they would prefer to have no improvements to current open space instead of development and investment.
- A comment to preserve Lincoln Park Baptist Church and green space in West Newton.
- General support for planting trees and adding greenery to the streetscape on Washington Street.
- Several commenters suggested that the plan was not strong enough on environmental sustainability and wanted to see things like solar panels and more requirements for energy efficient buildings detailed throughout the plan.
- Some commenters prefer larger, sizeable parks and new open spaces instead of smaller ones.

B. Building Types

- Consensus that market-driven scenario is not desirable. Many commenters are opposed to buildings that look like Pleasant Street or Arsenal Street in Watertown.
- Lots of commenters express preference for the courtyard scenario, including someone who commented, *“this looks gorgeous.”* There was an interest in hybrid scenario along Washington Street, as one person said, *“there’s no one size fits all, but the courtyard approach has lots of flexibility.”*
- The incremental scenario is preferred by some people who liked new buildings to be smaller scale and different shapes and sizes, for example, *“this is the best option that I have seen. 3-stories, on-street parking, and the buildings have a New England feel to them.”* On the other hand, some people feared this scenario would reduce the amount of mitigation funds that developers could make available for investment in community amenities.
- Some found it difficult to see the differences between the courtyard and market driven scenarios.
- Many commenters asked to keep the few architecturally significant buildings in West Newton, Newtonville.

C. Height

- There seemed to be consensus that buildings should step down in height towards abutting neighborhoods, however there was no clear consensus about what maximum heights should be.
- When people commented about a specific height, most, but not all, called for a lower number of stories in most locations. (See ‘Villages’ below for more area-specific information.)
- When responding to questions about taller buildings near the Turnpike, people who commented favorably often explained they thought it would provide a good buffer between the Turnpike and the neighborhoods, and/or new buildings could better connect the two sides of the Turnpike. Meanwhile, others opposed taller buildings near the Turnpike because they fear this would create more of a divide between north and south of Turnpike and/or lead to an amplification of some of the Turnpike’s negative effects.
- Areas identified as “Preserve the Scale of the Neighborhood” on the Sector Map received a majority of comments to keep the heights between two- to four-stories. Many people identified how existing buildings facing Washington Street in the area between Newtonville and West Newton are used as both residential and commercial offices (e.g. attorney office) and expressed how this mixing of residential and commercial uses should continue and perhaps include some retail.
- Mixing of heights was an idea many people found interesting. As one person put it, *“the problem with 4 stories maximum is that all the buildings will then be 4 stories, creating a uniform and potentially dreary mass. Could there be a mix of 3 and 4 and possible one or two 5 stories? How zone for that among different developers?”*

D. Villages

- There is a strong interest in seeing more village vitality. One commenter summed up a middle-of-the-road sentiment this way, *“we don’t need to be Harvard Square but we do need a lot more [activity] than we have now for our businesses to be successful.”*
- Interest in understanding how we can specify buildings to achieve *“visual sensitivity to neighborhoods”* and require certain building materials or building elements.
- Some people asked about setbacks, indicating a preference for buildings to be located further away from the street, especially in areas where the buildings are taller. Especially in the Zoning Toolkit, commenters asked about how minimal setback requirements would interrelate with the desire for wide sidewalks, café seating, benches, more trees and greenery.
- A few commenters supported historic preservation tools – ways to preserve some buildings while not stopping all development. The Armory, Our Lady Catholic Church, Jackson Homestead, West Newton Police Annex, Masonic Hall, Lincoln Park Baptist Church, and the Post Office Building were all mentioned as examples. A few people questioned whether the historic façade preservation tool is truly ‘preservation’ or worth the cost of the effort to preserve just the façade.

- **West Newton Cinema Block** - Most people don't like 'market driven' scenario. There are divided opinions about the appropriate heights here: many, but not all who commented specifically on height, think a 6-story building is too tall at the Cinema Block; at the same time many other commenters think this area is appropriate for heights of 6-stories, and in a few cases even more height. A majority are concerned about existing businesses remaining, especially the Cinema. There were mixed opinions as to whether the existing buildings are desirable. What is clear is, regardless of whether existing buildings remain, the existing businesses are very important to people; this person for example states, *"the building themselves have no importance to me, although the local character of the businesses should be retained."* There seems to be interest in higher buildings along Davis Street to screen from the Turnpike, although no consensus on the height of these buildings. Several commenters liked the idea of building an arts center in this area that included the West Newton Cinema, for example, *"location would be great for entertainment other cultural uses."*
- **West Newton Cheesecake Block** - Very little support for 'market driven' as people think buildings are too large and bulky. Support for enhancing Cheesecake Brook, Davis Court, and Dunstan Street. Some support for taller buildings along turnpike. There was some confusion about the number of units calculated in the development scenarios, and one person asked, *"why does the 'incremental' option have more units and more sq ft of retail than the 'courtyard' option here?"*. This unit count outcome is related to the study of site constraints including topography and anticipated parking; generally, in the incremental scenario, less parking is anticipated, so more of the building could be used for residential or commercial space.
- **Newtonville McGovern Site** - There appears to be consensus that 'market driven' scenario is not preferred because it is too *"monolithic"* and shows a *"horrible transition into neighborhood"*, especially Court Street residential area to the north. However, some people commented they would like to see more than 5-stories at this site. Several people preferred the 'courtyard' scenario and support the new street connection. As one person wrote, *"I really like the courtyard option. I think this is the way to go. It will make Newtonville look beautiful and it will allow space to be used efficiently."* There was some general interest for townhouse style stacked flats along Court Street, as well as historic architectural elements, such as arched doorways and window treatments in some of the brick building precedent photos. While there were commenters who preferred the 'incremental' scenario here, there seemed to be fewer than those who liked the courtyard approach. Again, there is a divide over the preference of maximum heights at this location and seems to be slightly more consensus about mixing of heights as a general concept. There was a request to change the description of the Court Street neighborhood from predominantly "single-family homes" to "predominantly two-family homes".
- **Crafts Street** – The 'market driven' scenario not preferred by most. Comments about massing shown in 'market driven' included, *"this is way too massive and overwhelming"* and *"mixed use is fine but not so massive."* As for the courtyard scenario, most commenters opposed the height shown in the tallest buildings labeled "J" and "O". For example, one person wrote, *"10 stories is too tall - 5 stories most at this spot only."* Others preferred the new park shown in this example, but simultaneously oppose the maximum heights shown, like the commenter who stated, *"you've got to be kidding me!! 10 stories!! I do like the green space in the back."* Many commenters like the idea of improving the commuter rail station and having mixed-use development here, but only a few commenters supported the idea of a 10-story building at this location. The 'incremental' scenario was supported by some commenters, but there was interest in digging deeper into what these building forms and heights would mean, and if this scenario would realistically invite office space. Many commenters expressed concerns about increased traffic here, and safety of existing intersections, especially Lewis Terrace nearby. There was interest expressed in understanding heights and sun studies.
- **West Newton Station Area** – Commenters seem to be more consistently in agreement that this area is the right place for new buildings and transformation, however, nearly all who commented on the heights of buildings here said they want to see shorter buildings than were shown in Draft One. Many commenters are onboard with improvements to how the highway on/off ramps impact the neighborhood here. There was a significant amount of interest in the 'lined bridge' scenario where small buildings would be built on either side

of the bridges across the Turnpike in West Newton, although many people are concerned about the degree of public subsidy that this type of project could require. As one person stated, *"while I can't believe it could be done economically, building on both sides of the bridge to isolate the street from the pike is a great idea. It makes the bridge more pedestrian friendly and connects the village with the neighborhood up the hill."* Some people were interested in the idea of office buildings here. Some people are concerned about what impacts there could be on the roads and traffic flow in this area. One person supportive of office buildings said, *"if large commercial-space developments here can turn parking lots and light industrial space into financing for village improvements as described and commercial property tax base, bring it on."*

- **Newtonville Square** – Like the lined bridges in the West Newton Station area, many commenters expressed interest in the lined bridge with small retail buildings to help bring the two sides of Newtonville together. While many people expressed interest in the deck park, most are interested in understanding what costs or development tradeoffs would be required to make this a reality.

Theme 4 – Transportation

A. Roads/Traffic

- Many commenters welcomed the vision for Washington Street to be safer and allow more ability for people to walk and bike to destinations.
- Commenters expressed confusion about how the dual proposals of increasing housing/commercial space on Washington Street could function with a decrease in vehicular travel lanes.
- Washington Street is seen as currently underutilized road by many commenters who expressed a desire for plans for more trees, bike lanes. Many see trees as helping to buffer noise and pollution from the Turnpike. For some, adding one- to two-story buildings, as shown with some of the 'pavilion' buildings on Washington Street is also desirable.
- Commenters expressed the need for more frequent and safe ways to cross Washington Street.
- Short-term tests of road reconfigurations were supported by many, for example this commenter said, *"test and learn before we spend!"*
- The idea of a central turn lane on Washington, which currently has none, was supported by many commenters.

B. Parking

- There seemed to be consensus that having underground parking garages is preferable to surface lots and preferable to street parking.
- Many community members expressed an interest in reducing the amount of parking spaces current zoning requires new buildings to have, although many others said they saw an ongoing need for more parking to be built.
- There is a tension between the dual desires of a less-car-oriented Washington Street and the current realities of getting around Newton without a car. These commenters responded to each other, *"If I could live work and hangout in Newton I would forgo my vehicle. I would rather see less space used on parking cars and more space used for people to live and enjoy where they live."*
 - *"Yes, that's a wonderful vision! But most of us work 9 to 5 elsewhere and have kids and hanging out without a car is unfortunately not feasible."*
- Some commenters responded to the plans by supporting the idea for keeping employee parking away from core of the village centers.
- Many commenters are concerned that businesses along Washington Street, especially those between West Newton and Newtonville, will have sufficient parking for customers.
- Although there were comments on both sides, a surprising number of people supported removing parking minimums as a way to discourage the overbuilding of parking.

C. Bicycling & Walking

- There is a strong desire for protected bike lanes along corridor, or as this commenter put it, *“this Washington St redesign project is an incredible opportunity to add similar protected bike lanes in Newton. It will be a crying shame if they aren't added to Washington St!”*
- In general, there was a significant amount of interest in bike lanes on Washington Street, although some people wondered if the eastbound and westbound lanes could be on the same side of the street
- Some commenters called for *“secure, ample bicycle parking”*.
- A few people commented on walkability and many supported sidewalks and streets with more greenery. Some connected walkability with density and supporting local businesses like this person, *“we need more people within a 10 minute walk of our village centers to help support any type of business that wishes to come in.”*

D. Transit

- ADA Accessible commuter rail stations and increased frequency was a consistent theme in many comments, as was the discussion about whether new housing and commercial space should be planned without improving transit first.
- Many commenters mentioned the *“chicken-and-egg”* conundrum that transit options are most likely to be improved and in a shorter timeline if new housing and commercial space is built.
- People asked for more details on how the City could work with private investors or development mitigation funds in order to implement improvements. Chapter 5. Fiscal Impacts of the Draft Two vision plan includes some more information on these tools, which will be further developed in March and April 2019. There were a few requests for upgraded bus stops on Washington Street.
- A few commenters identified Newton Corner as a good place for a new commuter rail station.
- Some commenters asked for BRT, or Bus Rapid Transit, on Washington Street. More information on this idea is discussed in Chapter 4. Street Repair of the Draft Two vision plan and will be further developed in March and April 2019.
- Some commenters expressed concern that the first draft plan does not include enough consideration about intra-Newton transportation. If the future of Washington Street is designed to be less car-oriented and more focused on walkability, bikeability and transit access, some commenters asked if there was enough consideration to how future residents, shoppers and workers could make trips to places like Newton Centre without a car. A few people said they find current intra-Newton transportation options acceptable, and while it doesn't look like bus service every five minutes, they see it as sufficiently connected to transit.

Theme 5 – Infrastructure Investment Mechanisms

- There were some comments about funding for the infrastructure improvements shown in the Draft One plan. These comments ranged from people who were skeptical that there would be sufficient public or private funds to pay for the larger transformations, like decking the Turnpike in Newtonville, to people who were very interested in the City exploring funding mechanisms to make improvements like new ADA accessible commuter rail stations happen, including mitigation funds from private development. Some people asked for more information about what kinds of community amenity benefits could be expected with by-right development compared to Special Permits.

The March 19, 2019 presentation to City Council Committee of the Whole will provide an opportunity for the planning team and fiscal impact consultant Tischler Bise to dive deeper into the fiscal impact models for Washington Street Vision. City Council will receive a presentation about Draft Two Vision Plan and Zoning Ordinance for Washington Street on Monday, February 11, 2019. Councilors will receive hard copies of the documents at the presentation. The electronic versions will be uploaded to www.newtonma.gov/washingtonstreetvision on Tuesday, February 12, 2019 and printed copies will be made available for the community in the reserve section of the Library and in the Planning Department of City Hall.