PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, June 3, 2014

7:00 p.m.
in
City Hall Annex
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair
Pamela Winters, Member
Steven Winter, Member
Steven Cohen, Member
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member
Catherine Preston Connolly, Associate Member

Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for
Community Development

Community Development Staff:
Liza Paden
Jeff Roberts

_____

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD
617.786.7783/617.639.0396
www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Sitting Members: Hugh Russell, H. Theodore Cohen, Pamela Winters, Steven Winter, Steven Cohen, Catherine Preston Connolly.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And the first item on our agenda is an update, at which Jeff Roberts is going to give us.

JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We're a little bit short on the staff that is normally here at the Planning Board, and the reason for that is that there are lots of competing events going on. There's a public meeting to discuss the East Cambridge and Kendall Square Open Space Planning Study and competition that's down at the Marriott and there's also a listening session that is going on.

So we circulated the Planning Board and there are some copies in the front, a schedule of what we're calling Master Plan Listening Sessions or Cambridge Conversations. The idea is to spend sometime talking to people. This isn't the master planning process, it's an opportunity to hear from people about what their thoughts and issues and concerns are in order to inform the development of that process that will take place in the future.

So for people who are in the audience we know you had a choice and thank you for choosing the Planning Board.

Moving to the schedule. So the next meeting that's scheduled is June 17th, and the public hearings that are scheduled are Planning Board case No. 292 which is the residential development at 180R Cambridge

Park Drive. And the Planning Board should

have materials or be receiving materials on

that. The second public hearing is the

Flaherty, et al Zoning Petition and that is

to extend the Medical Marijuana Overlay

Districts to encompass 61 Mooney Street, and

we'll be sending you some further background

information on that as well.

On the General Business for June 17th,

we're scheduled to have a preview for the

Planning Board, as the Planning Board has

requested to hear more about the Harvard

Kennedy School of Government campus planning,

and that will just be -- there won't be -- it

won't be a hearing, there's no application

yet, but there will be just a preview of what

will be coming.

On the schedule there will be 40

Thorndike Street, the courthouse case will

come back on June 17th because it requires an

extension due to the expiration of that. And

so we expect that that will be a, that we'll

be sending the Board a request for a specific

extension date. And we also expect on that

as part of the General Business on June 17th

to have the Board review an application for a

comprehensive permit having to do with

Jefferson Park, the Cambridge Housing

Authority. So they are, they're doing some

work that will require a -- they will be

seeking a comprehensive permit and you'll be

getting more information about that.

Upcoming meetings are July 8th and July

22nd. In July we know that the 75 New Street

case has been announced to come back on July

22nd. July 8th has not been advertised, but

we had tentatively been holding that for the

continuation of the 40 Thorndike Street case,

but the Board will be receiving confirmation about that. I should note that the City Council has requested that that meeting be held in a location in the East Cambridge neighborhood. So the location has not yet been confirmed, but we're exploring and Liza's exploring options for where that meeting might be held. So just keep an eye out when you see that announcement that you are in the right place as the rest of us.

And August 5th we will be bringing back to the Planning Board discussion of the Town Gown process. If you recall last time, we talked about that. It was, it was decided that we would bring back to the Planning Board some thinking about what material would be sent to the institutions as they prepare their reports for the end of the year. So we'll be doing that at that time.

And then there's more meetings coming up, August 19th, September 2nd, and September 16th if you want to put those on your calendars.

I think that does it for updates.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, Jeff, can I ask you a question? On June 17th did you say that the courthouse issue is just going to be -- they were going to request a continuance?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. There's no public -- there's no public hearing --

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

JEFF ROBERTS: -- advertised for that date. But we will need to, because I forget the exact date that the case expires.

JOHN HAWKINSON: June 20th.

JEFF ROBERTS: It will need to be extended.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next item on our agenda, adoption of meeting transcripts. And following that the BZA cases.

LIZA PADEN: So we have two transcripts; one for April 1st and one for April 29th that have been certified.

HUGH RUSSELL: Someone like to make a motion to approve those?

PAMELA WINTERS: So moved.

HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

Is there a second?

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. On the motion, all those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in favor.

(Russell, H.T. Cohen, Winters,
Winter, S. Cohen, Connolly.)

LIZA PADEN: So on the Zoning Board
of Appeal cases, Mr. Brennan is here. He
represents the Foundation Medicine Company
who would like to place a sign on the
building at 150 Second Street. 150 Second
Street is part of the Planning Board Special
Permit for the residential and office
development that was done between First
Street and Second Street.

You're not -- do you have a schedule at
the Board of Zoning Appeal yet?

DAN BRENNAN: No.

LIZA PADEN: Okay. So this is his
second stop after the East Cambridge Planning
Team? Did you talk to them?

DAN BRENNAN: No.

LIZA PADEN: So you're the first

stop.

So why don't you go ahead.

DAN BRENNAN: Sure. I have
handouts, too.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

DAN BRENNAN: Okay. Hello, my
name's Dan Brennan and I'm representing
Foundation Medicine. Our proposal is for a
height variance on the sign for the building.
The sign height will be roughly 45 feet off
the ground. Due to facade conditions, we
feel it's the best option on the building.
The landlord is not allowing us to do it
towards the center of the building because he
doesn't want people to be confused and think
that we're the only tenant in the building.
We will be taking -- we take up about 60
percent of the building, 70,000 square feet.
So it's not like we're a small piece of the

building, we are the majority of it. We

consist of labs and offices conducting cancer

research and, yeah, that's pretty much it.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, the sign is

facing the --

DAN BRENNAN: Bench.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- the open space

that you --

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: Would this sign be

visible from the river?

DAN BRENNAN: Let me see. So the

area we're speaking of is right over here.

There's some larger buildings in front of us

in both directions so I don't believe that it

would be visible from the river.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

DAN BRENNAN: I don't have it shown

on this picture of the building, but it's

roughly here. I included this so we could see the whole scope of the building so you can kind of get a feel for where it is. This is where the landlord won't allow us to really put the sign anywhere over here, so this seems to be the best option.

PAMELA WINTERS: So even though that is your -- that is your part of the -- of -- you inhabit that part of the building, he doesn't want you to put the sign there; is that correct?

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah, he feels that it's too close to the main entrance.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, okay.

DAN BRENNAN: We did seek an option to have it right here. But first of all, it does look a little odd on the building, because it's just not centered on the building, so, yeah, he wouldn't allow us to

do that. Also, there is a -- this picture

doesn't show it because it's an early

rendering of the building, but there is a

tree right here which kind of blocks this

whole section.

PAMELA WINTERS: That was my next

question.

DAN BRENNAN: I did include a

picture in the packet. It was wintertime but

it shows the tree there.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

(Nur Seated.)

LIZA PADEN: Just to let you know,

the sign itself is 60 square feet. It is not

internally illuminated. There's no

illumination for this sign. It is -- it

exceeds the height limit which is 20 feet to

the top of the sign.

STEVEN WINTER: Excuse me, that's 20

feet?

   LIZA PADEN: From the ground.

   STEVEN WINTER: From the ground,

right.

   LIZA PADEN: Or the second floor

sill line depending on which is lower.

  So they're asking for a dimensional

variance for the height.

   H. THEODORE COHEN: So could they

have put the sign if the landlord had allowed

it in that middle?

   LIZA PADEN: Yes.

   H. THEODORE COHEN: That would have

been --

   LIZA PADEN: No.

   HUGH RUSSELL: No, because that's

above the second floor sill. They have to

put it down there where there really isn't --

   LIZA PADEN: Where are you --

DAN BRENNAN: He's thinking right here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The middle horizontal.

LIZA PADEN: No, because of the second -- it's the second floor sill line or 20 feet, whichever is lower.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Whichever is lower.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So the 20 feet would probably be --

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: So another question I have is you have it in green and in orange.

DAN BRENNAN: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: Is that because that's the color or the logo of the company?

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah, exactly.

And I've been in discussions with concerned resident Carol and we've discussed some terms of the sign variance to remove the sign if the tenant was to leave. It's not going to stay up. It's not, you know, for another perspective tenant to use in the future and that we would not be trying to illuminate it in the future. And the landlord's agreed to not have other tenants apply for a height variance on this building other than us. So....

AHMED NUR: I guess that answers the question that I have, which is if the change of use happens and Mike's moves over there, could we require a letter from the landlord that this will not continue after the change, you know, of occupancy? Something of that sort? You know, it's easy for you to say yeah, we're not going to do it, but once you

move out, the landlord owns that Variance

now.

DAN BRENNAN: Understood.

LIZA PADEN: The Variance goes --

when you take down a sign, especially this

one which is pin mounted, then you're into

another -- a new sign. The Variance doesn't

go from one person to another person unless

you have a very specific sign, for example,

it has to be a sign that you're just doing a

face replacement. So you'll see some

freestanding signs, which are non-conforming

because they were put in when you were

allowed to do internal illumination. So if

they just take the plastic face out and pop

in another plastic face, that's, that's

allowed, because the face replacement is less

than 50 percent of the value of a whole new

freestanding sign.

AHMED NUR: I see.

LIZA PADEN: But in this particular case, you would have to take down all of the letters, and since they're pin mounted and somebody new would have to apply for a new Variance.

AHMED NUR: I didn't know that it was pin mounted versus framed. I thought once we said it's okay and recommend a sign to be there --

LIZA PADEN: It's a 50 percent value that they wouldn't meet that threshold.

HUGH RUSSELL: We can't regulate the content of signs because of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

CAROL O'HARE: But they can make a commitment.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I mean --

CAROL O'HARE: Which is what he

agreed to do.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, yes, please.

So we -- I have no -- but I think
that's a prudent thing for the Zoning Board
to do.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes. To seek that
commitment?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, I totally
agree.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

And we received a message from Carol
today saying that she was okay with it. Yes,
I mean she was not opposing this.

CAROL O'HARE: I support it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Supports it. Thank
you.

I want to get the --

CAROL O'HARE: With those

conditions.

HUGH RUSSELL: With the conditions, yes.

CAROL O'HARE: Especially the light condition.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I want to stick to our format which is that the public is recognized by the Chair.

Thank you.

CAROL O'HARE: I didn't realize. Excuse me, may I speak?

HUGH RUSSELL: So let me just say that we had a very unpleasant public hearing at last meeting and we're still somewhat in shock.

CAROL O'HARE: Sorry.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so, in this case, it is an unusual case where Ms. O'Hare has taken -- spent a lot of time analyzing these

issues and looking at them, so I think in

this case it might be useful to hear from

her.

STEVEN WINTER: Sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: Even though this is

not technically a public hearing.

CAROL O'HARE: Thank you so much.

And I appreciate -- I didn't realize,

Mr. Winter, that there -- I mean, I realize

that I was speaking during his session, but

since we had talked quite a bit, I didn't

know that I could be recognized.

HUGH RUSSELL: So you can speak from

your chair.

CAROL O'HARE: Well, I just wanted

to say that I think that this particular sign

proceeding has -- is perfect. He hasn't

jumped the gun by applying. I'm not saying I

would approve all signs because as you know,

I have principal objections to many of them,

especially the ones that are in your face and

lit up on account of the fact that our Zoning

Law is violated every time. But this is such

a modest sign and this petitioner has

accorded to you and the public an opportunity

to speak and to review the sign instead of

barrelling it through, you know, so I want to

give them huge credit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

I would actually concur that this is a

reasonable sign proposal. Our sign ordinance

presumes there is a sign ban above the first

floor windows and below the second floor

windows. This building has a projecting

canopy in that location that is shielding the

glass from the sun. It may be that as

buildings get more environmentally conscious,

we may have more examples of this.

CAROL O'HARE: Can I say one more thing?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

CAROL O'HARE: Including these commitments annual recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeal will go a long way to educating that Board which needs education about these matters. As you know, they approved all but one of the 13 variances applied for last year. So including the commitments that this gentleman offered to me, I did not extract them, would go a long way to helping this process and making it more regularizing.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, two quick comments.

First of all, I have no objection to this sign proposal in and of itself. But I must say I have difficulty reviewing

proposals like this without really reviewing

an entire signage scheme for a building. You

know, you approve one sign like this, there

are other tenants in the building. Other

tenants may seek a sign, some of which they

may be entitled to as of right, others may be

seeking a Variance, but one in very similar

circumstances as the one already granted for

the building. And you just sort of wonder

where you're going to end up. And so, again,

I'm not objecting to this, but I'm just

expressing some difficulty with the notion

of, you know, looking at one piece of the

signage of a building rather than a

comprehensive picture.

And my second quick comment, and

picking up on yours, and that is as we

approve buildings going forward, it might be

useful to think and to ask applicants about

what their plans and intentions are for

future signage. Frequently they won't

include those requests in their initial

applications, but they will dribble in, you

know, later frequently after the building's

been constructed as here. So, you know, if

we care about the signage on these buildings,

we might want to push it further into the

front of our discussions in the future.

CAROL O'HARE: The commitments

include a commitment that -- of the landlord

that no other sign height variance will be

permitted. And the landlord has agreed to

that, so that's one of the three and I will

shut up now.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, may I just

say one thing?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: I'm really happy

that it cannot be seen from the river.

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah.

PAMELA WINTERS: You know, across

the river. That makes me happy.

Also I think we kind of need to take

these case -- these sign issues on a

case-by-case basis in a way because, you

know, every sign is different, every building

is different, and, you know, when they come

before us, it's nice to take it, you know,

look at the building as a whole. I know that

you are -- you -- I was going to say own, but

you're renting most of that building, so --

and, again, as Ms. O'Hare said, no other

signs will be on that particular building.

So in this case I think it's a good thing.

And, you know, you just take it case-by-case

is -- and also there was a study done I

think. Hugh, wasn't there a study done on signs? Didn't you and -- or was that -- maybe that was --

HUGH RUSSELL: There was a study done and we recommended changes to the Ordinance which were adopted by the City Council.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: And then there was essentially, as I understood it, a dispute between two tenants in one building that boiled up into an incredible brouha that -- and the position of the anti-sign position then found a lot of sympathy with a lot of people who cared a lot about the river, and the result was the particular legislation was rescinded and went back and took place where we have no standards. So, you know, it's -- that's the way it is. I think the suggestion

that the particular features of this sign

that it's, you know, not illuminated, it's

not -- it's sort of, its impact is on the

very local area that it's in, that it's being

done because you cannot reasonably put a sign

at the place where you would like to have a

sign in terms of the Ordinance, sort of

because of those factors and because of the

commitment to remove it should the petitioner

no longer need it, all those are factors and

I think are in some ways things we should

keep in mind for future signs.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: I concur with

Mr. Cohen, I don't have any problems with the

sign. And I think, however, I think that a

letter that -- we could send a letter to the

BZA that says that we appreciate the process

that the proponent used and that we felt like

there's some modeling there that could be

used. And maybe you could talk to Ms. O'Hare

and find out exactly what kind of things did

really bring consensus on this sign, and

maybe we could mention to the BZA that there

was a community conversation that included

these points and it seemed to work in this

case. Maybe?

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: I should probably

respond to Steve's comment. That Steve's

comment about the Board (Cohen) wanting to

know the signage on the building. That's

sort have been one of our principles, so I'll

ask you whatever signage is on this

particular building now, do you know?

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah, just the one --

just the address at the entrance right now.

LIZA PADEN: So they have a

conforming freestanding sign on the property

that's a large 1-5-0 for the street number.

DAN BRENNAN: Yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. And presumably

there's more sign, signage entitlement?

LIZA PADEN: Yes. This building has

a lot of allocation.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, because it's

three streets.

LIZA PADEN: It's three streets and

it's also, you know, it's across courtyard on

both sides. So all of that counts.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's possible

someone might come back for another sign, but

if the Zoning Board follows the

recommendations, it will not be a height

variance someone is seeking. And if they

follow good sense, it will not be an

internally illuminated sign.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Just to add one
thing to our discussion, I think the sign is
fine. I have no objections. It makes sense
to me. But I would suggest to my colleagues
that they might take a look at two new signs
in Boston, and I don't know what Boston
Zoning is, but there is now a huge Converse
sign on this building that is being renovated
down on the waterfront when you cross the
rocks that just appeared recently. And also
the Vertex sign that is down in the
innovation district which is visible from
pretty much everywhere, from the green way,
and both of these signs have just seemed to
appeared out of nowhere and seems to have
contradict what Boston has been doing up

until now.

AHMED NUR: Hugh, I also have no problem with this particular proposal. I'm in support of it, but just to tag along with taking a look at the signs, Harvard Square, corner of Winthrop and Eliot, that place that had many small little restaurants that come and go, it's a corner, they have something now there on the glass, full glass, that looks like a tattoo painted on the glass. It's not a sign. Well, I don't know a sign --

HUGH RUSSELL: The things painted on glass are signs.

AHMED NUR: Okay. So it's a full glass. The whole place is basically two walls on Winthrop and on the other side. It's an eyesore, but that's one other thing that I wanted to bring in. We really have no

way of enforcing signs in Cambridge. I don't
know.

HUGH RUSSELL: We do.

LIZA PADEN: File a complaint with
the Inspector.

AHMED NUR: Okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so, we -- and,
you know, you don't have to do it personally,
we can ask that a complaint be filed.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

PAMELA WINTERS: So do we want to do
that, Hugh, ask that a complaint be filed?

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I'd like to
have a few more facts.

AHMED NUR: Yeah, take a look at it.

LIZA PADEN: Well, I'll go out and
do an inspection and I can send you
photographs and at the next meeting if you

want to, we'll file a complaint.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thanks, Liza.

AHMED NUR: Thank you very much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Great, perfect.

So, it seems like we are agreed to send a letter to the Zoning Board at the appropriate time saying that we support the request for a Variance for this sign citing that the conditions that are being proposed seem to us to be very important and germane to our favorable recommendation. And also citing that the design of the building makes it difficult to put signage in the location that was intended in the regulations.

And you've been listening to us.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: And citing that the owner has sought to seek no other height variances on the building.

LIZA PADEN: That's one of the conditions.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Technically is the -- who is the applicant? Is it the owner of the building or the tenant?

LIZA PADEN: The tenant is the applicant and the owner has to sign off on all applications whether it's for a Planning Board Special Permit or a Board of Zoning Appeal application.

STEVEN COHEN: You wonder if a condition on the tenant's Variance would be binding upon the owner, but I'll let some other brilliant legal theorist address that technical issue.

DAN BRENNAN: I do have a letter -- I already have a notarized letter from the landlord allowing you us to apply for the

Zoning Appeal. I'll have him add in that condition so that it's clear so he's not going to allow another tenant to do the same thing.

STEVEN COHEN: That would be good.

CAROL O'HARE: Condition has to be written into the Variance in order for it to be binding.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Is there a motion, then, to send this recommendation?

H. THEODORE COHEN: So moved.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Discussion? If not, all those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in favor. All but Tom.

DAN BRENNAN: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: So the other case that a board member or two wanted to look at was for 48 Lopez Street. And this is a Board of Zoning Appeal Variance to renovate the third floor of the building so that the bedrooms that currently exist there become more habitable. Overall, it's in the Residence C District on Lopez Street in Cambridgeport. And the lot itself is already small. It's only 1,838 square feet. So I have a set of plans here as well as a photograph of what the existing building looks like, so it's a small little single-family structure. And what they're proposing to do is to rebuild the back of the building so that they have headroom in the upper two spaces. So that's the existing house. And these are the plans.

I think Steve was the one -- I think you
wanted to look at it.

PAMELA WINTERS: Liza, what's the
height now of the bedrooms?

LIZA PADEN: The inside height? I
don't know that they said anything, what it
was. I mean, the complication is that the
existing -- it just doesn't go all the way
across. And so what they're proposing to do
is to bump it up like this.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yeah, yeah, yeah.
Oh, yeah. That's not good. Yeah. I don't
have any problem with that.

LIZA PADEN: Oh, okay.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm fine.

LIZA PADEN: Okay. Anybody else
want to look at it?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, does that --

LIZA PADEN: That's all I have.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And, Liza, is it going to come back at another time?

LIZA PADEN: What? Ipson?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LIZA PADEN: So Ipson decided to withdraw their case for the Board of Zoning Appeal case for the 12th and they will come back at a later time after they've had some discussions. They I believe are scheduling a meeting with the East Cambridge Planning Team as well as Ms. O'Hare.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Then the next item on our agenda is a public hearing on the Chun Zoning Petition which has been re-filed, and I think Jeff is going to do that for us.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'll just try to set this up and then the

Petitioner can speak when the Board would
like to move to public comment.

So, the -- this is the third go-around
for the Chun et al Zoning Petition, and the
petition as it currently stands, as it
originally was proposed to rezone the portion
of the Cambridge Highlands Neighborhood.
It's currently Residence B to Residence A-2.
And I think the Board has discussed this many
times and many concerns have been brought up
with that Zoning change.

The Planning Board did transmit a
recommendation the last time which was to
propose Zoning to create a petition that
would require multi-unit projects, projects
of three units or more, to get a Special
Permit from the Planning Board pursuant to
the townhouse and multi-family Special Permit
procedures which apply. In this district

they currently apply if you have six units or more. The idea would be just to take that down so that any project of that type would get a Special Permit, would be reviewed for the sort of the design fit, how the -- how the project works on the site and how it fits within the neighborhood.

The City Council was interested in taking it a -- had some City Councillors had an interest in taking a different approach. So that when it was -- when the recommendation was referred because the petition was expiring soon, the City Council opted to re-file the entire petition. So technically it's still the same petition it was before, but the comment that has been expressed is that an alternative approach is still the approach that's being sought.

So the last time we -- the last time we

talked about this, it was at the City Council

Ordinance Committee which had a public

hearing on May 20th, and at that meeting we

brought back this sort of table of options

that we had talked about with the Planning

Board. And the most recent memo we sent you

has that on page 4. So we went back to

walking through the different impacts that a

change to Residence A-2 would have. We

looked at the option of retaining the current

Residence B zoning but making a townhouse not

an allowed use which would, which would

reorient development to being single or

two-family structures, but would still -- but

would -- I'm sorry, but would not affect the

allowed density on any of the sites. It

would just affect the form of development.

And then the other option that we had brought

up as a possibility was to retain the

Residence B Zoning to keep townhouses as an

allowed use, but to increase the minimum lot

area per dwelling unit for lots that are

larger than 5,000 square feet. And then the

Planning Board -- what the Planning Board

recommended was to make the Special Permit

provision apply. So the Ordinance Committee

when they discussed this, there was -- I can

I guess reflect that there was some debate on

the topic, but in the end the Ordinance

Committee moved to request that we provide

Zoning text in the form of an overlay

district that would implement both the

Special Permit requirement and the increase

in minimum lot area per dwelling unit. So

now it comes back to the -- although it's the

petition itself that is -- the original

petition itself that's coming back to the

Planning Board, we thought it was prudent to

provide you with the, with the proposal that

we're actively working on so that the

Planning Board could give its comment on that

and that could go back to the Council when

they meet about the next time.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair? Jeff,

could you tell us just very briefly in an

anecdotal way, what additional layer of

protection does the lot size issue add to

that neighborhood which we know is a very

fragile echo system? What additional

protection are we providing with the lot

size?

JEFF ROBERTS: So if you look at the

map that we provided at the end, I think it's

a helpful map in looking at what the

ownership layout of the neighborhood looks

like. There are a couple of lots that are currently single-family homes on lots that are larger than 9,000 square feet but smaller than 10,000 square feet. And there has been concern about redevelopment of those into additional townhouse developments. I think the feeling was that the more appropriate style of development for lots such as that would be to retain single-family or two families, and so that that change would, would have that effect.

Another effect that some residents brought up as a concern was the potential of lots being purchased and then merged to be developed as a larger townhouse development. Under current Zoning it -- so the current Zoning to sort of disincentivize that you have a larger lot size, the ratio dwelling units that you can put on that goes down

because you need 20 to 100 square feet for

each of the first two units, and then for

additional units you need 4,000 additional

square feet of lot area. So the idea behind

this suggestion, suggested Zoning changes

that it's that same, it's that same incentive

but it's taking it up a notch in order to

deal with those, the small number of sites

that have a, that have a single-family home

on an unusually large lots.

Another -- something else that would do

is it would have some impact on the remaining

vacant lot in the neighborhood. It would

reduce probably not by a lot, but it would

reduce the somewhat number of dwelling units

that could be built on that site.

STEVEN WINTER: And that's a very

large lot?

JEFF ROBERTS: It is a very large

lot. And it's unusual also because it's in a

split zoning. So the Residence B portion of

the lot is very limited in its Zoning. And

then the other half of the lot is in Industry

B-2 which allows somewhat higher density

housing. So you would -- in looking at that

lot, they would end up applying the Zoning

provision that essentially kind of averages

out what you're allowed to build when you

have a split lot such as that and then, so

that's how it would get a somewhat larger set

of units and development allowed.

STEVEN WINTER: And, Jeff, the final

question that I have is did we as a Board

discuss -- make any recommendations about

Loomis Street or discuss in any way about the

concern that we don't want that opened up to

be a through street or to connect to other

streets because that, again, would be very

detrimental to the fabric of the

neighborhood. So have we protected that in

some way?

JEFF ROBERTS: I would say that --

so that we did discuss that in the previous

hearings and commented that the

Concord/Alewife planning study makes clear

that that should, you know, not -- that

should not be a continued roadway connection,

although there are some -- there could be

possibilities for pedestrian/bicycle

connections from that neighborhood into the

quadrangle area. I would say that my own

opinion is that the best way to deal with the

condition out there is to have the project

review requirements in place so that, so that

that -- so that that issue could be

considered and conditions could be put in

place if development were to happen on that

vacant site that would essentially resolve

the issue of having sort of unregulated

cut-through traffic. So both of the design

of the site and the project and the

conditions on the Special Permit, that could

be resolved by closing that off.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Excuse me, Jeff,

could a cut-through be done without the

approval of the Traffic Department?

JEFF ROBERTS: Well, it's -- this is

sort of a complicated issue. It's out of my

depth a little bit. I have discussed it a

little with the director of Traffic, Parking

and Transportation, and with the Commissioner

of Public Works, and the city has been very

active in finding ways to prevent that from,

that route from operating as a de facto, you

know, public road connection. But given that

it's private property, it's much more

difficult to enforce. It's been a difficult

provision to enforce, but I know that the

city has actively tried to do that.

That's -- so it's not for, it's not for lack

of trying that issues arise on that site.

It's more just because it's difficult to, you

know, you can't physically go out there and

put barriers up in place. So that's sort of

where -- it's in a murky legal state.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. So I guess

the motivation here for this is that brown

piece is that the fear is that there's going

to be a lot of development in terms of

townhouses or more units in that particular

area. Is that correct, would you say?

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, actually, we

have the Petitioner in front of us. That

might be the kind of question he could, you know, tell us about.

PAMELA WINTERS: Great.

And can I just say one more thing? Your neighborhood, your streets in your neighborhood, the Res B looks very similar to the one that I live in, and I just wanted to check, Jeff, is the -- so we had suggested last time to retain Residence B, the last one, retain Residence B Zoning but low to the threshold. Is that correct?

JEFF ROBERTS: That was the Planning Board's recommendation.

PAMELA WINTERS: That was the recommendation. Okay, thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: And, Jeff --

PAMELA WINTERS: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

STEVEN COHEN: And, Jeff, just one

quick question. I just want to see if I'm

reading this plan correctly. In looking at

those lots, parcels that are in excess of

9,000 square feet, several of them look like

they're fully developed, so there's basically

only three that might be affected, two that

seem to have single-family homes on them, and

one which is vacant. And I presume,

therefore, that the increased look or the

suggested increased lot area per dwelling

unit would probably impact those two parcels

with a single-family home, not so much the

larger vacant parcel?

JEFF ROBERTS: That, that was, I

think, I think that accurately reflects my

analysis of it, is that it appears that it

would only affect a small number of lots. It

would affect the future development on lots

that are currently sort of the ones that you

would see that appear to be underdeveloped

under current Zoning. On the lots that are

already developed, it could put those, the

existing development in greater

non-conformity. I haven't fully analyzed all

of the implications that that would be, that

that would cause. Some of the lots might,

you know, the number of the units that's

allowed, that are allowed under the proposed

rezoning or the suggested rezoning might drop

below what's there now. I think that the --

the other option that was looked at was the,

was to make townhouse development

non-conforming by use. And I think the issue

there was that it might have a greater impact

on -- in terms of, in terms of making those

existing townhouse projects non-conforming.

Because that means -- that would mean any

alteration to that could be an expansion of a

non-conforming use which can be treated more

strictly and under Zoning.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. If questions

are in order, why don't we ask Mr. Chun to

speak and then we'll see if other people want

to speak.

JOHN CHUN: Yes. Good evening,

Mr. Chair and the Members of the board. It's

good to see you here, and this is our third

time presenting our petition. And we have

gone through some modifications to our

language and we do appreciate the CDD for

assisting us with modifying the language that

we came to present. And I think -- I believe

that we are coming now closer to the end of

the journey here, and we're hoping to come up

with some resolution in the near future.

As for the question asked by

Ms. Winters. Yes, if you look at the map

there, the color map, I live on 48 Newman

Street which is the pink house next to the

brown lot there. And since the lot, the

brown lot was purchased by the developer back

in 2003, we have gone through a lot of

suffering having to suffer through so many

issues that we had right next to our house.

And then our -- another concern was that

overdeveloping next to my house, the brown

lot there. And by the way, the yellow lot

that's adjacent to the brown lot had already

been developed and there's a -- two

buildings. The first building in the

residential zone where the three units and

next one is in the IB-2 Zone with the four

units. And then even in the process of

building those units, we had gone through a

lot of issues with the neighbors. And then I

made the frequent visits to the Inspectional

Services trying to file complaints, etcetera, but again, it really has not come to a good resolution to this day. And we're still just waiting to see what's going to happen to the brown area.

So there has been a concern, and as well as you mentioned, Mr. Winter mentioned, there has been the issue with the Loomis Street being used as a through-fare connecting from the industrial side. And again currently there's a jersey barriers blocking any through traffic, but that jersey barrier goes up and down at any moment so we do not have the control over the jersey barrier. It's really at the mercy whoever is managing the jersey barrier that we can block some of the through traffic. And sometimes we do see when the jersey barrier is open, commercial traffic coming through at a pretty

high speed and that's concern for parents
with the kids.

So our petition has been modified
since, and as Jeff has explained at the last
meeting that we presented to you, you did
recommend having a special design review for
building of a three or more units of
townhouses in our neighborhood. At the
Ordinance Committee meeting that we held with
the Council members last month we wanted to
add another condition to that, and that was
by increasing the lot size requirements for
building a third or more units in our
neighborhood. And at this point we like to
present to you our modified petition to
preserve our neighbor's character as well as
prevent any overdevelopment in the area.
And, you know, something that we desire is
that we'd like to preserve our neighborhood

with plenty of green space. And, again, it's

mostly built up by single or two-family homes

there. And what we observed is that whenever

townhouses are being built, there's hardly

any green space and they try to maximize the

floor to lot ratio. So, for example, the

yellow lot that's next to the brown spot

there on the map, there's hardly any green

space over there. They just have a huge

asphalt open space there. And, again, that

sticks out in our neighborhood and really

does not conform to the character of our

neighborhood. So those are the kind of

development that we're trying to prevent.

And as the map displays, there are only very

few lots left in the neighborhood that can

build these multiple unit townhouses. And

those are the ones that we're really

targeting without impacting any of the

existing neighbors. So that's the petition

that we're presenting to you here today.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Is there a sign-up sheet?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, but I don't

believe anybody signed up. I'll check it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, well, then

maybe I should just ask does anyone want to

speak on this?

Would you like to come forward? Give

your name and address for the record.

PATRICIA AMOROSO: Yes. My name is

Patricia Amoroso, A-m-o-r-o-s-o. And I live

at 40 Loomis Street.

And again thank you for hearing us.

And I'm in total agreement of the John Chun

Petition. I think we've stated our case many

times over and hopefully you're in agreement

with this. Again, I mean I did -- I'm

passionate about this because again, I have

50 years in the city and started in East

Cambridge and now in West Cambridge for 40

years. And I, I represent -- I live at 40

and I own 34 Loomis and my family resides at

36 Loomis and 32 Loomis and I speak for them,

too, that we're in favor of this. And I was

on the Concord/Alewife Planning Board several

years ago so I do have a vested interest in

the area. And I leave it in your hands and

hope that you understand our concerns.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

PATRICIA AMOROSO: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish

to speak?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one.

So I just want to see if I understand

what I heard from Mr. Chun, that in terms of

these options, the chart of options we'd

retain Residence B Zoning, lower the

threshold for review of townhouses, and

increase the minimum lot area for the third

and subsequent units.

Is that the package?

JOHN CHUN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So from our point of

view, and I think is since we've already --

two pieces of that we've already recommended,

can we sign onto the third piece?

PAMELA WINTERS: 5,000 --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, increasing from

4,000 square foot for the third unit to

5,000?

Have I got that right, Jeff?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: So, Mr. Chair, I'm

trying to understand this also, so what we're

proposing is going to essentially affect

those units that are more than 9,000 square

feet, but less than 10,000 --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: -- square feet?

HUGH RUSSELL: And there are three

current lots like that --

STEVEN COHEN: I'm not clear.

Actually, I was going to ask Jeff. It's

labeled as larger than 9,000 feet. Are they

less than 10,000 feet? Certainly the vacant

lot isn't.

JEFF ROBERTS: No. The one that is

on Loomis Street, the single-family home

that's on Loomis Street is -- according to

records, which are, you know, not always

entirely accurate is about 9900 square feet.

And I think the other one is comparable to

that. I don't know what the exact number is offhand.

STEVEN COHEN: And the vacant lot of course is larger. So this is basically affecting these two parcels on which going forward they would only be allowed two units, but not three units as would be allowed under current law. Is that right?

JEFF ROBERTS: That's right.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, Hugh, that's what you just said, it would only impact three units?

STEVEN COHEN: Two parcels.

PAMELA WINTERS: Two parcels? Okay.

STEVEN COHEN: It might reduce the total number of units permissible on the vacant parcel.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

So I'm a little confused. There's a

parcel on Loomis Street that's yellow,

irregular in shape, that says four units. Is

that current development or is that the

potential development?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm sorry, that is

current development. The labelled on the

map, I should have explained, are the current

number of units on that site.

HUGH RUSSELL: So is the potential

single-family house the one that's just

before the bend?

JEFF ROBERTS: No, it's the one

that's blue with a red line around it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, got it.

JEFF ROBERTS: So everything that's

blue is single-family and the purple is

two-family. The townhouses we just labelled

with the number of units so that it would be

clear.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I understand.

STEVEN COHEN: Jeff, how big is the vacant lot?

JEFF ROBERTS: The vacant lot is about, I think, they're somewhere around the 20, 20 to 25,000 square feet.

STEVEN COHEN: But that's I guess problematic for us to analyze anyway because it's split into the two zonings.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's the difficulty. I could attempt an analysis that would say how many units are actually permitted under the current and proposed Zoning on all of these lots. We haven't gone that far in our analysis yet, but the idea is that if, you know, the general concept is that most lots in the neighborhood which are around 5,000 square feet are definitely less than 9,000 square feet would be unaffected by

the change, but lots that are more than 9,000 square feet would be affected, you know, assuming, you know, if they would be extra square footage to build those additional units. So it brings it down by a margin of either bringing it down from three to two or, you know, in some cases maybe bringing it down -- in the case of a larger lot, you know, it's the -- even though the Residence B portion of the lot is larger, it allows fewer units than the part that's in 3B-2.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, if the larger lot were subdivided, what's the smallest lot one could have in this district?

JEFF ROBERTS: 5,000 square feet is the minimum lot size in the district.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And so if it's 20 plus, conceivably they could get four lots out of it?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yep.

HUGH RUSSELL: Although it might be difficult to meet the frontage.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's right. They would need -- there's a lot width, 50-foot lot width requirement so it might require constructing a private way or something that would allow that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. But just looking at I guess they could probably do three lots and could put a two-family on each of them?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, I think they could probably do that. If the lot were subdivided they could be sold and developed as two-family structures or single-family structures, but --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, so if we did two -- my guess is correct, that they

could put in three, 5,000 plus square foot

lots and meet the frontage requirement, then

they could maybe have six units?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And under --

and I think a townhouse style development

would still probably yield more units, but it

would be townhouses versus single-family or

two-family, so there would sort of be

economic balancing of what's better.

HUGH RUSSELL: In some ways the --

if we look to -- if you remember the Bellis

Circle case we looked at where there seemed

to be many places in the city where there's a

desire to develop lots that have potential

for three units with several structures

because it increases the amount of open

space.

Was there another comment, Pam?

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. So, I feel

like this is déjà vu all over again here.

I've been through a similar situation as

this, I guess. My concern I guess is for the

green space. You know, certainly, you know,

increasing it to 5,000 square feet would

protect the green space, but on the other

hand I feel as though, I feel as though

there's a lot of green space going around

here just looking at the map, I'm not an

architect, but the other question -- the

other concern that I had was because there's

so few units or parcels that would be

affected, would this be considered spot

zoning? I don't know. I mean, that's just,

that's a legal question I guess.

And my last question would be the

jersey barrier, who, who authorizes taking

that down and putting that back up again?

JOHN CHUN: We do not control that.

So I believe it is the lot owner that handles it and there's sometimes a backhoe that comes over and lifts it up. For example, when we had a lot of snow over the winter, they opened it so that the backhoe could come in and shovel, plow the snow on their lot. In fact, the brown lot and then the yellow lot they used to be single parcel, but they actually subdivided that and then sold off the yellow lot for a dollar I believe to another person so they could develop townhouses in the yellow lot. So whoever is controlling the brown lot does have access to the jersey barrier and then they could bring in backhoe or other industrial equipment to do some work on the yellow lot area.

PAMELA WINTERS: So how many times a year is the other jersey barriers, roughly, removed so the traffic can go through?

JOHN CHUN: So I have observed --

it's been less frequent over the years, but

I've observed in the past year maybe two,

three times. Just the ones that I observed.

PAMELA WINTERS: All right.

JOHN CHUN: But there are some

neighbors that they're watching just to make

sure that does not get lifted up, because

again, once that's lifted up, there's through

traffic coming through.

PAMELA WINTERS: I understand.

Well, I, I feel as though I will have

to say that I kind of agree with what we

voted on before, but I'm, you know, I'm

curious to see how my other colleagues feel

about it.

STEVEN COHEN: Could I just say once

again in response to Pam, when you say it's

going to protect open space, if fact, nothing

that we're doing here affects lot coverage ratios or floor area ratios, nothing is affecting how much structure can be built on these lots. And frankly as a developer myself, you know, that's how I gained profitability, how many square feet I can build, not necessarily how many units I can build unless I'm pushed into building units than are larger than the market could bear. But I don't think that's the situation that you have here.

You know, my own sense is that this is primarily a design problem that the neighborhood has been encountering. And my own sense is that rather than monkeying around with some of the technical rules about, you know what you can build and how, is that the best tool that we have to protect the neighborhood, is that it would be a

robust design review. I think we understand

the issues expressed by the neighbors and I

think with such a design review, that we have

the judgment and the power to protect those

concerns and interests.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

STEVEN WINTER: Steve, does that

mean that you feel that the Ordinance

Committee recommendations are not viable in

your estimation?

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I don't know if

I would use the word viable. I certainly

support the recommendation for the Special

Permit and design review for three more

units, that's as we had originally

recommended. It's just the changing the

requisite lot area per unit. And, you know,

I'm a little bit troubled that it only

affects two units, two parcels in the

neighborhood. And, frankly, I don't even know that they have actual notice. They may have legal notice. I'm not sure that they have actual notice that this hearing is even taking place and affecting their units. But it only affects two units. And as I say, I really do think it's primarily a design issue that we can improve.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

I have to say I feel that the additional capacity that the Ordinance Committee has suggested is a good idea. I like that. And one of the reasons that I am -- that I'm going there is that Cambridge, one of the things that makes Cambridge so liveable and so successful, and I'm not telling anybody anything new here, is that we have things that are nestled right up against

each other. You've got a really nice little

neighborhood next to some industrial stuff

and then some more neighborhoods and then a

couple of schools. But we've managed to

nestle them in close to one another, pretty

close. And I think this is such a delicate

fabric in this neighborhood; Loomis,

Normandy. Any safeties that we can give, we

need to give those. And I am going to assume

that Mr. Chun is in favor of the additional

protection recommended by the Ordinance

Committee.

JOHN CHUN: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: And so I'm listening

to that, too, and my feeling is that we

should do both of those.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I was

originally opposed to the original petition

because of the impact it would have on all

the other lots in the neighborhood, and I

became very comfortable with what we came up

with at our last hearing because I think, I

agree with Steve, that it is really a design

issue. And while the neighbors may not agree

with me, I think they probably don't, I think

the townhouses that have been built there are

very sensitive to the neighborhood and fit

into the neighborhood very well. And so I

see, I also see it as a design issue. And I

think requiring a Special Permit for three or

more units achieves the goal that we really

want to see happen there. I have to say I

don't have the strongest feelings one way or

the other at this point. I am concerned that

really it is just relating primarily to one

lot, perhaps a second lot. I think the

concept of people putting lots together is

somewhat far fetched in this particular

neighborhood, this particular locale. So I

would come down personally, you know,

supporting what we had come up with at our

last hearing, not necessarily supporting what

the Ordinance Committee suggested as a third

alternative, but as I say, I don't have the

strongest feeling about it. If my colleagues

wanted to go that way, it's okay with me.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, let me speak in

favor of the Ordinance Committee proposal

because I -- part of -- it takes two lots and

the potential of combining lots perhaps out

of play in terms of demolition of existing

structures and replacing those structures

with new buildings. And I think that the

safest design approach is not to be tearing

down buildings and building new ones. So if

you get rid of that incentive, even if it's

only applied to a few lots, I think that,

that would be a good thing. And I think

it's, you know, if a developer says well, I

can only get two units on that, his approach

is different than if he thinks I can get

three. I mean, you know, developers have

their own beliefs and their own opinions and

all the rest, but I think that's -- that was

the motivation behind this and I think

there's some sense to it. It's not very

sweeping, but it's a little tinkering that

would be valuable.

STEVEN COHEN: Hugh, just a quick

comment. From a developer's perspective, if

you have a lot and you can only build say

5,000 feet on it, then the only question is

whether that 5,000 feet gets divvied up

between two units and three units. There are

actually many efficiencies with building two

units; better kitchens, better baths, more

windows, more saleable unit. I'm not sure if

you'd really be making a substantial

difference in the appeal to a developer. I

don't feel that -- actually, I don't feel --

that's certainly this issue either. I feel

strongly about the design review. I just

think that this is needles meddling with the

underlying mechanics that isn't going to

achieve all of that much and, you know, we

have an abutter who cares about what's going

to happen in the parcel next-door to him.

And, you know, I'm not sure if that's the

right approach to sort of global zoning, but

as I said, I don't think this will achieve

much, but the design review is what's

important to me. And if we ended up with a

motion, we all have to make compromises, I

would support the motion because it includes

the design review. I would oppose the change

in the lot area, but I wouldn't vote against

such a motion.

HUGH RUSSELL: So if we're trying to

give our best advice to the Council, it

sounds like that we're all convinced that the

design review is for three-unit and their

structures is an excellent idea to have the

largest impact.

That changing the Zoning from B to A-2

has a big impact that we don't favor.

And a third point, we're simply not

convinced that this mechanism will be very

effective to do much. We're not -- and

because of that, we're reluctant to -- some

of us are quite reluctant to support it. I

mean, I think we can send the report that

basically says that. We're not proposing it.

We're not saying it's a bad idea. We just

don't -- we're not convinced it's a good

idea. It's different.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, I don't know

how many of us are very reluctant about it,

you know what I mean? That's the only thing,

that's the only addition I would say to what

you said. It sounds like, you know, it's --

a lot of us just feel kind of, you know,

neutral about either/or.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: Maybe I'm wrong on

that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I mean I

think we can convey that in a report to the

Council. I mean, the Council has the

authority, they have more information than we

have. It's -- we give them advice and then

they continue on with their process. So I

think that's okay to do that. We don't have

to say, yes, it's got to be X or Y --

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- if we don't feel

that it's got to be X or Y.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: It might be

interesting to ask for a straw vote on the

number of units.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So let's just

ask that question. The -- so the straw vote

is: Do you think it's a good idea to do the

-- raise the number of square feet required

for the third and subsequent units, that's

the third line of the chart? So all those

who feel that's a good idea, raise their

hand?

STEVEN WINTER: That's the Ordinance

recommendations, correct?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's what's come

out.

PAMELA WINTERS: The Zoning options.

(Raising Hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: So there are three

members.

And how many people think it's a

probably not a good idea?

(Raising Hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: And there are four

members who think it's not a good idea. And

if I count right, has everybody voted?

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, four.

HUGH RUSSELL: Good. Okay, so we

don't usually forward votes to the -- straw

votes to the Council because it's --

PAMELA WINTERS: They're going to

get confused.

HUGH RUSSELL: They're going to get

confused, but I trust the staff's ability at

least on long observation and reading every

long decision and recommendation that goes

out under our name, that they're able to

capture what we're trying to say even if we

can't at the moment put it into precise

wording.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I'm very

comfortable with that as long as we are

giving them a -- we're annunciating something

very clear, even if it's that there was a

mixed feeling about it. I think we just need

to annunciate it very clear. We certainly

don't need to confuse the Council any more

than may already exist.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Well, that's

as I say, that is what Jeff and Liza do so

well when they write up our decisions.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, may I

speak? I agree with and I'm actually glad of

the outcome of this, but there are far too

many developers that have these jersey

barriers that would use that towards their

own access point, move it back and forth,

traffic from here to there, where the public

department -- I'd like to see honestly

collaboration between the Public Works and

the Traffic to see if they can mandate

something or be able to look at not just

Mr. Chun's petition, you know, some

neighborhoods don't have anyone to speak for

them and a lot of these are out there. So I

would like to recommend a citywide study of

these type of issues. You know, they can

come to us one by one, but I just wanted to

make a note that I've seen a lot where, you

know, these lots are 100 percent asphalt and

it's not a parking lot. We know what asphalt

is and heat affects and unsustainability and

whatnot and yet we just let it happen so....

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the
neighborhood planning process does look at
these kinds of situations neighborhood by
neighborhood.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. And just to
respond to that quickly, I would say that
we're fortunate in Cambridge that these kinds
of scenarios are rare, but there are places
where they do exist and they can be difficult
to resolve because it's -- it really has to
do with how someone uses their private
property and how much the city can do to
pressure people to conform to a certain
standard. And it's especially difficult when
it's someone who just has a vacant lot or
something that they're not, you know,
actively trying to develop. Because if they
were doing that, there could be building

permits that have to be issued and Special

Permits have to be issued and then the city

has more leverage. But when that's not the

case, it's more difficult.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And when

you -- my expectation would be that this lot

will not remain vacant for very long if --

because there's a person who's owned it has

already developed some structures and so

he's -- and when that happens, we can't

actually, as Jeff said, we can get this issue

resolved in the context of the conditions on

a Special Permit.

So do you want a vote from the Board on

this recommendation or can we just send it?

JEFF ROBERTS: The Board's pleasure.

I feel like that I have enough, you know,

material to draft it, but if the Board would

like to take a vote to close the issue and

then that would be appropriate.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So then the motion would be to
reiterate our previous decision, our previous
recommendation and discuss the -- and relay
the discussion about this additional
provision which did not convince a majority
of the Board. So is there --

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I would
have one other thing to add with the
permission of my colleagues, which is to say
that we've appreciated the -- John Chun, the
proponent, annunciating very clearly what the
needs are and being very temperate and
helping us to move along by gathering facts
and such.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

JOHN CHUN: Pleasure. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so, there's a

motion which I have made. I guess the Chair

can make motions occasionally.

Is there a second?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there more

discussion?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: On that motion?

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in

favor.

Okay, do we need to take a break before

our last item which I understand is --

LIZA PADEN: Well, we need to set up

a PowerPoint presentation.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

(A short recess was taken.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I think we're

ready to get started. The first step is Jeff

is going to give us some background.

JEFF ROBERTS: Thanks, I wanted to situate the Board with this project.

In October 2012 the Planning Board granted a Major Amendment to the North Point development plan, that's case No. 179. There were a few additional conditions put on to the project at the time of that Major Amendment, and one of them is that the permittee shall meet with the city staff to discuss opportunities for smaller parking ratios and/or shared parking as well as challenges of managing an MBTA commuter lot and a possible need for retail parking. And it goes on to say that before any development on lots beyond the one that is currently under construction by the proponent, that the permittee would report back to the Planning Board on the status of the discussions and

any recommended changes as appropriate. So
that's what they're here to do.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Thank you very,
much Jeff, and thank you everybody for having
us back here tonight. My name is Tom
O'Brien.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Could you use the
mic, sir?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Sure.

My name is Tom O'Brien and I'm with the
HYM Investment Group and we're here to do
exactly what Jeff suggests, which is to give
you an update on that and to discuss our
proposal that we've been working together
with staff on to try and answer that request
of us that was made of the Board when we were
last back before you.

What we're going to do tonight is I'm

going to give you a brief update just because

before the last time we were before you was

2012. And I've never been accused of needing

a microphone before in my life. Was 2012 so

we're going to give you an update on what's

been happening and give you a quick sense of

that which I will do. And then Doug Manz, my

partner, you'll recall who is the director of

our development team, will give you much more

in the way of the specifics of what it is

we've been working on with the staff and talk

to our parking proposal. So if you're okay,

I'd like to just begin.

So, first I'm going to give you an

update on our project status. So just a

couple of quick reminders. You'll recall

that the North Point site is a 45-acre mixed

use campus. I don't have it on the slide,

but just to remind you, so we are the HYM

Investment Group. We're a local firm based

here in Boston. We have a significant amount

of activity from this site as well as in

downtown Boston and also a project in

Brighton as well. So we're very pleased

about the level of activity that we've been

engaged with, and our partners on this site

are a group of investors based, for the most

part, outside of the area. But we developed

a really strong and good relationship with

those folks. They're good decision makers,

they've been terrific, and they've really

helped us follow through and deliver on all

the things that we said we're going to do on

the outset of this.

Again, 45-acre mixed use campus. The

master plan was originally approved in 2003.

And then you'll recall after a hiatus we

required the site in August of 2008. We

worked extensively with the community and with this Board and with the members of the City Council to put forward a Major Amendment which had a number of different parameters which that folks I'm sure will remember. We completed that amendment in 2012. As part of that amendment, we also sought and received the design review approval to begin the first building, which is 2020. We're going to talk about that a little bit more in a second.

The master plan, which was unchanged by the amendment in terms of the total square footage, allows for 5,245,000 square feet of total development. There's a split of approximately 3,000,000 square feet of residential and 2,000,000 approximately square feet of commercial. That was changed by the Major Amendment. The total amount is still the same as it was in 2003.

To date parcels S and T, which are two condo building here, those were completed. Those condos were not only completed but they were also sold out, so there's a significant number of people who actually are calling the site home today which is wonderful.

Many of those folks are now going into a second generation of reselling those condos as well, and I think with renewed confidence and renewed strength in the market people are feeling pretty good about their original investment in the site which is good.

In addition, North Point Common which is approximately five acres of what will be in its final form, a seven-acre common park, has been completed. For anybody, I'm sure most of you folks have visited the site, the park is quite nice and it actually works really well. With all the parks that have

been completed on the Charles River, there's

plenty left over for more development. So we

feel really good about the foothold of the

green space and kind of where we're heading

with that so far.

In addition Earhart Park which is a

park, kind of a pocket park, that's created

between Sierra and Tango here as well. It's

a good sitting spot and a great spot located

between the two buildings. And Northpoint

Boulevard which is the portion of the major

street that will run along the spine, along

the green space here between Sierra and Tango

and, and North Point Common has been

completed together with the bike lanes as

appropriate and the connection to the Charles

River and the overall bike path. So these

pieces have all been completed to date.

In addition to that, when we were last

before you, we were asking for the okay to

begin the construction of parcel N which is a

220-foot tall building, 355 units. We've

since named that building. It's now called

2020. It's a play on the fact that there are

really some great views from that building

both to the Charles River as well as into

downtown Boston, but also toward the Back Bay

of Boston as well. So it's -- and a play on

the fact that it's actual address is 20 Child

Street which is the small street that runs

off Northpoint Boulevard here.

So 2020 is the name of that building.

I'm going to give you a quick update on the

progress of that.

As part of that, we're working on a

pedestrian bridge connection as well as

another park that's going to be located in

front of the building known as Charles Street

Park.

One other bullet point on this slide we spent a great deal of time (inaudible) working on Green Line coordination matters. The, you know, we had been working closely with the community to try and address a number of issues that have come up in the course of the construction of the Green Line. I think all of us understand what a wonderful transportation project piece of infrastructure this is going to be when it's completed. Obviously when a major piece of infrastructure is being worked on and in the process of being completed, there are disruptions. And so what we've been working to do is to try to minimize those disruptions as best we can, and to make sure that the station, Lechmere Station in particular, when it's completed, is completed in a way that

really does make this a pedestrian-friendly and transit-oriented site. Those are the key watch words for us and I think, too, for the community.

So just a bit about this project. This is our 2020 project. Again, 355 units. We've -- we're building all of the affordable units on-site, so there will be 41 affordable units. Obviously as part of the whole process the entire (inaudible) on the actual design and location, and all of that's been completed and the affordability, those are all in process.

There will be 8,000 square feet of ground floor retail, including what we hope is going to be a very strong restaurant here at this corner. We're purposeful in that regard and we're asking black iron to the construction of that space to make sure it

does operate as a restaurant. But what we're

tying to do, you'll recall, this building --

let me just go back real quick. -- this

building is the first building to be located

on the far side of North Point Common. So

that's a key objective for us. Is, you know,

it was, it was an important statement for us

to start to move on the rest of the site and

develop on that far side. And so as part of

that, you know, to build a restaurant here on

this site, we think is going to create the

concept of an anchor there together with the

open space and the concept of the green space

connection up to the Gilmore Bridge, which

obviously that connection also will allow us

to connect the Orange Line station and

community college for the first time to a

Cambridge spot, meaning our site, which we

think is a really important factor as well.

These are the parks that will be created in front of this building right about here.

And, again, here's the overall site plan showing the connection to the Gilmore Bridge. These parks, we worked with Land Works which did a great job of helping us think through how to develop these parks with an eye toward the long term. We very much wanted this to be a grand entrance to the site, pedestrian entrance. It probably was a temptation for some folks to think of this as just a simple granite staircase, but we wanted it to be green and open. This was about the width of a city street. And, again, to be a really grand entrance that will withstand the test of time in terms of it being a great spot for the site.

In addition, we are creating a 355 bike

space, one to one, bike space storage

facility in the building. We've embraced

that and elected to make that an amenity for

the building. So we'll have bike repair

spots and places to hose off your bikes and

all those sorts of things in that space.

Just a few more bits about this

building. We, you know, we completed our

work with you in the fall of 2012. We moved

immediately toward completing the design of

the building and working with the

contractors. So, as you can see, this is a

pretty solid schedule having completed with

you folks in fall of 2012. We have

foundation commencement beginning in April

2013. We completed the core in November of

2013. Steel topped off in April 2014. We

actually got a nice day for a steel topping

ceremony with a lot of folks attended. And

we expect the building to open in spring of

2015. It's a beautiful building and it's a

great statement for, you know, creating

progress and the sense of progress on the

site.

Let me give a quick update on our

retail square which will lead into discussion

that we're going to talk about tonight.

So one of the things that we talked

extensively about from way back from the very

beginning, so remember I said we completed

the amendment to the master plan with you in

2012. We acquired the site in 2010, in

August of 2010. So we spent about two years

really in a community process both listening

to people and trying to work hard and think

through about what we thought the site

needed. And one of the things that really

cried out from all those meetings, both from

the community and frankly from our design

team and in our group of professionals, was

that there was no overall retail square or

retail plan for the site. That in the

previous plan, there was, there were a lot of

buildings thought about but there really

wasn't a sense of a central square, a central

town square, a central space. And that was

particularly galling I think for everybody

because of a couple things:

No. 1, the Green Line Station that's

going to be built here, really calls out for

a kind of central retail spot on the site.

But in addition to that, with the creation of

the new Green Line Station here, there will

be significant improvements made here at

Monsignor O'Brien. And what we really wanted

to make sure happened was that there be a

retail square that encompasses both sides of

that street. So that Monsignor O'Brien

stopped being Monsignor O'Brien Highway,

hopefully, and became something like

Monsignor O'Brien Boulevard; a place that

really was more pedestrian friendly and a

place that could work more clearly as a

retail square on both sides of that street.

That was a really important piece for us.

In addition to that, I would just add a

couple of quick things that are important

details I think that we care about and the

community cares about. We thought carefully

about the concept of a public market, and

this came up early on, within the first month

or two of us sitting down and meeting with

the community. When we were back before you

in 2012, we were sort of back and forth as to

whether or not the public market should be

here on this side of the street, kind of

supported by the overall retail, the amount

of retail that could be here or here on this

side of the street with parcel V hoping to

add to the vibrancy on both sides of the

street. And where we really migrated to over

time is that we think the public market

should be here on V which aligns itself, I

think, well with the sense of, again, of

trying to create a vibrant retail square on

both sides. And also that was the preferred

location of the community as well. So we're

happy to embrace that sense.

So we're working now toward the process

of establishing how that can be designed,

thinking through -- this is the current

location of Lechmere Station. So thinking

through elements of Lechmere Station that

could be preserved and how we can create the

public market on parcel V here. So we're

really excited about that. But, again, the

overall concept is that this would be a

retail square. That we would take each of

these parcels: V, R, Q, I, and B, and really

dedicate these to a retail square. In

addition, there was significant support in

the community and continues to be for the

concept of a decent sized grocery store,

which would he thought might best be located

here at B as sort of a destination at the

back of the retail square. So, you know,

what we had focussed on early on in that

process was that this could be about a 50,000

square foot grocery store here on this side,

that we could also use that as a spot that

could manage a significant amount of the

parking on the site as well so that that

could be both a garage as well as a grocery

store with perhaps some of the use on top of

that as well. So that laid out pretty well.

And then in addition to that, we wanted
to make sure that while on the original
concept no retail could be, no individual
retail particular unit could be more than
10,000 square feet. We wanted to be sure
that we embraced that and what we've been
working toward is making sure that this
retail is distinctive and unique and sort of
grounded in Cambridge. Sort of Cambridge.
We already are close by the Cambridgeside
Galleria Mall, which does just fine. The
last thing we need to do is copy that with
the same kind of national chains. This
should be unique and different and really,
you know, hope to create a neighborhood here.

So that's -- those are the sort of the
basic concepts that we thought about with the
retail square. But the overall idea is to

take some of the retail that was scattered in
the original plan and focus it into the
concept of a public square.

So, you know, we, as we thought this
through, part of what we struggled with was
that in the original plan there was an
overall amount of retail that was envisioned
at no more than about 150,000 square feet.
As I said to you, about 10,000 square feet is
the maximum size of any one retail piece.
And really what we thought about that there
should be a retail cluster. These darker red
pieces are what we thought about as the
retail. As I'm going to represent to you in
a second, we think that the amount of retail
given the overall volume of five million
square feet should be and could be bigger.
And one of the key things that both the
community we agree on is that there should be

a supermarket. So there should be at least

one space that can be bigger than 10,000

square feet, focused on a grocery store.

So what we're going to talk to you

tonight about is increasing the retail to

approximately 300,000 square feet. This is

not an increase in the 5.2 million square

feet. This is would be a reallocation.

AHMED NUR: I'm sorry to interrupt

you. Could you go back to one more and tell

me what the potential retail and existing

retail color differences are just by looking

at this map? They look both the same.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Sure. It does look

a little bit. So the proposed retail really

are the darker red pieces here. And these

are all projects to be completed. So, you

know, V, I, all the way across to the site to

B, these are all new buildings to be

completed. So those are, those are proposed retail.

You're right, that the coloring on this slide doesn't come out very well. But there is some retail, for example, here and here. So these are existing retail spots in existing buildings. But the darker red is proposed new.

AHMED NUR: And I was looking at the left, bottom corner you have three markings here consisting of potential -- is that potential at the very bottom?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah. It says potential. But that's really these pieces up here which could be here also on the site as well. Sorry, the colors don't really come out okay on the slide. Apologize by that.

DOUG MANZ: This was the plan that was approved in 2012. What we've been trying

to show is how far we've stretched the
150,000 square feet which is the dark red.
The additional areas which is, again, is
really again, on the North Point side of the
potential retail. Those were the areas that
could also be potential retail that we all
thought, but we didn't have enough square
footage to get to those potential. This was
a way to prioritizing. We only have 150,000
square feet. We thought the parcel N and the
connection with the Gilmore Bridge was really
important and the retail square cluster and
then we ran out.

AHMED NUR: All right. So now we're
proposed?

DOUG MANZ: Try to increase to fill
it in.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So, again, we're
gonna talk a little bit more in detail. I'll

move through my part and get to Doug's part.

So increase the retail to 300,000 square feet. Again, a reallocation, not an increase in the 5.2.

Allow a 50,000 square foot grocery store. And then also to talk through the retail parking. There's today no retail parking allowed on the North Point site which is a, you know, it's important piece that we need to fix that we've been working with on staff. And so our suggestion is that we allow retail parking at 0.5 spaces per thousand square feet. And then we could talk about how we're going to get there through a shared parking analysis.

This is my last slide and I'm going to introduce Doug. I do just wanted to point out on this slide, as we build out the building 2020, we included this photo. So

this is the view from one of the top floors

of 2020. So this is the kind of view that

can be achieved from the site, which I think

even though we had thought about it and been

around it, it was surprising to us as well

and really quite nice. So we're excited

about, you know, kind of the views that are

available.

So, again, what we're going to talk

about tonight, and I'm going to introduce

Doug in one second, an updated trip

generation analysis that we think can suggest

the increase in retail square footage. The

reallocation, as I said, some of the

commercial square footage to retail from some

of the existing square footage think through

the current mode shares and, you know, we'll

walk you through that. We'll talk about an

updated average size of the residential

units, the units are shifting in comparison to the market. And at the end of the day there will be no increase in peak hour trips, no increase in daily trips. All those pieces -- the transportation, the changes in transportation expectations and processes and habits of people are really sort of coming our way in terms of how this mixed use site can be put together and the way we can share and use the parking overall and in a more effective way.

So, again, let me just go through these quickly:

No change in total square footage across the site.

No change in the split of commercial and residential.

Simply reallocation on approved uses in square footage.

And so with that unless there are other questions for me, I'll come back.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have questions should I raise them now?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think I'd like to hear the whole thing.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So Doug is going to keep going through the details.

DOUG MANZ: Doug Manz from HYM Investment Group, director of development. Thank you. Good to see most of you. Some new faces here as well which is great.

So Tom kind of went through this, but again, you know, given that we are reallocating, particularly in the commercial square footage, again, we had 200 square feet of approved commercial space. There was 150,000 square feet of basically retail. About 200,000 of hotel. And the rest was

office and lab. So this has really taken

retail from the one to 300 and then reducing

the office and lab amount.

So, again, it's really a reallocation

within the uses themselves. So we have

actually submitted a preliminary trip

generation analysis to the staff. We've been

working with Sue Clippinger and Adam Shulman

on this as well, but basically going through

all these assumptions. And we come back with

a Special Permit Amendment, you guys will

receive this analysis, the detailed memo.

We'll go through it, you know, methodically

so you can see it.

But, again, we're really excited that

now that 2020 is well underway, our focus is

really now shifting to what's next at North

Point? And, again, with the green light

extension kind of coming, you know, feels

fast and furious, we're meeting with them

almost every other week now. We would love

to start looking at the retail square coming

online either at the time the Green Line

Station opens or very soon after. So that's

why we're coming back to you now on this, and

but the retail parking is a key component,

too, as well.

So, but with that I'm going to shift

gears to the North Point parking district.

And, again, this is where we were required by

the Special Permit amendment to come back to

you. So we have been working very diligently

with the City of Cambridge staff, so

particularly with Sue Clippinger, Adam

Shulman, with Jeff as well, as well Stephanie

Groll. A whole host of staff members that

we've been working with. So we've been

meeting over the course of a full year. And

so we've had a great experience. So this is really a result of a really great joint effort to get to this point. We're pretty excited about it.

And so the existing North Point Special Permit parking parameters -- so this is what's currently approved. Okay? And this was really approved back in 2003 to give you a sense of this is almost, you know, 12 years now, 11 years almost old in terms of the information. So we were originally approved for 4,980 spaces. Basically 5,000 spaces. That's a lot. In addition, there's also still the 300 MBTA parking spaces. So the 49 plus the 300.

The parking ratios there are the parking ratios that are in the North Point Zoning. And as you can tell, these are, you know, a bit older and out of date. This

Planning Board and the City Council have approved Zoning ratios that are less than this and updating the Zoning. So Kendall Square, for example, is less than these ratios. But that's what is in our Special Permit at this point.

There are some key parameters that, you know, we should just look at, too. We are allowed to build up to 1.25 spaces per thousand square feet for some of the earlier buildings. This really deals with the parking strategy. As you guys may remember from the site plan, we abut the computer rail yards. So there's a parking strategy about having above grade garage and a larger garage against the commuter rail yard creating a buffer to the overall site. And, you know, it allows us -- we would still front it with uses towards the site. So you wouldn't see

them from the site itself. That's a very

important consideration.

However, the original North Point

Special Permit did not allow shared parking

between parcels. So each parcel was

basically a standalone entity. It built its

parking as they thought it needed, but again

was a combination of above grade and below

grade parking strategies. What we're going

through now the efforts of about a year's

worth of work.

So, we've been again meeting with the

City of Cambridge staff and so, we've

definitely come up with what we believe is to

create a North Point parking district. And

this will lead through shared parking to a

very material reduction of proposed parking

throughout the site. And, again, we're

really calling it shared parking district.

It would only -- now again, North Point

Zoning District is a larger area. When we

talked about the shared district, it really

is just North Point. Again, there is one

area here that we included the glass factory

which was not purposeful. It's really meant

to include our site. It would include Sierra

and Tango, but it does not include any of the

Archstone or Avalon properties now or 22

Water Street. It's really focussed on our

mixed use plan.

So, I'm going to do the best way I can

from a shared parking district in laymen's

terms to how it works. And, again, many of

you might be familiar with this. This is not

the first time it's been used in Cambridge.

This is basically joint usage of a central

larger managed parking supply. And the idea

is that we've analyzed what the City of

Cambridge and Susan Sloan-Rossiter is here as well. Susan's working here for the last year. The idea is to analyze parking needs by type of use, and by that time of day. And so, for example, residential uses have peak parking demand at night and then they have a low parking demand during the day, particularly Monday through Friday, during the workday, and offices are the opposite. Their peak demand is during the day, at night it gets very low. Although with some of the technology companies maybe not low enough for them, but, you know, the idea is very low at night.

And so the idea is that the shared analysis shows peak shared demands. The idea is that we're looking to rather than planning a site for all the peaks of the individual parcels, we're looking at how can we share?

And so the idea is basically the shared

analysis leads to a lower of sum of

individual uses peak demands. So basically

by sharing parking we can actually build less

parking, and that's really important because

it actually caps the number of potential

trips generated to the site but the idea is

trying to be sufficient with the working

supply which is really important. This is

really beneficial for mixed use developments.

Again, we're a perfect example. We have

three million square feet of residential, two

million of commercial. It doesn't really

work well when it's all commercial or it's

you know, commercial and retail. You've got

to have mixed times. It also works much

better in urban environments. Again, these

are expectations. People in urban

environments are used to parking in larger

shared garages where they could be parking

next to, you know, employees of a company and

they might be a resident of a condo building.

So, again, we think this is an ideal site for

it.

     This, I'm not going to go through this

again. This is going to be part of the

parking that we submitted in detail. This

kind of shows the parking demands of

individual uses through the course of the

day. So this is blurry. Can we adjust that

a little bit. This is eight a.m. -- or six

a.m. in the morning and this is basically

midnight. And these two lines are really

residential and hotel. It's hard to see the

colors. This is residential and hotel where

at night, you know, five a.m. in the morning

everyone's home, parked. And this kind of

shows the reverse commuting pattern with

vehicles leaving the site. And, again, it's

not a significant number, again, in Cambridge

because there's not a lot of reverse

commuting type of thing, but there's a dip

and they're leaving their spaces. And then

office and lab and retail kind of go the

other way, which is they peak more around

eight to nine a.m., kind of hold steady

during the workday and then they drop. So

the idea to reduce parking is really in this

toft here which is between the peak and the

low, the idea is they can be shared parking.

So this is absolutely a great opportunity.

Now we have all these designs here. We'll go

through this in a lot more detail. You know,

again, this shows the office and lab that

drops off pretty quickly, but the retail

stays around longer. But, again, remember

most of our site is residential and office

and lab and that's where the big opportunity is.

AHMED NUR: So what happens at nine o'clock when the two meet together, these guys are coming and these guys are going?

DOUG MANZ: Yeah, so this is where, again, you know, we look at the peak time. So, again, you start to see peak demands based on those crossover events, you know, and that's where the analysis really takes hold where the share can happen. We want to make sure there's still enough parking supply.

So, now we again have done detailed analysis. We have shared the preliminary results with the City of Cambridge because again we've been working jointly on this. But the analysis shows that we can have on-site parking demand with 3800 shared

parking spaces. This is almost a -- this a

reduction of 1100 parking spaces. This is

huge from our perspective. But, again, it is

a very detailed analysis because, again, from

our perspective we want to shake sure from an

investment point of view and also future uses

of the site, there still is enough parking.

But this is a pretty material reduction of

it. By showing this, too, we also have the

opportunity, and I think this is really --

this is not a Zoning change. These parking

ratio reductions is really through the

Special Permit, but we can actually reduce

the parking ratios because now with less need

of parking we can lower those ratios in our

Special Permit to bring it more current with

what you guys are seeing in Kendall Square

and other places which I think is really

important.

So, but in order for this to work as shared parking, these are some key parameters I just wanted to go through. This is a shared parking district, so this only work if we're allowed to share between the parcels. So the idea is that we set the boundary of the district, we cap the number of spaces at 3800 or some number close to that, but then there's not a lot of restrictions between parcels, because again in order for the parcels to work, there are two or three parcels may be sharing one garage during different times of the day. So that's a key component. It's still very important for us to build some of the earlier buildings at 1.25 spaces per thousand square feet, but that's again more about the strategy of that. We're trying to get the bigger garages in the back which also are associated with the

commercial buildings. It's easier for the

residential users to go into a commercial

garage associated with an office building and

vice versa. So we've always had this in the

plans. Our office related garages are

basically built bigger. They end up having

almost two entrances to maybe one to the

office but there may be a separate one more

public out which allows it easier to shared

so it's an important point.

Some other parameters, this is getting

a little bit into the detail, so on the ratio

a second ago, and this is an important drop,

the residential goes from one space to unit

to 0.75 spaces per unit. So, again, that's a

big drop. But there is a nuance that that's

an average which is really important. And

we've been working again with the City of

Cambridge staff. The minimum would be 0.5

spaces per unit, but the maximum would be still one point space per unit. The average over the site will still be 0.75. This is important because rental buildings need a lot less parking. So, again, N parcel and 2020 we would be find with other lenders, our future residents, and our investors 0.5 spaces per unit.

For condominiums like Sierra and Tango, there would be a lot angst when somebody owns, you know, a $500,000 condominium and they go to sell it and they don't have a right to a space. It doesn't have to be a deeded space or a dedicated space, but there's a lot of concern that if you sell condos in the city, at least having one space associated with that is very important. So that's the reason for the nuance that there's a range. Now it doesn't mean that we -- we

could end up building a condo with less than
one space per unit. But the idea is that
really, I mean, this tends to gravitate more
towards to the rental side and the ones
(inaudible) tend to gravitate more towards
the condominium. And as part of this, if you
guys approved it, we would reduce the parking
ratio at 2020 right to 0.5 spaces per unit.
You guys may recall there was a large surface
parking lot also associated with that. That
would essentially go away, and which I think
is important point.

        And the retail parking parameters is
also really important. Again, 0.5 spaces
per thousand square feet. This stems from
any successful urban square. Even in the
City of Cambridge has some type of parking
available for retailers, and particularly for
the grocery stores. Now, to give you a

sense, this is not a lot of parking spaces.

So if we have 300,000 square feet of retail,

it's only 150 parking spaces between out of

300,000 to count. So, but for us to get a

lease, say, with the grocery store, they're

going to be very interested in knowing that

in that garage on parcel B there's at least

some number of spaces available for people to

pull in and shop type of thing. And also

when you get a cluster of restaurants, even

though they're all under 10,000 square feet,

they're all going to be interested is there a

place, you know, for my patients to park.

Again, we're not creating a big regional

draw. We're not Cambridgeside Galleria. But

someone just being able to drive just seven

blocks, you know, away might want to drive as

opposed to walking, you know, that kind of

thing.

So, again, but it's an important parameter for us, but yeah, I don't think it's necessarily -- it's not a huge component so even though it seems like we're asking retail parking, the overall strategy, again, and it will be part of the 3800 spaces.

So next steps, Tom, do you want to go through it?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So just to kind of wrap up and answer your questions, so our next steps is -- so first is to request for a Special Permit amendment. And, you know, as we said, we'll go through it in detail when we file it but we'll be asking for an increase in the retail allocation of 300,000 square feet. Within that we want to allow a grocery store of up to 50,000 square feet. The creation of the shared parking district, as Doug just suggested, and that will allow

us to reduce parking ratios across the

different uses on the site and to allow

retail parking of 0.5 spaces per 1,000 square

foot. Again, that would be if we build

(inaudible) retail 150 spaces within the

overall allocation of the reduced amount.

And so in terms of schedule, we hope to

submit the Special Permit amendment by June

26th. We will go back to East Cambridge

Planning Team. We were just with the East

Cambridge Planning Team -- I should just

mention as an aside, we did a presentation

about the potential of an i-cubed (phonetic)

transaction at this North Point site in order

for us to build out more infrastructure. So

as Doug said, we're very pleased about the

progress that the site has made so far and

really pleased about where we can go next

with the retail square. But in order to

continue the process of really putting the

site in position to be able to build another

commercial office building, for example, or

another residential building, we think that

the site cries out for further development of

infrastructure. So we just -- in front of

the East Cambridge Planning Team about two

weeks ago walking through that process and

we'll be filing that application with the

city perhaps as soon as next week. That

process has gone well. We've also meet with

just about every city councillor with the

exception of one or two at this point, and

all of which has gone well on that. So we'll

be back on just this piece, though, in front

of the East Cambridge Planning Team and other

community processes as well in June. So our

hope is that if we can get that submission

done on June 26th. We can host the first

public hearing in July, shooting for a

potential approval in September. I know you

folks are busy. And then that would be

followed by a City Council Zoning Amendment

to allow the retail parking in the North

Point District which we think is required in

the Zoning. So those are the key next steps

for us.

And, again, that's the final piece.

We're happy to take questions both Doug and

I.

DOUG MANZ: And the only other

comment I would add, too, is that the only

item that requires City Council approval is

the retail parking. The retail parking is

not allowed by the underlying zoning

district. All the other changes as far as we

can tell from our lawyers, counsel is in the

full purview for the Planning Board to make

which we are excited, because we can get

everything now which is important for us to

get most of this done now.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

A number of questions. They're sort of

all over the place.

The first one is what the current

schedule for the T relocation and expansion?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So the T has begun

work on bridge relocations, bridgework, some

demolition and things like that. So they let

out a couple contracts to do that work right

now. The work on the completion of the new

station at Lechmere would begin in earnest in

2015, and then our understanding is that we

would see that station, the physical station

at Lechmere completed in about the summer of

2016. So you actually see it in the air.

However, unfortunately they're also going to

be replacing -- so the station gets built

here, but then all of this existing track,

because remember the track makes a turn here

to this current site, so all of this existing

track must be replaced as well. So during

the course of 2016, this track will be

replaced. And then when replaced, when this

connection is made between the completed

station and the track, then there's a period

of time where there's practice -- work done

with the drivers, training with the drivers,

things like that, all of which is being

controlled by a variety of federal

regulation. When the new station actually

put into service even though it physically be

there for a year in the summer of 2017.

        H. THEODORE COHEN: And then it will

then continue to Union Square?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes. So the first three stations -- right now this is our understanding, are completely funded. So there is a loop that will basically make a turn out here just at the farthest corner and make a turn to Union Square. And then one of the pieces -- Brick Bottom -- those first three stations, Lechmere, Brick Bottom, and Union Square are funded and underway. In addition to that, the MBTA is in the process this summer of completing their application to the Feds to cover the cost of the rest of the project as well. To complete that. Although I don't have a final schedule for the other six stations to be completed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And where would the final station terminus be if they got funded for everything?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Right around Tufts

University.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So parcel V
where you're talking about putting the open
market.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I can go back to
that site plan. Or I can just work off of
this one.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's fine. So
currently that's the T station?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: That's the T
station today, yeah.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Now, when the T
station is moved, I assume the property is
still going to be owned by the T?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: It's going to be
owned by us. So --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is that already

a done deal?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: That's a done deal,

yes.

The T -- the MBTA, in order to build

the Green Line Extension, required rail

rights that are north of here, that they

could not take by eminent domain because the

railroad is an interstate commerce entity.

So there's a superior sovereign in the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts if you can

believe it. As a result of that, that cannot

be taken by eminent domain. So we worked

together with the railroad on the one side

and the MBTA on the other side to complete

the swap of those rail rights which are

rights that go all the way up the Fitchburg

Line up to Route 2, as well as rights that go

up to Manchester. So in exchange for the

value of those rights, parcel V, parcel N,

and parcel I of the development, which is the

original plan that was envisioned as well.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Great.

Now am I correct in assuming that the

market and parcel V is not going to be part

of this shared parking?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Well, it would

be -- I mean the market hopefully has really

a strong sense of a walk-to market, a real

neighborhood market. But it, you know, would

be -- I mean the overall need of the market

really would be considered part of the shared

parking analysis. But hopefully it's a

minimum burden in terms of trips and parking

don't you think?

DOUG MANZ: Yeah, I don't think --

we're not -- I mean, the outdoor market I

think is more of a, you know, sort of people

would bring tents and set up. It could be

carts. You know, we're not envisioning a

physical structure there today. If it's very

successful today, maybe we're not counting as

part of the retail square footage and build

out.

          THOMAS O'BRIEN: There's another

outdoor market three stations down,

Haymarket. There's another market, public

market --

          H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

          THOMAS O'BRIEN: -- being built with

the Commonwealth of Massachusetts right at

Haymarket. So I don't think this becomes --

I think that is a regional draw for people.

I don't think this is a regional draw. I

think this is a neighborhood-oriented public

market.

          H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

          HUGH RUSSELL: And there will be

other uses on the site?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: And there will be other uses on the site, yes. Yeah, I would envision food uses, you know, maybe some other things. But things that are distinctive, unique, and sort of Cambridge.

DOUG MANZ: And when we say retail square, we should be clarifying, too, all of the parcels that Tom referenced I, Q, R, and B, these are still multi-story buildings with mostly residential on top over retail. So it's more of an urban square as opposed to retail square. There are no single story type of buildings on this site. And, again, the only thing that we're asking for a waiver, the 10,000 square foot minimum is the grocery store. Again, that's in keeping with the original intent of the plan which was meant to be a vibrant urban use mixed square.

H. THEODORE COHEN: A 5,000 square foot market, is that the size of Trader Joe's.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: 50,0000?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry, 50,000.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: 50,000 would be larger than a Trader Joe's. It could be a Whole Foods.

PAMELA WINTERS: Whole Foods.

HUGH RUSSELL: The old Stop-N-Shop was 40,000 or 45,000.

H. THEODORE COHEN: On Memorial Drive?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: On Memorial Drive, yeah. It's not a Super Stop-N-Shop. It's more like a Whole Food-ish type of thing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure, okay. So it's bigger than the Trader Joe's?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Well, remember,

when the overall plan -- if we're, you know,

three million square feet of residential is

about 3,000 dwelling units together with, you

know, a vibrant East Cambridge Neighborhood

which should create a good demand for a

market there, there's -- remember Whole Foods

purchased the old Johnny's Food Master which

is up here in Charlestown, you know, just

across the Gilmore Bridge. So there's a

small Whole Foods that's probably 15,000

square feet. It's not a very big market.

Yeah. And then of course there's other

markets.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The Shaw's.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: The Shaw's is

further north. But I think there really will

be a tremendous amount of demands for a

market. And I'm not saying it's a Whole

Foods, you know.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I just wanted to get the sense of the sizes.

Now you're talking about a hotel. Is there a proposed site for that?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah, so the hotel has been envisioned here. This red piece is the hotel. Again, we think of this as part of the retail square. So as Doug said, what we're really trying to do is if the MBTA is going to deliver the station in service in 2017, then it's not too soon if you think about a 24-month or so construction period plus a 12-month design period for a total of 36 months, now is the time for us to think about starting to deliver these buildings. So these are, as Doug said, these are residential buildings with retail below. We think of this an urban square. And the hotel

is something that can really bring -- attract

a lot of vibrancy as well in terms of food

service on the first floor and, you know, a

very active draw for people that's what we

wants that to be. We want this to be a

really strong pedestrian zone on both sides

on Monsignor O'Brien Highway.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I've been using

North Point Park a lot.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Oh, great.

H. THEODORE COHEN: There's

virtually no parking there. Do you envision

there being some in this shared parking for

recreational use? I know you're going to

have the skateboard park, too, at some point.

DOUG MANZ: So, what I will say, so

we have had conversations with the City of

Cambridge staff, that it is the intent that

over time that there will be metered parking

on a lot of the North Point streets. And

that's also an important component and it's

more we have to work out with the City of

Cambridge how it works. But the idea is that

a vibrant retail square has on street parking

basically. And we also want to make sure

that if we have on street parking, that we

also have it available -- that it's available

later in the evening, that it doesn't stop at

five or six. Right now there's very limited

metered spaces which is down at North Point

Common.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

DOUG MANZ: So I think as the

roadway expands, the idea is that it won't be

dedicated visitor parking just for buildings.

It's meant to be a vibrant district and

that's where, that would be, and that's where

I think we would, you know, the metered

parking would provide that parking for people to actually share. We're going to have 11 acres of open space counting North Point Park, that's 20 acres of DCR Park. It's an incredible opportunity for people to get to the site.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: There's metered parking, you know, down --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, a little bit.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah, I know, but in the mornings you can usually get it. But so there's probably, what do you think, 20, 25 spaces or so if I think.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And that metered parking I take it is not park of your -- it won't be part of your request?

DOUG MANZ: Correct. It won't be part of that. Right now today we manage

North Point Common. We take care of it. We

also plow the streets on Northpoint

Boulevard. Eventually the streets will be

turned over to the City of Cambridge, and DPW

is waiting for all the buildings to be

constructed against it. So that these will

be public roads and managed by the City of

Cambridge. Long term I think the prospectus

to having metered parking is part of the

overall plan.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess my last

question is if you get the reduction in the

parking, what happens to what where those

thousand spaces would have been?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Well, I -- you

know, I think what we're saying is that the

analysis of the peak -- so when Doug showed

the graph that, those intersections on either

side of the graph, so at nine in the morning

or at six o'clock at night, what we're trying

to do is plan for those overlaps, you know,

to make sure that we have enough spaces for

that. So we believe, based upon all the

analysis, that we'll all have enough spaces

long term, but there are still challenges to

make it work so that's why in the initial

buildings the 1.25 spaces, as Doug said, the

buffer that could recreate and the railroad

side. But also as we respond to the

potentials of built-to-suit office tenants,

often times they're pretty clear they want

one space per thousand and stuff like that.

In the early days trying to accomplish this

will require some, you know, some clear

thinking on our side to make sure it works

out.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That really

wasn't my question. You know, you said if

you do -- you can do away with the open air

parking by 2020.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: It just happens

with the parking, you mean?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: It just goes away.

We don't build it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So how many open

air lots are proposed now?

DOUG MANZ: So well, right now

there's only -- and they're really meant to

be interm lots. So eventually over time

they're all open air lots. They all will be

structured parking. That's important to

note, too. So there's a current

parcel (inaudible) which is 120 spaces.

That's handicapped parking --

So parcel U is a service lot today.

And it was built as parking for Sierra and

Tango. That lot would not go away. It goes back to the one space per unit kind of maximum. Eventually that 128 spaces being incorporated into a future garage somewhere else on the site, and that's how that lot would work. The parcel end lot we're going to build on L and M ceases to exist because it's not needed. Now, when you divide it by 20 parcels, you know, a thousand space sounds like a lot. When you divide it by 20 parcels, you're down to like 50 spaces per parcel. So what it basically means that there's a reduction of parking at almost all of the parcels, but we still probably would still have larger garages on E, F, G, and H which are commercial. So if there's a reduction more on the residential building, you know, parcels that we go through it. But it's not like suddenly like, you know,

three-and-a-half story parking garage slowly

becomes one and a half. It's kind of

incremental. That's the reason why it would

evolve through. It is an important impact

because by the time you get through the site,

you know, instead of ending up with 5,000

square feet, you're down to more like 4,000

square --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you end up

with more landscape open space?

HUGH RUSSELL: Probably not.

DOUG MANZ: Well, we already

increased it by two acres last time, from

nine to eleven. So I think what this might

mean is that the mass of the parking

structures themselves on the parcels probably

gets less. So you might lose a half floor of

parking, and some of the parcels, you know,

that type of thing. It might be more

pronounced on an above grade garage. That

might be more some of it comes down. We

still have to evolve where it ends up to be

honest.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I nodded my head

because the combination of all the changes

that we have made has been, you know, we --

as part of what we've done in the last

amendment is we relocated the residential

remember here to this part of the site. And

in doing that, we changed the where -- the

basic footprints of those buildings. And so

as Doug said, we were able to add two acres

of open space. So this park in the previous

plan did not exist. This park did not exist.

This park did not exist, and I believe this

park did not exist. And so we've added the

overall -- our objective is to try to build a

community here that does have a significant

amount of open space. So the overall group

of changes made today has increased in the

open space.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. And now

question for you or someone on staff, was

there some rationale for there not being

parking for retail?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So that

was my question was to go back to this

because I remember these discussions fairly

vividly, and the idea was that there would be

-- having a little bit of retail parking was

almost worse than having none because it

would give people the impression that it was

retail that one could drive to and you would

end up with more cars who would drive as

opposed to designing retail that specifically

was not supposed to be driven to. That was

the original rationale. And I will say at

the time the neighborhood was extremely

concerned about the traffic as opposed to the

amount of parking. And, therefore, the

higher per square footage trip generation of

retail was A very big concern. And that's

also why the retail ratio was quite low for a

project of this size. I guess I'm looking

forward to seeing the new numbers because a

lot has changed. We know a lot more about

the data -- the mode shares have changed a

lot. And, you know, the traffic in the area

has changed. But there -- I mean, it was a

very conscious decision to say if we give

anyone the impression that you can drive to

this retail, it will result in a higher trip

generation.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, can I --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm all set.

PAMELA WINTERS: Are you all done?

Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm all done.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

Catherine, I don't know if I agree with
that or not and you're the traffic specialist
here. But I think that in this, in this
whole North Point development I think that
retail parking is important because, you
know, if you want to go and get some
groceries, if there's a grocery store
there --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'm not
debating that, Pam. All I'm saying is that
there was a conscious decision in 2003 --

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, okay.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: -- that
that was the rationale then.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, oh.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'm not

saying that that is necessarily the correct

rationale to apply now.

PAMELA WINTERS: Gotcha.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And

especially -- I mean, we, again, the whole

concept of a grocery store was considered at

the time.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And the

idea that it would attract so much traffic

was considered prohibitive and why it was

limited to 10,000 square feet, because they

specifically did not want a grocery store

going in there and causing that kind of

traffic.

PAMELA WINTERS: But the people who

are living there, right, they need to buy

groceries, they need to have --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Again,

not saying that's the right answer today,

Pam. I'm saying that was the rationale in

2003.

PAMELA WINTERS: No, I understand.

I'm not arguing with you. I'm just telling

you what my opinion is.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No, I

understand. And I think it's an interesting

perspective and an interesting idea. I will

be interested to see the traffic numbers and

frankly to hear from the community as to

whether or not their opinion has changed,

because that was very much a driving factor

in setting all of these numbers in the first

place.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

But think of it this way, though, that

if there is a grocery store there and a

pharmacy there, that people will be using it

in this parcel of -- in this -- in North

Point and not having to go through the city.

So, you know, rather than going to, you know,

Whole Foods or wherever, you know, they will

stay in this, in this area and it will

decrease, actually, the to me, to my -- I

don't know --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: To the

extent that you are attracting people who

live there --

PAMELA WINTERS: That's right.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: --

that's right. To the extent that you're

attracting people from East Cambridge, that

may or may not be right.

PAMELA WINTERS: But they would have

other places probably to shop. You know, I'm

not familiar with the places in East

Cambridge, but probably --

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so --

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Could I add to --

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, so now I've

started a little argument here.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Here's what we've

discovered.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: We've been doing

this for four years, and what we've

discovered is that there was a pretty clear

sense from the neighborhood that people would

now like a grocery store. So I wasn't there

in '03 --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: -- so I can't speak

to that. But it came up really early on,

actually, that people would like to see a

grocery store there of approximately 50,000

square feet. And in addition to that, there

was a sense that also come up pretty

consistently in all the public meetings that

we've done, that for people who live in this

neighborhood let's say three, four, five

blocks from the neighborhood, that they'd

like to have, I think, if it's going to be a

grocery store, that they'd like to have a

place to park to go and load the groceries

into the car and go back and forth.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: And that issue, I

can't speak for what happened in '03. I can

say over the last four years it's been pretty

consistent.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes,

and it doesn't surprise me that there's been

evolution on the question. I mean in '03

when we were doing the traffic analysis and

talking to the neighborhood about it, this

was much more of an unknown. And having

Sierra and Tango over there and all of those

and starting to see those connections to the

neighborhood would -- and getting more data

on how traffic is behaving, would tend to

change people's perspectives on things. But

as I say, the question that Ted has raised

was, was there a rationale? There was. Is

it applicable now? Maybe not. Maybe it is

time to revisit it.

                THOMAS O'BRIEN: One thing that --

                HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I'd like to

intervene on this discussion.

                CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

                HUGH RUSSELL: I recollect that the

entire development is traffic driven, the

amount of parking was related to the amount

of traffic, and there's one particular move

that was the key to this which was the left

turn in from the top into the site in the

a.m. peak hour. That that was the most

difficult move to accommodate. And so that

if you think about people driving across

First Street to get to a grocery store at

five o'clock in the afternoon or six o'clock

or, you know, whenever, it's a -- you have to

look at the various constraints.

Now I've been looking out at Adam and

Sue who we all know we're going to be

listening very carefully to their advice.

And I was wondering if you wanted to say

anything at this point in time?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So I, I think the

information that you're -- that you have and

the challenges that you'll have to be

thinking about, are kind of interesting

because this is a pretty big project and it

had a long hiatus. And so a lot of things

have changed really from 2003 until now. And

we've learned a huge amount of stuff and, you

know, you had a very nice opening comment

about how the parking is really matched to

traffic and activities. But, you know, I

think we've gotten much better at this and

we've learned a lot of stuff along the way.

So, you know, I think we're seeing in the

city that auto ownership and residential is

not as high as we had seen it and thought

about it in 2003. I think we're seeing that

the mode shares, and especially in the

Kendall in this area, have really been

excellent in terms of other modes of

transportation. And we've done a lot of work

thinking about the shared parking and ways in

which you can more efficiently use things.

So there's a really nice opportunity here

which, you know, to really be thinking about

the parking and in the light of the things

that we've learned since then, which I think

is a really part of the conversation. And I

think the other thing that's happening for

which I can provide you no expertise

whatsoever, is that people's opinions about

what the right development to happen in the

area, what makes this area the best, and what

should be happening is also changing and so

the conversation about the grocery store, and

I think retail and parking, we've always felt

that when it's small retail, not more than

10,000, we don't really see a significant

parking need for that kind of retail. It's a

lot of walk-in retail and a lot of retail

from nearby people, and the expectation is

these will be city streets, there will be

metered parking, there will be some short

term parking in the area. When a project is

wanting to do a bigger retail activity, then

obviously, you know, that changes what's

needed to support that. So I think that's

the conversation that's happening. And the

nice thing about this is that I think the

change for looking at a grocery store and

thinking about retail and retail parking and

potential retail trips is being matched by

some of the changes that we're seeing in the

mode share for office and auto ownership for

residential. So it feels like there's an

opportunity to be rethinking this whole thing

in a way where these kinds of changes can

balance each other. And so, you know,

obviously you're going to have decisions to

make about what makes sense, but there are

some, you know, sort of good news/bad news if

you want to say or maybe it's all good news

but they have different kinds of impacts.

AHMED NUR: I just have a quick question.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think one of the things that we've spent a lot of time thinking about is what makes successful streets? What creates life? And I think -- so the decision to try to focus the retail in that zone adjacent to the T station, a place that people will be filtering through as they're going to their homes that are out in some of the other blocks, that's very much in tune with what we're learning.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: That you need a certain amount of concentration and intensity. Add to that a supermarket, that, you know, that seems to incorporate a lot of learning. So I'm happy -- Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: I have maybe four items

here and I'll make it very quickly.

And first of all, I wanted to say this is a really great presentation; easy to understand, very clear, and I appreciate you being here and taking the time.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Other than the colors on the one slide, though.

AHMED NUR: Secondly, I vividly remember two things that we brought up, one was my family -- this summer it hasn't happened because we're doing renovations at our house, but we oftentimes go to the park, North Point Park, and I recall not having bathrooms there with all the people and the children and the birthdays and so on and so forth, and we talked about public bathrooms. And you don't have to answer that right at this minute, but I just wanted to put it out there.

And we also talked about having this, was it -- all the commercial buildings in the garages sort of be a retaining wall from that view and the noise of the railroad. And having all the residential buildings internally coming in.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: We could make it all, but yeah, you could see that there are two residential buildings still there. But what we tried to do is move those residential buildings into the park which is a nice amenity for the residential.

AHMED NUR: Okay, yes. So we're still doing that. Because I heard the structural garages will now be using that as a --

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes. The blue here -- I should have said that. The blue here is commercial. So we envision these to

be buildings that have larger floor plates that, you know, will be back up against the rail yard. The advantage we see sometimes like this one, you know, you might say well, you're putting them against the rail yard, so it's going to be hard to attract a company. But this is also a very prominent site for, you know, for a potential company. And close by the Orange Line Station as well. So it's a good area.

AHMED NUR: Another comment -- two more, is the -- I would like to see for your next visit, and members can obviously express, I'd like to see maybe a 3-D drawing, just like the one that you have in the completed buildings. For example, parcel 2020 is parcel N, that's building 2020?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: And then there is the

indication first, and I don't know where that

is with respect to that 2020.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So here's

education. So here's the existing -- well,

actually, they're both existing now because

they both moved in last week. But so this is

the original EF Building, and then this is

the new EF Building. They have not yet

completed this glass piece here. That's

been, that's been --

AHMED NUR: Oh, yes, the waterfall.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes. The wall, the

waterfall. It always seems like a great idea

until they actually build it, right?

So that will be completed as quickly as

they can hammer the contract to get it done.

AHMED NUR: Right.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: But they are in

this building. They are operating in this

building as of right now. So that's the

second EF building.

     These are the two, you know, what were

originally museum towers and now called --

          AHMED NUR: Okay, you do have --

okay, so you do have the drawings? That is

completed.

          THOMAS O'BRIEN: This is parcel N,

2020 right here. And these two counter

buildings are completed. And this building,

this is the Archstone, that's completed.

          AHMED NUR: Okay.

          THOMAS O'BRIEN: These others are to

be built.

          AHMED NUR: Okay.

     And the last comment, you know, I

wanted to say it's possible, I mean, no one's

thought about it yet, we have a lot of boats

going in the summertime, you know, the

Charles River, both the duck boats going in and out of there. Talk about shopping and talk about transportation, that bottleneck right in the middle of the Museum of Science, is completely jammed constantly. So why not use the water transportation to go shopping? The Whole Foods is right at the Charles River, right at the bank. You know, the water taxi to go shopping in case there was none over there. People can get dropped off right there and go shopping at the Whole Foods right at the BU, come back in, and drive them wherever they want.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I love that idea. Yeah. We love the idea. There isn't a water taxi on the Charles. As you know, there's a water taxi in the harbor, but there's not a water taxi in the Charles. In addition I would say, too, you know, what a lot of

people have discovered is that North Bank

Bridge, which you probably have discovered --

AHMED NUR: Yes, right.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: -- which is a great

access point to the Paul Revere Parks on the

other side and it allows you to get into the

North End pretty easily. And there's another

pedestrian bridge, you can see it framed out

right along the tracks, that will take you

directly from this side of the North Point

Park directly across to the back of North

Station as well so you don't even have to

make the jump to cross the Charles River. So

there's more alternatives, you know,

pedestrian, boat, all of that that's coming.

HUGH RUSSELL: Are there questions

or comments?

PAMELA WINTERS: I have just, I just

have one very tiny question. You had

mentioned something about black iron being in

the corner of one of the restaurants.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah.

PAMELA WINTERS: What is that?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: So the systems that

are necessary to handle air handling and run

the cooking, you know, move air from

cooking --

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Will be, you know

we're investing in that.

PAMELA WINTERS: I understand.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: To build that out

as a restaurant. True restaurant space.

PAMELA WINTERS: Great. I didn't

know if that was the name of the restaurant.

AHMED NUR: It can be.

HUGH RUSSELL: They're built out of

black iron so that they can, there can be a

fire inside and maintain their intactness.

DOUG MANZ: If you don't build them out initially or provide the space for it to create a restaurant, it can be very expensive. So we made the leap of dedicated space and putting the iron in. I don't want to call it plug and play because it's complicated for it, planning for it is really important because it gears it towards that use.

PAMELA WINTERS: I also wanted to say I liked Ahmed's suggestion about the public restrooms. And I think that's it. And possibly a pharmacy. I don't know if that was something that came up in your thinking or not.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah, I think definitely a pharmacy would be the right thing, though. The way pharmacies work

today, sometimes they have a significant

grocery piece of it so you have to balance

the pharmacy and the grocery through -- we

have to think that through. I think

definitely the pharmacy. You can envision

the things that people want and need every

day. Clearly a great coffee shop. We want

to make it an attractive place for people to

be. Maybe a cleaners, clothes cleaners. A

lot of these people that work in this these

places today have a pet. Pet grooming

facility. All those kinds of things. Mostly

great food places where people can gather.

PAMELA WINTERS: Great.

DOUG MANZ: We have discovered we

have the largest dog park in, you know, in

East Cambridge right now with North Point

Common on four acres which we diligently try

to maintain as we can and police people.

Side note.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: It is a dog park.

STEVEN COHEN: I had a few comments

myself. First of all, in general I'm very

supportive of your vision here. I certainly

support the additional retail. I have no

problem with it, 50,000 foot market. I

contrast by the way, the design, the

architecture of your 2020 with the Museum

Towers on the other side of the bridge, boy,

is that night and day.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah.

STEVEN COHEN: So I think you're

going in a great direction and I encourage

it.

But about parking, I'm -- I tend to be

sort of the parking skeptic on this Board.

And, again, certainly no issue with providing

parking for retail, but the reduction of

one -- is it 1,000 spaces thereabouts?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Approximately.

STEVEN COHEN: And I certainly

understand from the developer's perspective,

I mean, gosh, I don't know, that's 15, 20

million dollars. So there's certainly some

serious motivation, and I understand that.

In other locations where we've been dealing

with reduction in parking, I mean, it's been

a conventional urban centers and at Kendall

Square and Central Square, and you know, I

question whether those, that same reasoning

would apply here. But in any location one of

my concerns has been well, okay, it sounds

good, but what if it turns out not to be so?

What if it turns out that the demand actually

exceeds the parking that you provide? Now if

it only affects the economics and

marketability of your project, well, that's

the, that's on you. But if it results in

spillover parking on adjacent neighborhoods,

then that's another issue that I would be

concerned about. Now, again if you're in the

heart of the city, there are adjacent

neighborhoods. Here you're somewhat in an

island of your own, but I wonder even here,

especially for the office workers, to what

extent if in fact demand exceeds your supply.

I wonder to what extent they may in fact

cross over the highway and park on the other

side in the existing neighborhoods. And that

would be a concern. That would be

exacerbating a situation which is already

problematic.

So, I guess that's just an issue that I

raise and it's one that we always have to

grapple with when we speculate about parking

needs in the future. But, you know, when we

get to that point and when we really have to

make the decisions, and I guess it's more the

Traffic and Parking folks that will evaluate

it. I just wonder how confident we are of

those numbers? I mean, the ratios that

you're talking about are very low of course

by many standards. Gosh, what was it a half

a space per thousand for retail. For

instance, you know, in the suburbs Whole

Foods is looking for six per thousand. You

know, I don't know how that plays out here,

but I would be concerned about the spillover.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, I guess I'd

comment from my perspective, I do not

anticipate that we're getting a request to

build, you know, 15 buildings at once. We'll

be getting a request to build them in

probably, you know, groups. We'll have time

to test our assumptions as time goes on. If

there's -- I mean, just as we did on the

Smith now Avalon Properties when we

discovered, they discovered people weren't

parking, we said okay, you can use that

garage for the cloverleaf building. If

parking is tight on a parcel, closest parcel

to the bridge, which is apt to be the first

one to go, then, you know, you put in an

extra 30 spaces in the next one so that the

shared parking -- but it seems to me thinking

of this now, as we go forward for the next

buildings, based on what we know now, yes,

there's an overall plan. Most of the parking

spaces I think are being picked up -- a lot

of them are being picked up in the shared

concept, which particularly with a revised

site plan makes more sense than it used to

because you could, you walk across North

Street to the garage entrance that is --

presuming there's going to be some parking in

your building, some across the street. So

it's a very close share, somebody's not

walking six blocks.

STEVEN COHEN: Hugh, if I could

interrupt for a second?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: First of all, I

totally buy the shared parking concept.

That's a truth.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: But maybe

procedurally I'm wondering are we being

asked, are you guys asking us now to reduce

the parking requirements by a thousand or are

we still coming at this on a

building-by-building basis? And that

thousand is just a speculative projection for

where you, you know, may be going?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: When we file, we

will file the revised, you know, ratios that

we described which will result in an overall

reduction of parking. I would just add,

though, that, we were -- we're as nervous

about this -- I mean, it's not just a

question of savings on the construction of

parking. The one piece that's untested is

the commercial piece, right? I mean, I think

the residential piece has been tested, you

know, and I think that market is fairly well

known at this point. But I would say the

commercial market, we still face the issue of

as we're trying to attract a commercial

tenant to the site. You know, every time we

respond to an RFP, you know, every single

time it's by root, the broker will ask us to

provide one space per thousand. Right? And

so the challenge we have is that even though

the population of these companies is

changing, and their use is changing, their

real estate team, the senior real estate team

of the company hasn't yet changed their, you

know, their parameters nor have the brokers

and other sorts of folks. There's a lot of

education at all levels of doing this. So I

guess I would say, you know, we, we didn't

simply look at this as, wow, this is a great

idea, let's see if we can save money on the

construction of parking. We're embracing

this as something that helps us make this

parking district work more rationally, you

know, rather than having an empty residential

parking garage during the course of the day

we can use those spaces more efficiently more

effectively.

STEVEN COHEN: I understand it's

still the spillover I'm concerned about. But

still procedurally I'm still not clear.

So when Doug says that we're reducing the ratios in the Zoning, is that Zoning Amendment that we're talking about?

DOUG MANZ: No. So I think we should clarify, too. So all of the requests questions that we're having is really within the Special Permit amendment. So when we request the reduction of ratios, right, it's really within the Special Permit amendment. It leaves the Zoning unchanged. It keeps the Planning Board flexibility that if we rundown that road. We're asking for you to cap. Right? So we reduce the ratios, we would cap it at some number. We say approximately 3800 because we're all in agreement with the analysis. And so, again, but we would be asking for that today. I think what we're really excited about is the shared parking

district. I'll give you some speaking

points.

On the residential side for apartments,

there is definitely no issue going to 0.5

spaces minimum. We have investor sign off on

that on 2020. We got lender sign off on that

on 2020. So again, this goes back to Tom's

point, very well proven.

Condominiums is a different story. The

average is 0.75. We know that even if the

data shows 0.9 spaces per unit, that I should

not count condominium units. The lender, who

puts, you know, the big construction on that

is not going to do that because they're

nervous about it. And so the challenge is

the office side, but I will say that we have

an Orange Line Station which, again, from

Cambridge's perspective the Orange Line

probably seems like the other side of the

world from North Point, it's 150 yards away

with the Gilmore Bridge connection. That's

huge. We have the Green Line, which again is

going to be extended which is huge from our

perspective. We're walking distance today

from the commuter station at North Station.

So surprisingly we have a lot more access to

transportation than say Kendall Square does,

which seems surprising to other folks.

They're just not used to.

The EZ Ride shuttle goes right through

our site. And I think, again, I think that's

where -- the good news is that commercial

parkers can't park in the East Cambridge

neighborhood. It is a bit of a haul, too,

when you think of about. And the residential

uses I think were again are peak demand of

all parking is really that kind of daytime

switchover. So I don't -- I think we feel

very comfortable, but that's why we're

working with the City of Cambridge staff very

closely because we want -- we think this is

an incredible joint opportunity, but it is

something that we, especially be making sure

that we're very careful with. We have to

convince our investors in particular that

we're not making a mistake by constraining

the parking supply. We're trying to be

efficient with it is what we're trying to do.

HUGH RUSSELL: If I run the numbers

in my head, right now two million square feet

of commercial development requires 2,000

spaces. If you change the ratio to 0.9, it's

1800. So there are 200 fewer commercial

spaces that are needed. The retail adds, as

you said, 150 spaces. For residential, if

it's 2500 units, then you're losing a quarter

of that or 625 spaces. So that -- you add

those three things together, you get about

500 net spaces that are five or six hundred

reduction. The additional reduction is the

shared parking which is, you know, maybe 500

spaces out of 4,000. So it's not a huge

amount of sharing, but it's enough to be, you

know, to make it significant, to do. So what

we're being asked, we're being asked to

approve is a Special Permit that allows these

reduction and allows them to make a case for

shared parking.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Hugh, I'd like to

say one more thing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: One of the things

that we have to our advantage is the PTDM

Ordinance, the Parking and Transportation

Demand Management Ordinance, requires

employers to report on their employees' mode

share and the success or lack of success that they may be having. And so that's been in place for quite a while. And we have a lot of information about the mode decisions that people are making, not just in Kendall, but in other areas in the city. And so that's an opportunity we have to learn from what's actually happening in Cambridge and try to make sure that information is used as we're thinking about or as we're talking with you about ideas about where we might go. So, it -- there is a factual base to this stuff that we're able to pull together to look at that.

STEVEN COHEN: I would just say that, again, being somewhat the skeptic on this subject to a kind of narrow range actually that I'm skeptical, but still somewhat skeptical and being the pragmatist, and I guess I, I guess I would be inclined

to, you know, to not actually reduce the ratios upfront but to create a mechanism to reduce them so we have some flexibility as we go along. And if in fact experience shows that our projections were a little bit more optimistic than the reality turns out to be that the mechanism is in there to, you know, go back to the original numbers. You know, simply, you know, you make it an ongoing subject that has to be advocated and demonstrated as we go along rather than simply reducing the ratios upfront.

Now, to some extent the market will speak and you'll have to respond to the market. And as I say, if we're just that, then I say that's your issue and only you bear the consequences. The only concern I express as I say, is if the demand exceeds supply and it spills over elsewhere. And it

may be as you say, you know, I haven't looked

closely, it may be that the possible

alternate locations for parkers are really

not so close or appealing and that this

really isn't a matter of concern. Just

throwing out the concern in general early on

and, you know, perhaps you can address it

when you're actually, you know, present these

matters to us.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes, I think when

we present, we'll present a lot more detail

around the numbers. What we're trying to do

is introduce the concept to you tonight. We

approach this, we're very nervous, you know,

me in particular on the commercial side, you

know, just because I know how we are in terms

of trying to compete for the commercial

tenants that are going to be needed to build

this out. And so we were -- sort of went

over by the numbers, but it certainly

deserves more depth and, you know, a lot of

presentations which we're more than happy to

do.

PAMELA WINTERS: Steve, I think that

Hugh had mentioned also that this is sort of

an ongoing process, and as the buildings come

up and, you know, we'll sort of see how it

goes in terms of --

STEVEN COHEN: I'm advocating for

that also, but it's just that I believe that

the folks are requesting a reduction in the

ratios upfront, and so that -- that kind of

sets the table. It's not a totally

flexible --

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's -- I

would say it's an updating of the ratios to

the current practice.

AHMED NUR: And I'm also thinking

that this is a brief update and which that

they are projecting proposal, maybe testing

the waters and, you know, but they are just

basically proposal and they're projecting

that this is what they're going to most

likely ask. When the time comes, I'm

assuming that even though the city has been

meeting with the developer time to time with

regarding to these updates, that the traffic

engineers, theirs and ours, would update us

in the new proposal.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: If I could just add

one thing. It's not solely the reduction in

spaces. Remember what we're doing here kind

of hand in hand is making it possible for

each of the buildings to work together in

terms of the parking that's created. So the

hand that we were dealt was that there could

be no shared parking between buildings on

this 2020 building site which just seems not,

you know, just seems odd, right?

STEVEN COHEN: It seems crazy.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: It seems crazy. So

the idea was, okay, let's make it possible

for people, even though you're going to the

office building and be able to use the

parking garage across the street in the

residential building, and for the residential

building frankly to get revenue from that

during the course of the day. That's a good

thing, right, from both sides?

Really what we're saying in that

analysis, then we're realizing that we don't

have to build as much parking as what was

originally. So that's part of it. And then

the other part of it is the changes in mode

shares, but that's sort of a lesser piece of

the overall, you know, using the parking in a

rational way.

STEVEN COHEN: I think what you suggested is that it does come to the parking demand in the office buildings.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes, that's the part. I mean, that's why I agree with the Chairman. There's a piece that's untested, yes. It's not tested, as I said, because the companies that we're talking to, we know -- we think we know the population of the workers. And when the companies are building these buildings, they're building the buildings to attract more of those kinds of workers. And most of those worker do not want to own a car. They want to work in a colloquial --

STEVEN COHEN: I was going to say all the executives and managers still want their parking spaces.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: I agree. And they think everybody else wants their parking place. So that's part of the challenge.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I have a comments if I could.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

STEVEN WINTER: We've reached close to our ten o'clock time. I just want to comment that I feel very hopeful and very optimistic about what's happening at North Point. I feel like there's a proponent who is doing urban planning as opposed to simply doing developments. So that makes me very hopeful and very confident. And I also feel like we have a professional staff in the city that is working very closely and clearly there's a free exchange of information. That makes me very confident. And I think that the inner play between the Board and the

proponent is also very good. So in a larger

sense, pulling back, I'm feeling very hopeful

about where we're going. Of course, we're

going to disagree on some points and that's

okay. It's not all hugs and smiles. But in

a general sense we should acknowledge that

we're really going the right way here.

STEVEN COHEN: Great.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Just two things.

Catherine, I'm wondering was there a 2003

rationale for no shared parking?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

The two-thousand -- as I recall the 2003

rationale for that was that people were

afraid of what happens when the buildings get

sold off to different owners and the new

owner wants additional parking on their own

site and suddenly we're getting a lot of

pressure to exceed the cap of parking that

had been carefully calibrating to match the traffic situation. So that was their rationale.

I think what the developer is now talking about is an overall scheme that would have to have built into it what happens when these buildings are split up and broken off. And I think within the context of shared parking and everything we know now that can be accomplished. But that was really in response to people's fears about what, will there be overwhelming pressure once the buildings are sold off to individual owners to exceed the parking cap?

STEVEN COHEN: That of course echos the discussion that we had a few weeks ago with the PUDs --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes. That's exactly right.

STEVEN COHEN: And they make it so that the discussion about some overarching organization to coordinate requirements, you know, within the PUD and perhaps that's how the parking, you know, will be addressed here.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Can I just add, the overwhelming theme that we've seen over the last 10 or 15 years is buildings, in particular residential buildings, that were built let's say prior to '07, way overbuilt the parking. Way overbuilt the parking. Because they built it on the assumption of, you know, one space per unit or whatever it is. And so the owners now have the opposite problem. They're looking, they can't get revenue from all the parking they built. We see it. We have a 2,300 space garage in downtown Boston and only 1500 spaces in the

garage are full every single day. And so,

it's, so, you know, the parking demand has

changed drastically particularly in

residential side.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. Chair, if I can just summarize even

though I'm -- I being kind of the voice of

2003 parking analyst here, I would just like

to -- I would just like to say I actually am

really excited about seeing what the data

shows and how this is going to be

accomplished and think that all of the good

work the city has done in the many years

since I have left and all the analysis that

has been done and data collected could really

result in an exciting change to the project

here that could make it even better. And,

you know, I do think that the data will need

to bear that out. But I'm optimistic that

it's going to and that these situations can

be figured out and it can, you know, be a

better integrated and feel more, more part of

Cambridge and similar to the rest of the

fabric of the city than a place onto itself.

So, that's the updated view of what I think

as opposed to what was pressuring us to set

the ratios the way we did in 2003.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And I just have

one last question.

Who -- does anyone know who owns the

lands on the other side of the Gilmore

Bridge?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Right here?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yeah, so this is

owned by DCR. They've set it up as a some

say temporary, some say permanent, as a truck

yard today. We've been trying to track it

down. It's a little unclear. As of right

now they're -- we believe that they have an

obligation to build these out as fields, but

that's a little unclear as well. So, you

know, part of our effort is not only to move

the next stop of, you know, retail square of

next buildings, but also to make sure that

whatever the obligations are for the

Commonwealth and DCR are on that site as

well.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So ultimately it

may just be open space?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Well, we hope. But

DCR doesn't always agree with us on that. So

we'd love it to be open space, but I'm not

sure that the state agrees with us on that.

STEVEN COHEN: What city is that?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: That's still in

Cambridge.

STEVEN COHEN: That's still Cambridge?

THOMAS O'BRIEN: Yes.

So the borders are Boston -- Charlestown comes across kind of like there. There's a box that comes across. The site plans show it. We actually had a slide I think on this, that. Here's the borders. So, Boston comes like this. This is Charlestown on this side and then this is Somerville.

PAMELA WINTERS: Somerville.

DOUG MANZ: You know, one thing we should update you, too, on as well, that we did go last fall to the City of Somerville before when we acquired the site there was only industrial zone still in Somerville. We have actually updated the Zoning now and have been approved for the Zoning that matches up

to the site plan the Cambridge site plan

basically exactly. And so that's been in

place, too. So now, the site is fully zoned

in all three cities, and then we have at

least Special Permits in Cambridge as well as

Boston.

          THOMAS O'BRIEN: So here's --

imagine this, so next stop for us will be

Palestine I suppose to figure out, but

imagine building this thing, right? This

potentially could require building permits in

all three communities.

          STEVEN COHEN: That serpentine line

otherwise known as squiggly line that's the

boundary?

          HUGH RUSSELL: That's the boundary.

          STEVEN COHEN: Who the hell drew

that line?

          PAMELA WINTERS: A river. There was

a lot of controversy on that too.

THOMAS O'BRIEN: There's been a ton
of money spent on lawyers and the -- all the
rest of it. And the controversy was
resolved.

HUGH RUSSELL: And every time we
would ask Bob Healy the question, he'd say
there's no dispute between Cambridge and
Somerville.

PAMELA WINTERS: There you go.

HUGH RUSSELL: We're not fighting
over that. We each collect our taxes from
the property owner and we -- of course, there
are streets in your neighborhood where there
are houses are split between --

PAMELA WINTERS: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- between the City
of Cambridge and Somerville.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hugh,

if that were true, I wouldn't have a job.

HUGH RUSSELL: The only thing I would say is that on the parking question, the interests of the city and the interest of the developer, are very closely aligned. In total, you know, there are places where the developer gets pushes from potential clients to put in more parking and, you know, their nervous lenders on certain things that they have to respond to, but they don't want to build parking that's empty and nor do we. At least there's probably an ideal vacancy rate of a parking garage which is probably a little bit, there always should be a space available for the guy that's coming home at eleven o'clock at night to park his car. And because there are really very few spillover options, we can trust that that alignment exists. And ever tried to find a parking

place between Cambridge Street and O'Brien

Highway for one reason or another, I used to

when I was supervising reconstruction of a

building in North Point, I would -- several

times I'd tried that and realized what a

foolish idea that was. And so I don't think

that's changed in the 15 years since I was

doing that.

So are we complete?

AHMED NUR: We are.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I believe so.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much

for this update and the work you're putting

in.

BRIAN MURPHY: I have some papers

for the members as well.

(Whereupon, at 10:05 p.m., the

Planning Board Adjourned.)

ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

The original of the Errata Sheet has been delivered to Community Development Department.

When the Errata Sheet has been completed and signed, a copy thereof should be delivered to each party of record and the **ORIGINAL** delivered to Community Development Department to whom the original transcript was delivered.

INSTRUCTIONS

After reading this volume of Planning Board, indicate any corrections or changes to testimony and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. **DO NOT** make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself.

REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN RECEIVED.

ATTACH TO PLANNING BOARD
DATE: 06/03/2014
REP: CAZ

ERRATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript of Planning Board, note any change or correction to testimony and the reason therefor on this sheet. **DO NOT** make any marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. Sign and date this errata sheet (before a Notary Public, if required). Refer to Page 215 of the transcript for Errata Sheet distribution instructions.

PAGE   **LINE**

_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____
_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____
_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____
_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____
_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____
_____   _____   CHANGE: _____
                          REASON: _____

        I have read the foregoing transcript of Planning Board, and except for any corrections or changes noted above, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statements made.

                              _____

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BRISTOL, SS.

I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned Notary Public, certify that:

I am not related to any of the parties in this matter by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

I further certify that the testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 23rd day of June, 2014.

_____
Catherine L. Zelinski
Notary Public
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 147703

My Commission Expires:
April 23, 2015

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.

lead [2] - 104:7, 122:16
leads [1] - 125:2
leap [1] - 181:5
learn [1] - 196:7
learned [3] - 169:2, 169:7, 170:2
learning [2] - 172:12, 172:18
lease [1] - 134:5
least [6] - 85:1, 111:1, 132:16, 134:7, 211:5, 213:12
leave [2] - 17:4, 61:11
leaves [1] - 191:11
leaving [2] - 127:1, 127:5
Lechmere [6] - 99:18, 107:16, 107:17, 139:15, 139:18, 141:8
left [5] - 59:16, 97:2, 112:10, 167:19, 207:14
legal [4] - 36:15, 51:9, 70:15, 75:3
legislation [1] - 28:16
lender [2] - 192:6, 192:12
lenders [2] - 132:6, 213:9
less [12] - 18:17, 63:4, 63:12, 66:18, 72:2, 121:2, 121:4, 125:4, 129:14, 132:5, 133:1, 157:17
lesser [1] - 201:18
letter [6] - 17:15, 29:18, 35:6, 36:17, 36:18
letters [1] - 19:4
level [1] - 94:6
levels [1] - 190:7
leverage [1] - 88:3
License [1] - 217:14
life [2] - 93:4, 172:6
lifted [2] - 72:8, 72:9
lifts [1] - 71:3
light [3] - 21:4, 118:18, 170:1
likely [1] - 200:6
limit [1] - 14:17
limited [3] - 48:3, 151:10, 162:12
line [7] - 15:6, 16:6, 65:13, 83:14, 211:13, 211:14, 211:18
Line [12] - 99:4, 99:8, 101:16, 105:11, 105:15, 119:4,

143:5, 143:17, 175:9, 192:17, 192:18, 193:3
LINE [1] - 216:9
lines [1] - 126:14
listening [5] - 3:18, 35:15, 76:14, 104:15, 168:11
Listening [1] - 4:4
lit [1] - 23:3
live [6] - 52:7, 56:1, 60:14, 61:5, 164:10, 166:3
liveable [1] - 75:17
living [1] - 162:17
LIZA [35] - 9:6, 10:3, 10:15, 10:19, 11:5, 14:13, 15:2, 15:5, 15:12, 15:15, 15:19, 16:5, 16:10, 16:13, 18:4, 19:2, 19:11, 30:10, 31:1, 31:7, 31:11, 34:4, 34:17, 35:16, 36:1, 36:7, 38:3, 39:5, 39:14, 39:16, 40:1, 40:4, 40:6, 60:6, 90:14
Liza [5] - 1:14, 35:2, 39:3, 40:2, 85:16
Liza's [1] - 7:7
load [1] - 166:8
local [2] - 29:4, 94:1
locale [1] - 78:2
located [5] - 2:9, 97:9, 98:18, 101:4, 108:9
location [8] - 7:4, 7:5, 23:16, 35:13, 100:11, 107:11, 107:16, 184:13
locations [2] - 184:8, 198:3
logo [1] - 16:18
look [22] - 13:17, 27:12, 32:8, 33:5, 34:16, 38:4, 39:2, 39:17, 45:16, 53:4, 53:9, 55:19, 69:11, 86:9, 87:3, 111:13, 111:14, 121:8, 128:7, 168:8, 190:9, 196:13
looked [4] - 43:10, 54:12, 69:12, 198:1
looking [17] - 22:1, 25:13, 45:18, 48:6, 53:2, 68:10, 70:9, 111:12, 112:9, 119:3, 124:17, 124:19, 160:7, 168:9, 171:6, 186:10, 206:16

looks [4] - 33:10, 38:14, 45:19, 52:6
Loomis [10] - 48:16, 57:8, 60:15, 61:6, 61:7, 63:15, 63:16, 65:1, 76:7
loop [1] - 141:4
Lopez [2] - 38:5, 38:10
lose [1] - 157:17
losing [1] - 194:18
love [4] - 119:2, 178:14, 178:15, 209:15
low [8] - 52:10, 124:7, 124:11, 124:12, 124:13, 127:12, 160:6, 186:6
lower [6] - 15:6, 16:7, 16:9, 62:3, 125:2, 129:15

M

main [1] - 13:13
maintain [2] - 181:1, 182:19
Major [4] - 91:5, 91:8, 95:3, 95:18
major [2] - 97:11, 99:12
majority [2] - 12:1, 89:7
makers [1] - 94:11
Mall [1] - 109:12
manage [2] - 108:16, 152:19
managed [3] - 76:4, 123:18, 153:7
Management [1] - 195:18
Manager [1] - 1:12
managers [1] - 202:18
managing [2] - 57:16, 91:13
Manchester [1] - 143:18
mandate [1] - 86:8
Manz [2] - 93:7, 117:9
MANZ [16] - 112:18, 113:16, 117:9, 128:6, 138:12, 144:16, 146:7, 150:16, 151:14, 152:18, 155:10, 157:12, 181:2, 182:15, 191:5, 210:13
Map [1] - 2:8
map [9] - 45:17,

45:18, 55:19, 56:1, 59:8, 59:15, 65:7, 70:9, 111:13
margin [1] - 67:5
Marijuana [1] - 5:5
market [27] - 73:9, 96:10, 106:13, 106:18, 107:6, 107:19, 116:2, 142:4, 144:5, 144:8, 144:9, 144:10, 144:11, 144:17, 145:7, 145:8, 145:9, 145:17, 147:2, 148:7, 148:12, 148:19, 183:7, 189:11, 189:13, 197:13, 197:15
marketability [1] - 184:19
markets [1] - 148:14
markings [1] - 112:10
marks [2] - 215:14, 216:6
marriage [1] - 217:6
Marriott [1] - 3:17
mass [1] - 157:15
Massachusetts [3] - 1:7, 143:10, 145:12
MASSACHUSETTS [1] - 217:2
Master [2] - 4:3, 148:8
master [4] - 4:6, 94:17, 95:11, 104:12
match [1] - 205:1
matched [2] - 169:4, 171:8
matches [1] - 210:19
material [4] - 7:16, 88:18, 122:17, 129:8
materials [2] - 5:2, 9:19
matter [3] - 198:5, 217:6, 217:7
matters [3] - 24:8, 99:4, 198:9
maximize [1] - 59:5
maximum [3] - 110:10, 132:1, 156:3
MBTA [6] - 91:13, 120:14, 141:10, 143:4, 143:14, 149:10
mean [31] - 19:18, 20:14, 22:9, 39:7, 54:18, 61:1, 70:14, 74:8, 79:6, 81:17, 82:5, 82:13, 82:15, 132:19, 133:3,

144:8, 144:11, 144:17, 155:4, 157:15, 160:12, 162:5, 166:17, 177:17, 184:5, 184:9, 186:5, 187:1, 189:6, 189:9, 202:6
meaning [1] - 101:18
MEANS [1] - 217:18
means [2] - 54:18, 156:12
meant [4] - 123:6, 146:19, 151:17, 155:11
mechanics [1] - 80:9
mechanism [3] - 81:13, 197:2, 197:7
meddling [1] - 80:8
Medical [1] - 5:5
Medicine [3] - 2:5, 10:5, 11:8
meet [7] - 19:12, 45:5, 68:3, 69:2, 91:10, 128:4, 137:11
meeting [17] - 3:6, 3:15, 4:16, 7:3, 7:8, 9:3, 21:14, 34:19, 40:11, 43:3, 58:5, 58:9, 106:15, 119:1, 119:19, 122:12, 200:8
Meeting [1] - 2:4
meetings [4] - 6:14, 8:1, 104:19, 166:2
member [1] - 38:4
Member [5] - 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11
MEMBER [1] - 212:19
members [10] - 9:18, 37:18, 58:10, 84:5, 84:10, 90:10, 95:2, 119:17, 175:13, 214:16
Members [2] - 3:2, 55:8
memo [2] - 43:6, 118:12
Memorial [2] - 147:13, 147:15
mention [2] - 30:6, 136:12
mentioned [4] - 57:7, 180:1, 199:6
mercy [1] - 57:15
merged [1] - 46:14
message [1] - 20:12
metered [7] - 150:19, 151:11, 151:19, 152:7, 152:15, 153:9, 170:18
methodically [1] -