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**PREFACE**

The American Planning Association (APA) and the City of Boston would like to express their gratitude to the Mattapan community for dedicating time and energy to the Cote Ford AICP Community Planning Workshop. We greatly appreciate the community’s efforts toward laying a foundation for a future planning process for redevelopment of the Cote Ford properties. The following is a list of attendees that signed-in for the workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Darlene Santos-Smith</th>
<th>Tracey Ragland-Kelley</th>
<th>State Representative Russell Holmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Mapp</td>
<td>Jeff Stone</td>
<td>Peiyi Xu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ines Palmarin</td>
<td>Marcella Brown</td>
<td>Kay Kaigler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jenkins</td>
<td>Barbara Fields</td>
<td>Michele Ewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillie Searcy</td>
<td>Lisa Dix</td>
<td>Latisha Johnson-Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midori Morikawa</td>
<td>Yvonne Malcolm</td>
<td>Supreme Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Pruce</td>
<td>Ernest Bennett</td>
<td>Ray Pegram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Kelley</td>
<td>Sheree Holmes</td>
<td>Guale Valdez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop greatly benefited from the following professional planners attending APA’s 2011 National Planning Conference held in Boston who volunteered their time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenn Moyer, AICP</th>
<th>Deborah Lawlor, AICP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lundgren, AICP</td>
<td>Deb Meihoff, AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ford, AICP</td>
<td>Joseph Lee, AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Brown, FAICP</td>
<td>Kerry McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Hubbard, FAICP</td>
<td>Steven Pantalone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pfaffmann, AICP</td>
<td>Carlyn Maksymuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Bartolomé</td>
<td>Jeffrey Lambert, AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Mahony, AICP</td>
<td>Alice Walkup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peiyi Xu</td>
<td>Glenn Moyer, AICP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the following volunteers from the AICP Community Planning Workshop Committee were instrumental in planning and conducting the workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carey Duques, AICP</th>
<th>Amy Minzner, AICP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Estes-Smargiassi</td>
<td>Jennifer M. Raitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Hoey</td>
<td>John (Tad) Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Kearney</td>
<td>Jeremy Rosenberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Kim, AICP, Committee Chair</td>
<td>Monica Tibbits, AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lee</td>
<td>Dana Whiteside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Mallis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Mercurio, AICP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APA Staff**

Monica Groh, Director of Membership and AICP Programs  
Ryan Scherzinger, Senior Outreach Associate  
Thomas Bassett, Senior Program Associate
INTRODUCTION

Community assistance is built into the professional role of a planner. One principle of the AICP Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct states that certified planners shall aspire to “seek social justice by working to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of the disadvantaged and to promote racial and economic integration.” Yet another principle is that certified planners should aspire to “contribute time and effort to groups lacking in adequate planning resources and to voluntary professional activities.” In the early 1990s, the American Planning Association (APA) and its professional institute, the American Institute of Certified Planers (AICP), began an on-the-ground effort of addressing issues of social equity by providing pro bono technical assistance to communities facing limited resources. By pairing expert urban planning professionals from around the country with citizens from local communities, the initiative seeks to foster community education, engagement, and empowerment. APA has worked with many communities across the country, including most recently, a concerted recovery effort in the Gulf Coast region in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina.

Through APA’s Community Assistance Program (CAP), AICP sponsors two initiatives: the Community Planning Workshop (CPW) and the Community Planning Assistance Teams (CPAT). CPWs are held in conjunction with APA’s National Planning Conference. Workshops are designed to address a local planning issue in a community of the conference host city. Projects are selected to ensure that the community benefits from a focused one-day effort involving community members, local planning staff, and APA volunteers from all over the country. Workshops assist a community that does not have all of the necessary resources to engage in the community planning process. Workshop planners prepare a program that is intended to: a) serve as a legacy of the National Planning Conference for the host city; b) highlight the capabilities of the planning profession; c) visibly demonstrate planning to the public; and d) provide training for both the practitioners and the community on public consensus building while honing skills in community participation and problem solving. CPATs are three- to five-day projects. Communities are selected during two annual application periods. Each team is selected for the specific expertise needed on the project to offer pro bono assistance in developing a framework or vision plan that promotes a sustainable, livable, economically vibrant, and healthy community. Information regarding all of APA’s Community Assistance Program efforts may be found online at: www.planning.org/communityassistance.
PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Cote Ford properties in the Boston neighborhood of Mattapan have been vacant since 1993. Two blocks from the Mattapan Square business district, the 150,000 square foot multi-parcel Brownfield site presents an opportunity to envision new uses for the young, working-class neighborhood.

Urban planners from around the country volunteered their time to work side-by-side with Mattapan community stakeholders on Saturday, April 9, 2011, as part of the American Planning Association’s (APA) Community Planning Workshop. The workshop was held in conjunction with APA’s National Planning Conference being held in Boston from April 9-12. The goal of the day-long workshop was to establish a foundation for the planning and development of the former Cote Ford properties. The end product of the workshop was to develop a consensus driven “vision statement” and recommendations for next steps to be used by community members and the City of Boston as a “road map” for the future planning and redevelopment of the Cote Ford properties.

Going forward, it is clear from the feedback received at the workshop that the type of public participation process modeled by the workshop—one involving active listening and engagement—inspires trust and confidence in the community. As a result of the successful workshop, the visions, goals, themes, and ideas contained in this report will be used by the City of Boston and the Mattapan community as a solid first step in planning for the future development of the Cote Ford properties. The Cote Ford site in Boston’s Mattapan neighborhood provided a unique planning project for APA attendees and community participants. The Cote Ford parcels represent a wealth of planning challenges and opportunities, including brownfield remediation and reuse, transit-oriented development, economic and urban reinvestment, and sustainability, among other issues relevant to redevelopment of Cote Ford.

BACKGROUND

“Cote Ford” is a former auto dealership that has been vacant since 1993. It is a 150,000 square foot (SF) multi-parcel brownfield site located in the Mattapan neighborhood of Boston, two blocks outside of the Mattapan Square business district along a residential side street, Regis Road. The current owner’s inability to pay back taxes (now in excess of $1.6 million) has prompted the City of Boston to foreclose on the properties.

Two of the parcels front on a local arterial, Cummins Highway, and will abut a newly proposed commuter train station on the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) Fairmount Line. The new station will provide rail access to major retail and employment centers and will be a 15-minute ride to downtown Boston. Despite recently enhanced zoning to further encourage redevelopment, repeated redevelopment efforts have faltered due to a combination of program and financial issues.

With 3.2 acres in 10 lots (not all contiguous) the site represents a significant opportunity for redevelopment that includes transit oriented development principles. At the same time, preliminary environmental assessments of the site concluded that contamination exists (potentially over $1 million in environmental remediation) and measures must be taken to ensure that potential residents do not have contact with contaminated soils.
Other factors to consider include the many non-contiguous vacant parcels on Regis Road, with two- and three-family dwellings interspersed among the lots. The site is within a five-minute walk to Mattapan Square and would anchor a medium to high-density corridor from the Square to the proposed Cummins Highway/Blue Hill Avenue commuter rail station. (See Appendices A through D for larger site maps.)

Map 1: Cote Ford in relation to Mattapan Square. Source: Google Maps

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Workshop Scope
Planning for the Cote Ford site cut across many functional areas in planning. The goal of the workshop was to create a vision(s) for the potential reuse of the Cote Ford properties that will greatly enhance the quality-of-life and vitality of the immediate communities and Mattapan neighborhood overall.

- The final work product from the workshop was a consensus-driven Vision Statement with recommendations for next steps which can be used by community members and the City of Boston as a “road map” for pursuing further planning and development of the site.
• Comprised of both planners and community members, breakout groups provided a critical opportunity for planners to hear concerns directly from members of the community as well as test and develop different ideas in collaboration with members of the community.

• The workshop has provided the City of Boston an important foundation for a potential land disposition and planning process for the Cote Ford parcels. Future planning efforts can build upon the outcomes of the workshop and more effectively and efficiently plan a successful process for the redevelopment of Cote Ford that will be supported by the community and stakeholders.

Workshop Agenda and Overview
The 2011 AICP Community Workshop was held on Saturday, April 9, 2011. The workshop began at 8:00am and concluded at 4:00pm with a working lunch (See the workshop agenda for more details in Appendix I).

The planning participants met at the Hynes Convention Center conference site for a Workshop Primer led by AICP Commissioner Lee Brown, FAICP. The bus tour to the project site and surrounding neighborhood followed, and after the tour, planners met with elected officials and community member participants at the Mattapan Library, which served as the workshop location.

After introductions, an opening presentation provided additional background and contextual information to participants. The presentation prepared participants for breakout group discussions on specific topics of concern such issues as land use, housing, economic development, urban design, and open space. After the presentation, community members were asked to provide some context and community perspective.

Following the presentation, the approximately fifty attendees formed four breakout groups. Comprised of both planners and community members, the breakout groups provided a critical opportunity for planners to hear concerns directly from members of the community as well as test and develop different ideas in collaboration with members of the community. A series of questions were provided for each group to initiate the discussion. These questions included the following:

• What is important to you?
• What do you value?
• What are your priorities? What do you want to keep? What do you want to improve?
• Mapping your priorities: Where should change happen? Where should it not?

Following a working lunch, participants reconvened in a plenary session to share the ideas developed by each breakout group’s morning session. Input from the first breakout group session was used to frame and guide a second round of breakout group discussions for further refinement and consolidation. The goal of the second breakout group session was to develop an “Elevator Vision Statement” – what you can tell someone about the future of the Cote Ford site in a 20-second ride on the elevator.

A final plenary session was an attempt to “bring it all together” - to synthesize the results from the four breakout groups into a consensus vision statement. The workshop concluded with a series of projected next steps and a realistic timeframe for the future planning of the Cote Ford site.
WORKSHOP TAKEAWAYS

Vision Statements
At the end of the workshop, each of the four breakout groups presented its final vision statement, which they culled from their day’s discussion. Instructions were to make visions statements succinct enough that one could summarize it during a short elevator ride with a neighbor, community leader or an elected official, such as the City of Boston’s Mayor Thomas M. Menino. The vision statements and recommendations for next steps can be used by community members and the City of Boston as a “road map” for the future planning and redevelopment of the Cote Ford properties.

While each breakout group developed and presented its own vision statement, the statements, shown below, contain remarkable similarities.
Red Team
- A high quality design compatible with the existing neighborhood scale. This includes thoughtful, creative and flexible use of space and materials.
- Community and family-oriented.
- Multiple purposes, including inter-generational housing and retail.
- Community engagement should be a given.

Blue Team
Thank you for this opportunity to allow us community members and planners to work together, in order to make Mattapan a destination to be proud of. We are so proud to be a model for the rest of Boston.

We have:
- A great mix of housing and retail.
- A community center where youth, seniors, and others socialize together.
- A place where the Cote Ford site and Mattapan Square work together to enhance our community.
- New development that fits and reflects our community.

Green Team
Create a gateway to the cultures of Mattapan that will capitalize on the multicultural diversity of the community. Establish residential development that reflects the architectural character of the existing neighborhood, with community-focused business that holistically promotes a healthy lifestyle.

Yellow Team
[We'd like to see] high-quality development that enhances the neighborhood and is a place where someone could raise a family.

- Balances gateway and neighborhood character.
- Has [uses] like a nice sit-down restaurant and shops.
- Creates retail/mixed use on Cummins with residential on Regis in scale with existing homes.
- A place that reflects the “Country Living in the City” environment that defines Mattapan.

Bringing It All Together: Common Ideas and Themes
Reviewing the vision statements and breakout group notes, one finds common threads, identified below. These ideas and themes listed could serve as a starting point for continued conversation between the City of Boston and the Mattapan community about the future of the Cote Ford site. Detailed breakout group notes are provided in Appendix K.

1) Community Engagement: Participants seemed to feel that the public engagement process used for the workshop — where members of the community are engaged from the inception, before any ideas were placed on the table by planners — should be a model for the public participation process at the Cote Ford site.

2) Quality Design & Neighborhood Compatibility: Many expressed the desire that any new development in Mattapan square be “high quality” in design and execution, “beautiful,” with “architectural character.” Olmsted Green was given as an example of high quality, well designed developments. At the same time, participants felt that the design should be
compatible in scale and character with the existing neighborhood.

3) Mix of Uses: An interest was expressed in seeing a mix of uses, including housing and retail, especially ground floor retail. A number of participants said they would like to see a community center catering to the intergenerational needs of youth and seniors. Chain stores and fast food establishments should be avoided. Other desirable uses include restaurants, cafés (something like Haley House Bakery/Café in Dudley Square), printing, a gym, and a farmer’s market.

4) Diversity: The desire for diversity was a prominent theme. More specifically, a desire was expressed for diversity in age, income and housing tenure. Many workshops participants felt that the community at the Cote Ford site should be intergenerational, one that accommodates the needs of youth, families and seniors. Making the neighborhood affordable to a mix of incomes is also an aspiration for many. In terms of housing tenure, while some expressed the belief that only homeownership housing should be allowed, others felt that rental housing should be allowed as long as it fit in and was well designed.

5) Safety: Many felt that a premium should be placed on safety from crime.

6) Walkability: A walk-able, pedestrian oriented neighborhood with an attractive streetscape and pedestrian amenities was an important value.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?
A common vision provides a strong foundation for planning; it can serve as a guide for the community planning process.

Going forward, it is clear from the feedback received at the workshop that the type of public participation process modeled by the workshop—one involving active listening and engagement—inspires trust and confidence in the community. Therefore, any future planning process should be premised on a public participation process that begins with active outreach and listening on the part of the BRA and the City of Boston.

Potential next steps in the planning and public participation process might include the following:

1) Site Acquisition
Two of the ten Cote Ford Parcels, located at 820 Cummins Highway and 30-32 Regis Road, are now in the one year redemption period (City has control of properties, but owner has option to pay off debt and regain properties). These are the two largest parcels that make up the Cote Ford planning area. The redemption period will end in late March/early April 2012. It is expected that the parcels will not be redeemed by the former owner.

The other eight parcels, which are located on both sides of Cummins Hwy, on Regis Road and on Hollingsworth Street, are still under court review. Until the court returns judgment on these, they remain in the land court system. However, it is assumed these properties will follow the same course as the two Cote Ford properties in the current redemption period.
2) Refinement of the Vision Statement

Once the City has site control, the planning process could begin. Neighbors, community members and other stakeholders are invited back to consolidate the four vision statements into a single, clear vision statement which would, in turn, guide the subsequent planning and disposition process.

3) Community Planning Process

Working consistently with a designated group of diverse representatives from the local community will provide a future planning process continuity and accountability. With this in mind, the City should consider the formation of an advisory group to guide the City in translating the community vision into a specific plan for the Cote Ford site. Comprised of neighbors, nearby businesses, community leaders, and participants of the AICP workshop, the advisory group would be invited to participate in a series of conversations with City staff about specific planning topics—for example, land use, transportation, open space, housing, urban design, and economic development. These conversations would focus on how give the community vision specific physical form—i.e. land use (housing, shops, community facilities), building heights, open space, and transportation. The product of this planning process would be a specific plan for the Cote Ford site which would guide future development of the site.

4) Request for Proposals (RFP) Process

Once the advisory group and larger community developed the overall plan for the Cote Ford site, the City would prepare and issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to solicit development proposals for the site. The RFP would stipulate development requirements and guidelines based on the plan developed through the community planning process.

5) Public Review and Selection of Development Proposals

Once qualified proposals were identified, the City would invite all qualified proponents to present their development proposals to the community. Based on the ratings criteria of the RFP and community support, a project proponent would be designated for the development of the Cote Ford properties.

__________________________
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# APPENDIX I: Mattapan Neighborhood Demographic Data

## Mattapan Planning District

### 2010 Census Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age, Race, Ethnicity, and Housing</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000 - 2010 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population - All Ages</td>
<td>37,607</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>34,616</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>(2,991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>2,398</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>30,435</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>27,508</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>(2,927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2,741</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>(650)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000 - 2010 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (alone)</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>(174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (alone)</td>
<td>29,116</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>26,008</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>(3,108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (alone)</td>
<td>4,716</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native (alone)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (alone)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (alone)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race/Ethnicity (alone)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races/Ethnicities (alone)</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>(803)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Population - 18 Years and Over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000 - 2010 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>20,666</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>20,435</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>(231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>(470)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Ethnicity</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000 - 2010 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (alone)</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American (alone)</td>
<td>19,857</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>19,470</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>(387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (alone)</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3,551</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native (alone)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (alone)</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (alone)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race/Ethnicity (alone)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races/Ethnicities (alone)</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>(561)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2000 - 2010 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>13,143</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13,558</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>12,402</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>(150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J: Workshop Agenda

2011 APA National Planning Conference
AICP Community Planning Workshop (P350): Cote Ford Site, Mattapan Neighborhood, Boston

AGENDA

8:00am  Participants meet at Hynes Convention Center for Workshop Primer
8:30am  Bus Tour to Site: Bus departs promptly from Hynes Convention Center. Introduction to the Mattapan Neighborhood and Cote Ford Site
9:00am  Bus Ride via Blue Hill Avenue/Morton Street
9:10am  Drive through Mattapan Square
9:15am  Arrive at Cote Ford site for walking tour
10:00am Arrive at Mattapan Library: Introductions, Background PowerPoint Presentation
10:45am Breakout Groups Begin - Brainstorming
12:00pm Working Lunch
12:45pm Large Group – Morning Summary
1:00pm  Breakout Groups – Creating an “Elevator Vision Statement”
2:00pm  Large Group – Breakout Group Reports
2:30pm  "Bringing It All Together"
3:30pm  Next Steps
4:00pm  Depart for Hynes Convention Center
4:30pm  Arrive at Hynes Convention Center
APPENDIX K: Breakout Group Notes

Each breakout group was asked to respond to the following series of questions. Notes from breakout group discussions do not necessarily respond to the questions in the same order as they appear below.

- **What is important to you?**
- **What do you value?**
- **What are your priorities?**
  - What do you want to keep?
  - What do you want to improve?
- **Mapping your priorities:**
  - Where should change happen?
  - Where should change not happen?

**RED TEAM:**

*Notes about numbers of dots reflect the importance given a comment during review of ideas by entire breakout group.*

**Characteristics:**

- “Soften” ride on Cummins
- Maybe landscaping
- Streetscape, nice buildings
- Beautify, make attractive - makes you feel good about Mattapan
- Safety
- Something that “fits in” with existing neighborhood (1-2 family homes and open space) (4 dots)

**Process:**

- Community engagement and communication
- Adequate and timely notice (mail/email)
- DND and BRA keep residents informed
- Use City’s neighborhood representatives
- Get info to leaders of neighborhood
- Neighborhood newspapers

**Gathering place (9 dots):**

- Youth friendly (Boys and Girls club)
- Restaurant
- Bistro – more upscale, bistro, like Haley House (but affordable)
- Retain residential parking options
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• Elderly housing and care facilities ("Aging in Place", Like Fuller Village in Canton/Milton) (5 dots)
• Landscaped setback from road (high quality/attractive)
• Could be mixed with commercial
• Ground level business (more upscale, no burger king, no dollar stores) (4 dots)
• Business and employment opportunity
• Teaching job skills
• Nothing to keep on site – tear it all down!
• Retain sense of homes, family, so they aren’t overpowered, blending with residential and community

_Housing:_
• More owner occupancy= commitment to neighborhood
• Mixed income, not all low income (9 dots)
• Quality rentals, e.g. Olmstead Green
• Multi-family ok if up to 3 stories and high quality
• Youth cultural center – arts and music training with green areas, organized activities (5 dots)

_Perception vs. reality:_
• Neighborhood used to be safer, quieter
• There are issues for youth (gangs)
• Lower density = lower crime (one dot)
• Almost rural, feel you can breathe

_Community engagement should be a given:_
• Elderly housing is a growing issue, want to stay in area
• Youth cultural center – kids need something to do/place to gather
• Style of housing = consistent with community (owner-occupied, mixed-income)
• Community-oriented/family-oriented (shared space)
• Can be “multi-family” but without problems of renters
• Well-designed density expands range of possibilities
• Job training helps youth grow
• Quality design rental housing can add value
• Diversity of retail
• Mentoring = elderly and youth living near one another

**BLUE TEAM:**

_**Report Out:**_
• Change – from 1970s white, working class to predominately black, Asian, Caribbean.
• More professionals came in
• Changes in Mattapan Square:
  o From bustling to discount stores
  o Original Brighams
Destination Shopping

*Cote Ford site “odd place”:

- Disconnect from Square but close physically
- Cote Ford development influenced development of Mattapan Square “Needs help” (10 dots)
- New hub for Mattapan?
- Community Center (vs. YMCA in Dorchester) (8 dots).

*Qualities:

- Brick, beautiful
- On street parking
- “Lovely neighborhood”
- Compare prices in Mattapan vs. Milton
- Large % of homeowners (taken care of)
- 10 minutes from Braintree, South Shore Plaza
- 7 minutes from Arnold Arboretum and Jamaica Plain
- Blue Hills up the street
- Proximity to Roslindale and JP
- But, centrality of location is invisible.

*Development ideas:

- Sr. Housing with ground floor (2 dots)
- More retail shopping (7 dots)
- Restore physical qualities in Mattapan Square (2 dots)
- Mix of housing and commercial activity at Cote Ford (2 dot)
  - Lots of absentee commercial landlords
- Church of the Holy Spirit provides community services

*What to keep:

- Bank (1 dot)
- Sense of community (3 dots)
  - What happens will strengthen –or weaken--the neighborhood
- Diversity of neighborhoods
  - Restaurants
  - Green space (2 dots)
- Maintain houses (1 dot)
- Streetscape improvements
- Pedestrian improvements (especially along Cummings Highway) (2 dots)

*Future vision:

- No crime!
- More green space (1 dot)
- Outstanding
- Community connection regained
- Revitalization
• Connectivity
• Restaurants
• Vitality
• Grand Opening!
• Fitting
• Destination!
• Supermarket v. nice convenient store
• Farmers market issue
• Retail with housing above (not too high in scale)
  o 2 story houses (versus 4-5)
  o Can be design issue
• Allows for transition – meeting different needs
• Design that blends
• Middle of everything
• Youth/elderly
• Green – back [of site]
• Retail front
• Connection to Square
• Future memories – I love
  o Take kids – exercise equipment
• Excitement about what it has
• “Destination”: planners, residents, cooperation
• Mix of activities; walkable; connections
• Go to other destinations; people come here (like J.P., Roslindale, etc.)
• 1st time working with city and residents
• Block party – talking to Mayor
• Ground floor of process
• Award winning – example for rest of Boston
• Recognition of Mattapan
• Difference – Milton v. Mattapan- streetscape
• Brookline – residential v. city feel
• 1st community project with planners and residents
• Working together – proud of it
• We created a community center
• “Really are a destination” – elderly, shopping
• Place to live? Housing – yes
• Mixed used – housing, retail – mixed income
• Diversity –all definitions – type of housing; family size; all definitions
• New development fits in
• Path along river – greenway (not walkable now)
• People from Milton come
• Site=connector between communities
• Linear park potential; but significant barriers (fences, house)
• Market in Milton, now drive through for rail (Canton, Stoughton)
• Larger market potentially
• Neighborhood –scale-commercial
• People from Milton bank here
• “Build around history”. Milton has; Mattapan should.
• Smart facing retail/housing for site
• Cote does not equal Milton Square = Mattapan Square.
• Preserve residential
• Construction impacts
• Health center proximity to housing

**GREEN TEAM:**
Parking Lot

*Those planning property need to be inclusive of:*
• Youth
• Abutters
• Regional entities (Milton, regional planning entities)

*What is important/are you looking for?*
• Parks/green space
• Businesses – new, preserve local sit down restaurants
• Promote healthy eating/living (not McDonalds, Trader Joe’s)
• Diversity
• Gym
• Wary of big chain stores

*What do you leave [the area] for (or would like to see)?*
• Fruit/veggies/meats
• Computer repair
• Function hall
• Family entertainment
• Youth education/activities/recreation
  o Pop Warner football
• Community calendar

*What to bring back/add?*
• Pocket park
• Open areas
• Green space
• How to get community involved in healthy living
• Senior citizen activities
• Multi-cultural center

*Residential:*
• Keep neighborhood looking like a neighborhood (Like pictures 1 and 2)
• Fit context
• Homey
• 4 stories on Cummins
• 2, maybe 3 [stories] on Regis
• Townhouses with step back to 3 stories on road

Priorities:
Parks & open space

Activities:
• Youth/entertainment/recreation
• Cultural
• Senior

Education:
• Youth
• Adults

Promoting health:
• Eating
• Restaurants
• Gym
• Fresh fruit/veggies

Ideas – Need in Mattapan:
• Asset mapping
  ○ Advertise what's here
• Community website
• Plan for safety/maintenance/design

Focus:
• Intensity of activity on Cummins Highway
• No commercial off Cummins Hwy
  ○ Limited ingress and egress
• Compliment business and Mattapan Square (don’t compete)

Mattapan embraces diversity as gateway to Boston

Storefronts focused on Cummins

Residential areas reflecting existing character

Create family oriented area that promotes:
• Economic diversity
• Healthy
• Multi-cultural
• Family oriented
• Education
• Inclusive/welcoming of everyone in Mattapan

Uses for Site:
• Park
• Multi-cultural center
• Neighborhood focused businesses (printing, coffee, health food)
• “Underground”, multi-level parking
• Residential:
  o 2-3 stories – Regis
  o 4 stories – Cummins
• Trees/streetscape

Gateway to culture of Mattapan:
• Capitalize on multi-cultural diversity of community
• Residential (reflects architectural character of neighborhood)
• 4 story on Cummings, step down to 2-3 on Regis
• Focus on homeownership/affordable
• Fresh food/eco-friendly structures
• Community focused businesses
  o Coffee
  o Printing

YELLOW TEAM:

What stands out?
• We are in 2nd/3rd generation
• What brought me here?
  o Open space and parks
  o Big back yard (one yellow)
  o We know all our neighbors
  o Not like city but only minutes to the city
  o NSWE access, you can get anywhere
  o Quiet (two red, one blue)
• I can choose to participate in urban activities (theater) (one yellow)
• Safety (one green, one red, one blue)
• Can raise family here (two red, one green)
• Suburban feel
• Schools
• Walkability
• Country living in the city (one green, two red, one yellow, one blue)
• We have plenty of green space (It’s in our backyards!)
What is missing?

- Quality retail
- Destinations
- Development
- Neighbors define Mattapan differently
- Brookline community at a price we can afford
- Quality of building/housing materials
- It’s a secret
- As kids, we could ‘let loose’ (neighborhood safe, high, quality of life)

Better communication/participation:

- Sit down restaurant (3 red, 2 yellow, 1 green)
- Senior needs
- Community center
- To have everything we need right here
- Movie theater

What we don’t want:

- To become a parking lot
- More density
- New station
- A parking problem
- Building right up to the sidewalk

What we are:

- Country living in the city
- Safety
- Neighborly

What we need:

- Quality retail and restaurant
- Gateway project – “you have arrived”
- Solutions that are attractive
- “To maintain the line” between mixed use and 1-2 family neighbor

What we want to be:

- Identifiable
- All our needs here
- Attractive and clean (environment)
- Strong, multicultural