PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, December 2, 2014

7:00 p.m.
in
Second Floor Meeting Room
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair
Tom Sieniewicz, Member
Steven A. Cohen, Member
Louis J. Bacci, Jr., Member
Mary T. Flynn, Member
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member
Thacher Tiffany, Associate Member

Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for
Community Development

Community Development Staff:
Jeff Roberts
Suzannah Bigolin

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

* * * * *

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And I would like to welcome our three new members; Thacher Tiffany, Louis Bacci, and Mary Flynn. I was going to say Mary is not here with us, but of course this room is very different than when you were here.

MARY FLYNN: Yes, 20 years ago we didn't have any microphones or anything. So it was very different.

HUGH RUSSELL: Was it held at the Veteran's Affairs Office or something?

MARY FLYNN: I really don't even remember. It may have been the Arts Council. I don't remember. Maybe.

HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe the Arts Council.

Okay, the first item on our agenda is the update by Brian Murphy.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, Jeff Roberts, Community Development. It seems Brian may have been tied up somewhere else, so I will do the update.

So coming up in the future, and then for the benefit of people who weren't there, but I think all the members of the Board here were there, last night was a City Council roundtable discussion with the Planning Board, and there will be a follow-up session of that roundtable scheduled for January 12th.

For upcoming scheduled public hearings, on December 16th at the Planning Board we will have two public hearings on two Zoning petitions. One is the City Council petition to rezone a section of Walden Street from a

Business A to a Residence C-1 District.

There's also a hearing on a petition from the

Whitehead Institute to change the -- to amend

the Zoning for the MXD District which is the

district we're looking at tonight. That

should be interesting.

Those are the only scheduled public

hearings we have scheduled at this point.

But we do have some tentative items of

business to -- just to as a preview, on

December 16th, we may again tentatively have

an update on the process for the Foundry

Building, which I think many members are

familiar with. It was a building granted to

the city as a part of the Alexandria plan,

rezoning and plan.

And then on January 6th we expect at

this point to be back to the Planning Board

for continued discussion of the Volpe Zoning

Proposal stemming from the Kendall Square

planning process as well as the -- as well as

the initiatives from the Volpe Center and the

GSA.

Another date that is interesting to

keep in mind is January 20th of the Planning

Board. It is our intent, and I think Brian

mentioned this last time, it is our intent at

this time to hear three things that are all

related to the North Point area at that

meeting. There will be a -- we're trying to

get the MBTA to give a presentation on the

Lechmere Station design, which is advancing

to completion. We're -- we'll be having a

public hearing on the Major Amendment from

the HYM North Point developers, which is a

continuation of a case that was -- that had

its preliminary determination earlier in the

fall. And similarly, we'll be planning to do

a second public hearing for a Major Amendment

on the Avalon North Point. So it will be an

interesting opportunity for the Board to

review all of those at once.

We also, there is another Zoning

Petition that we have not yet confirmed or

scheduled a hearing date, but it's a petition

from Normandy and Twining development

partnership to rezone a portion of the

Central Square area at the corner of

Massachusetts Avenue and Main Street. And

we'll be providing more information about

that for the Board as we get closer to a

hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: It might be useful

for us to see that before our next roundtable

meeting with the Council, because they were

talking to us about it and we hadn't see it.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, we will endeavor

to do that. The petition has been filed. We should at least have the petition on our website fairly soon. There will be analysis from staff to follow.

And a couple other dates to point out are February 3rd and 10th, those are the dates that are reserved for Town Gown discussions. And as we had discussed with the Board last year, the plan is to have the February 3rd meeting be dedicated to presentations from the institutions and public comment, and then the February 10th meeting, at least the first part of the meeting will be reserved for more of a dialogue between Planning Board and representatives of the institutions.

So that's what we have on the schedule looking forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Just to remind

the Board the first meeting in January, the

Board has to elect a Chair and we do that

every year.

Are there meeting transcripts?

JEFF ROBERTS: At this time there

are no new meeting transcripts.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think there was

at least one Zoning Appeal case?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, there was a

request to review a case at 186-188 River

Street. This is a -- and I have the file

here and I'll pass it around for the -- pass

it around for Board Members to look at. This

is a rather unusual building on River Street.

It's commercial in nature. It's a building

with one large ground story and then it rises

up to a much smaller second story component

on top of the building. It's a building that

was sold, and the owner is proposing to

enlarge the existing structure so that it will remain a two-story building. It will be converted into three residential units, which I think I would probably describe as town home style units in a row, each being a two-story unit with a roof terrace on top. So this is a project that requires numerous variances and Special Permits, as you mentioned, to parking.

If you look within that package, there's a picture of the property. And I think it could be best described as filling out the second story. Taking what is now a partial second story and filling it out so that it covers the entire footprint of the building.

HUGH RUSSELL: I see. And there's one car that will be partially within the required front yard setback?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Correct.

JEFF ROBERTS: Oh, and the attorney representing that case is also present so... and may be willing to answer questions.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the purpose of the Planning Board review of the Zoning Board cases is so that the -- we can inform the or remind the Zoning Board of the overall planning considerations that might be part of this proposal. They've also particularly asked us to do a design review of two kinds of cases: Sign variance cases and cell tower cases. So -- and we've been trying to get Suzannah to help us particularly with the cell tower cases which are -- often take us a lot of time.

So several of us have actually served on the Zoning Board of Appeal and some of us a very long time ago, and so we have, you

know, great confidence that the Zoning Board

can do the job of hearing testimony and

listening to abutters, making sensible

decisions. But if there's something that

would help them in making that decision, we

help with that. Occasionally we'll offer a

letter of support if we think it's -- if some

particular project is very much in the public

interest. So you'll hear often we'll say

we'll leave it to the Zoning Board to vote

upon. So eventually those drawings will find

their way to you two guys and then we can

talk about it.

　　　　　LOUIS BACCI: I actually walked by

it.

　　　　　HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

　　　　　THACHER TIFFANY: What's the cross

street?

　　　　　LOUIS BACCI: Kelly.

HUGH RUSSELL: I assume that not too long from now the cases will be electronically available. It's actually at the forefront of having electronic billing permit submissions. That would mean we could review them before. And ideally they'll be out there so anyone can review them beforehand.

STEVEN COHEN: So is the parking space actually between the building and the street?

HUGH RUSSELL: No. Beside the building.

STEVEN COHEN: Beside the building within the setback?

HUGH RUSSELL: And is the abutting -- where is the abutting building? Also up on the street?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I'm sorry?

HUGH RUSSELL: Is the abutting
building on the other side of the parking
space up near the street?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes. It
has almost a zero setback there.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: But the
plan involves removing the two car garage
that's in the rear now and creating three
surface parking spaces, but the setbacks on
the parking spaces aren't completely
compliant.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

Again, the -- when I arrived on the
Board 25 years ago, the Board was vigilant
about parking in front yards and so we always
look at that. And if there's a street where
everybody has a front yard and somebody wants
to park there in the front yard, we're -- we

don't like that. This is a case where I
don't think there's any -- you know, there
isn't any front yards and the cars are pretty
well shielded by the adjacent structures. So
I think our usual dealing of not liking cars
in front yards is hampered by the fact that
you're not going to really see them unless
you're right next to them in which case
(inaudible).

Personally I fell comfortable leaving
this to the Zoning Board.

Okay? So we should pass that back to
Jeff when you're done.

The next item on the agenda is public
hearing case No. 294, 88 Ames Street. A
project review Special Permit for a new
proposed apartment building, some retail on
the ground floor.

I know Jeff wants to give us sort of a

background to put this within the regulatory

framework because this project is also a

better view by the Cambridge Redevelopment

Authority. But I would like to claim for the

Planning Board the -- this project, because

15 years ago we said we want Boston

Properties to build housing. And we

recognized that the only way we were going to

do that was to give them floor area that can

only be used for housing. In addition, the

project was very far advanced. It basically

committed all of the property under their

control, and so through a fairly tortuous

process, at least for them, we finally have

this proposal in front of us.

       Now, what we'll do is we will hear a

presentation from Jeff, who will sort of

orient us, and then the petitioner will

explain the project to everybody in the room.

There's an opportunity for us to ask questions, sort of a fact if there's something that isn't clear from which you've heard that you think is important to be out there when we get public comment. Usually there aren't very many of those, but sometimes it's whatever it is. And then we would go to public testimony. There's a sign-up sheet over there that people have signed up on, and we'll call people in the order that they've signed up. After that, we will start talking about the case among ourselves. It's usual for a case of this size that we'll come up with a few items that we -- a few or perhaps many items that we want more information on, we're thinking on. And so we won't actually vote on a case tonight in all probability, but you know, I'm only one person here. So it's about what

basically all of us want to do.

So, Jeff, do you want to start off?

JEFF ROBERTS: Sure, Mr. Chair. And I'll actually just pick up where you left off with the history, that this is a Special Zoning District in the city. It was created as part of an urban renewal plan. And while there was housing included in that plan from the beginning, it wasn't really until the Planning Board, through the citywide rezoning took that action of adding the 200,000 square feet of only -- of floor area only for residential use that this became a more real notion. And in fact was a -- was permitted, became a project that was permitted by the Planning Board in the past. That project ultimately did not get built, and in its place was built the Broad Institute expansion, which is across the street at 75

Ames Street. And as part of that project

which had a rezoning associated with it, the

Boston Properties, which is the developer of

this site under the authority of the

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, was asked

to identify alternate sites where the housing

could go.

This is one of the sites that was

identified at that time. That was in 2010.

And a few years later Boston Properties came

forward with a proposal to proceed with

housing on that site, but also required

additional actions by the City Council. So

those of you who are on the Board last year

remember that there was a Zoning change which

modified some of the dimensional requirements

to allow this site to be used, and there was

also a disposition process so that the owner,

the developer of the project could acquire a

section of Ames Street from the city which

was -- which was agreed to for a price, and

under the stipulation that the applicant

would redesign and rebuild or would rebuild

Ames Street according to the city's design.

So that's a -- just a note that that's a

parallel process that's going on where the

city is finalizing and establishing the final

design for Ames Street.

One of the particular aspects of that,

of that disposition, which is notable for the

Board, is that the open space that's created

on the ground level as a result of this

project being built and the other portions of

the roadway being sold to Boston Properties

is that the Planning Board will also

review -- as well as reviewing the project,

reviews and approves the open space created

at the ground level.

So just to jump back quickly to the
Zoning. This is a building that meets the
Zoning requirements of this area. It's
unlike other Zoning Districts in the city
because it establishes total aggregate gross
floor area limitations on certain uses rather
than more specific lot by lot dimensional
requirements. This project meets the gross
floor area requirements. In fact, with the
development of this project, it will just
about reach the development cap in the entire
district.

There is, along with the 200,000 square
feet of residential, some remaining gross
floor area for commercial use, which the
proposal is suggesting will be retail at the
ground and second floors.

The number of dwelling units is not
constrained by Zoning. So in this case it's

proposing 280 units. That's within the

limitation because there is no limitation.

But there is a requirement for affordable

units to be contributed to the city under the

inclusionary housing requirements.

Open space, I already mentioned.

Parking, the rezoning from last year

establishes a minimum parking of 0.5 space or

a half a space for every dwelling unit or one

space for every two dwelling units, which is

being proposed.

The most recent planning discussions

and Zoning discussions in the Kendall Square

area assume that projects would adhere to the

bicycle parking requirements which were

viewed and endorsed and sent forward by the

Planning Board in 2012 as a process that CDD

undertook, and the City Council adopted those

in 2012. So what the applicant is seeking in

this proposal is a modification to the

bicycle parking requirements that is

authorized in the Zoning. And it was created

because when we were working on this, we

acknowledged that the thinking about what's

the best way to provide bicycle parking is

something that would evolve over time as more

people are bicycling in the city, and we

wanted to leave some opportunity for an

exploration of alternative technologies or

other systems that might actually provide

bicycle parking in a way that's equal to or

better than what the strict requirements of

the Zoning provide. The requirements of the

Zoning are really meant to be the simplest

and most straight forward set of requirements

for providing adequate bicycle parking.

     And then the final piece of the Zoning

is the project review Special Permit. Most

projects in the MXD District have not

required review and approval by the Planning

Board, but when the additional gross floor

area was created for residential use in 2001,

the provision was included that that

residential project would be subject to the

Article 19 project review Special Permit.

And there are two components to that. There

is a review of traffic impacts, and the

Planning Board would be looking to the

information provided in the traffic impact

study as well as comments provided from

Traffic, Parking and Transportation

Department as well as to make a determination

of what the anticipated impact of the project

will be and whether adequate efforts are

being made to mitigate those impacts through

the proposal. So that's one component of the

project via Special Permit.

And the other is the urban design review. And the Planning Board's role, again, with the assistance of staff, is to determine whether or not the project meets the citywide urban design requirements.

And as you mentioned, Mr. Chair, this is somewhat of an unusual project in that it also has design review jurisdiction by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. And one way to think about those two jurisdictions is that the -- it's the jurisdiction of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority to see that the project is meeting specific goals of the Kendall Square urban design -- urban renewal plan, while the Planning Board's role is to see if the project meets the broader citywide design objectives. So that summarizes where this project sits in terms of the Zoning and the planning.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there anything left for Jim to say?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Not much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Who's going to start from Boston Properties?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I'll do that. Thank you. Thank you, good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. For the record, James Rafferty. I'm an attorney with offices at Adams and Rafferty located at 675 Mass. Avenue in Cambridge. As noted by the Chair, you know, we have all these preparatory meetings and everyone is assigned a role, and my role was to provide the background of the Zoning, and lay out what relief was required. Fortunately I don't get paid by the word. Mr. Roberts' memo and summary is right on target.

I just picked up on two things that I

think are relevant for the Board's understanding here.

One is credit does belong with this body with regard to the additional GFA here. There was a less than lightened proposal that accompanied the citywide rezoning that suggested that the last available GFA in Cambridge Center be restricted to housing. And a wise member of this Board who served for some years suggested that if you really want to make something happen, the way to do it is to incentivize it, not to prevent it from happening. So it was suggested that if we add 200,000 square feet of GFA, an opportunity there when the market conditions were favorable, we would likely see it. So in the midst of a citywide rezoning that saw down zoning nearly everywhere, the MXD District saw an increase of 200,000 square

feet. Of course this created expectations on

the part of Mr. Cantalupa for years to come,

but, you know, we could do things contrary to

efforts that were moving in the other

direction. But the reality is that this has

been a long sought after project. In fact,

the rezoning associated with the Broad was

accompanied by a letter of commitment that

was signed by Boston Properties and contained

within the letter of commitment an agreement

negotiated with the City Council at the time.

There are financial penalties that increase

every year if the housing is not produced.

So just by being here tonight Boston

Properties is saving money.

The requirement was that they needed to

come forward within so many years of the

Certificate of Occupancy for the Broad.

They're way ahead of that schedule and

Mr. Cantalupa will share with you the

practice. There were further additional

commitments associated with what we call the

Google connector and the City Council action

around that. Also it included an added

commitment of Boston Properties to bring

forward the housing proposal within a year.

They have done that. They have spent the

better part of the last year or so working

with the Community Development Department,

and of course the City Council on the

disposition instruments needed to effect Ames

Street as well as the Zoning changes which

really are pretty technical and didn't do

much to change the GFA and the heights

associated with the building. So what you're

seeing here today is really the form and

structure you've been seeing for years. It

was what was before you in form when the

rezoning was evaluated. But what the rezoning allowed us to do was to change the way lot areas and open spaces were calculated within this so-called subdistrict.

So having said all of that, I have very little to add. Mr. Cantalupa is going to kind of give a little bit of introduction and background and the rest of the team then is tasked with walking you through the building, sharing the architecture with you, and also helping you understand some of the issues. I just point out the one issue that we spent a fair bit of time on, and of a project this size, it was perhaps in many respects the most dominant issue that we spent time on and that was the bicycle parking requirements. Because since the adoption of the requirements, we've tried to fit this in to this plan. And as you know already and

you'll learn perhaps in greater detail during

this presentation, this was a significantly

constrained site. The architects deserve a

great deal of credit for being able to fit

this building in between two other buildings

in front of an active loading dock and

garage. So there are significant physical

constraints that influenced some of the

decisions around bicycle parking and its

location. And it is true that the criteria

for the Planning Board Special Permits around

modifications suggest that the alternatives

proposed must be sufficiently comparable and

we hope you'll be able to conclude based on

our presentations and the information that

we've submitted that what's proposed is

sufficiently comparable and certainly meets

the spirit, if not the outright, requirements

of the Ordinance. With regard to the number

of bicycle spaces there are a few areas which

you'll see in the application around

distances to elevators, location of certain

bicycles. But we've got an awful lot of

bicycles here because as the Ordinance

requires it and it's seen as a very

bicycle-friendly location. The parking

ratios here presume a reduced amount of auto

usage. So there's no effort here to not

fully embrace bicycle opportunities. There

just are some very really physical

constraints that have led to the seeking of

that relief.

Thank you. Here's Mr. Cantalupa.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Thank you, Jim.

Members of the Board. With those two

introductory comments, I really don't have

much to say so I'll get right to it. Let me

take a moment to introduce our team to you.

I am Mike Cantalupa with Boston Properties. Our architect for the project is FX Fowle out of New York. John Skyler and Dan Piselli are here to describe the project. Clara Batchelor is here from CVA Landscape Architects who is also doing the landscape work for us. VHB is representing us on the traffic, this site civil and other environmental, and they're here to make a proportion of the presentation, Mark Gunghans and (name) are here, and Mike (inaudible) and Dave Stewart and Ben Lavery from Boston Properties.

One thing I will just mention to you as a start in selecting FX Fowle to do the project, one of the things that particularly appealed to us was there portfolio of experience in New York and in fitting for lack of a better term, buildings into tight

urban sites. And so as Jim pointed out, when we started the work on this site, we recognize that we had some real design challenges. And we think FX has brought a particularly keen and creative sense to the site and has done a great job.

Let me also just say that in making this presentation, Boston Properties is actually proposing to develop the housing here. I think there's been some discussion in various parts of the city that I've heard that we are not necessarily housing developers. That's really not the case. We actually have developed a fair amount of housing. Recently in Boston at Atlantic Wharf. And our D.C. office, and in fact have four towers under various stages of planning here in the Greater Boston area for housing. We're committed to doing it. We want to do

it particularly in settings with Cambridge center. They're large, mixed use, they're urban, and we think it makes sense to develop it ourselves and to own it and manage it ourselves.

The context I think has been described particularly well here with respect to the Broad Zoning that allowed us to modify the plan for the housing. I'll just remind some people that in addition to this Planning Board reviewing the housing plan for housing, where the second Broad building now sits, we in fact had actually made a commitment to build it. We had ordered steel for the project and then, you know, the worst recession known to mankind happened in 2008 and we had to abandon our plans. And thank you very much for allowing us to modify those plans and accommodate the Broad's growth

because that I think is a win for all of us.

Jim has adequately described the Google development where we modified the Zoning. I'll just point out between the Zoning changes that were allowed for the Broad and the Google plan where those projects happened, the net result of that we think is activation of the street to a much greater degree, certainly along Ames Street, which up until the more recent development I think has been -- almost can be viewed as a service road. The net effect of those developments going forward also had the benefit of shielding above grade parking structures from the street. And so, those, I think, were positives from an urban planning standpoint. This project, too, will do the same exact thing. It will further activate Ames Street very clearly and I think you'll agree will

lock a pretty delighted patch of the street, of Ames Street, from the one of the parking garages in Cambridge.

I think that is essentially what I'd like to describe. I think everybody else has touched base pretty clearly on the context. You have in fact already taken some actions in favor of this project in reviewing the disposition of a portion of Ames Street and the series of zone changes. So we think the table is pretty well set to execute the project. So with that let me turn things over to John Skyler from FX Fowle who will begin to describe the project.

JOHN SKYLER: John Skyler. I'm a partner with FX Fowle Architects. Let me walk you through this project very quickly.

So the site itself is this little red area here, which is just to the east of Ames

Street.

This is Main Street.

This is Broadway.

This is Five Cambridge Center, Four Cambridge Center, Broad Institute. And this is what has historically been a service alley and the -- and this presentation will be describing it as Pioneer Way.

And just to highlight again about 200,000 square feet of residential area. This doesn't include the retail. Retail can be up to about 16,000 square feet. We're looking at 250 for height maximum. And then its complying with the MXD District Zoning.

So just to orient you again. Here's the overall site plan. The piece in red is our roof plan. This is Ames Street. Main Street. Broadway. This is Five Cambridge Center, Four Cambridge Center. This is the

existing parking structure. And through this area here what is known as the Google Connector across there. And this is what heretofore had been the service alley, which is called Pioneer Way.

So this is a great site, but it's a very challenging site. It has many significant constraints. The photograph on the left shows the site itself which is really this parking garage. The site is both in front of and on top of that existing garage and it's threaded between two adjacent buildings, Four Cambridge Center on the left, Five Cambridge Center on the right. Very tight site just like we like them. And the section on the right side, which is looking to the north, works from the Broad Institute on the left, Ames Street. This is the overall zone of the tower. And then this

shows the overlap with the existing parking

structure and the area that's hatched right

here shows the portion that will be removed

to the demolition.

So the building's really organized in

two simple parts. There's a base and there's

a top. And within the base there's a retail

zone and the residential entry zone that's

really concentrated along Ames Street itself.

And then we've taken the backup house, the

service bits, the loading dock, and all those

things and we've tucked those around to the

side off of Pioneer Way, so you've been able

to maximize the activity along the street

here. And then at the second floor, on the

north side, there's an additional floor

retail. The balance of that floor is

residential, the third floor is residential,

and at the fourth floor this is where you get

the setback. You get an amenity space for
the residential functions and exterior
terrace for the use of the residences. At
the top of the building, a fully enclosed
mechanical penthouse.

So, this is an overall view of the
tower and the project from the southwest with
Ames Street in the foreground, Main Street on
the right, Broadway on the left, and for
purposes of clarity, we've taken a little bit
of artistic license and we've eliminated the
buildings in the foreground. You can still
see the outline right through here so just to
help you understand what's going on with the
project.

So, the overall building is made up of
a couple simple elements in terms of its
composition all in response to the urban
condition. So there's a three-story base.

That reinforces that pedestrian zone along

the street, relates to a projecting base of

Five Cambridge Center and lines in general

with many of the lower buildings along Main

Street and Broadway. And then there's a

reveal zone set back right through here which

sets up a kind of transition between the base

and the tower. The tower itself is comprised

of two volumes; one of them which is oriented

more towards Ames Street, and it really deals

with kind of neighborhood scale. And then a

second volume which comes up and caps over

the top of the building and works in concert

with the rest of the volume to create a city

scale presence and a skyline presence and

identity.

Now, in terms of the exterior design of

the building, and we really were working

simultaneously both inside out and -- inside

out and outside in. And so from the inside
we were concerned about light and air and
views, privacy, and we were also trying to
manage the issues about energy consumption
through the ratio of glass to solid wall.
From the outside in, we're concerned about
the views towards the building and the manner
in which it would frame outdoor spaces and
exterior public spaces. So when we started
looking at the overall facade, first thing we
did is when we were looking at the
relationship to the adjacent buildings, we
tried to understand where it was tightest.
And in those areas this is where we had kind
of the, kind of most constrained areas, we
had the densest facade. The areas where the
best views were, and most light and air, is
where we had the most open areas. So within
the densest areas we then took that and we

started to articulate that with these

vertical piers and have punched windows in

them, and then as you get towards the better

views, then it opens up and these are more

horizontal strip windows. The last move that

occurs is that the building makes another

transition both towards the views and toward

the top, so it opens up more as you go up

vertically and horizontally towards the

views.

This is a view looking north on Ames

Street, Five Cambridge Center on the right

side, Broad on the left. And this is a view

looking south on Ames Street. And, you know,

point out here with -- well, Four Cambridge

Center on the left, the Broad Institute on

the right. And so here you can really see

how that base establishes the street wall and

in kind of forms that space at the north end

of Broadway and right at that point at Mead

Hall. And this right through here sets up

the pedestrian scale of elements and the

neighborhood scaled elements as they work

their way up.

And now this is a view looking west on

Main Street with the MTA Kendall Square stop

in the foreground, Main Street plaza through

there. And here you can see the building

beyond. We've kind of a slenderer profile

that presents itself on the public space of

the plaza as well as the park itself. And

you can also see the interrelationship

between the two volumes and how they're

working to create that skyline presence and

identity.

So, the building is intended to be a

high performance sustainably designed

project. A few of the highlights are that

we're tracking towards LEED Silver, and we're

anticipating and including some innovative

tenant control which studies have shown would

reduce energy consumption if the individual

tenants have their own control. So imagine

some of the systems such as Nest, for

example.

We will be employing green roofs at the

habitable terraces, and additional

landscaping for the accessible terraces.

Now, one of the issues that we've been

dealing with is the issue of kind of climate

change and our response for resiliency there.

And so we've taken the electrical equipment

that would normally be located in the

basement to the building and we brought that

above at the first floor. These are the kind

of the most vulnerable portions of the

building, hardest to replace and get the

building back online.

Water conservation here really falls into two categories: One, is we wanted to reduce the potable consumption. And we did that through low flow fixtures and efficient irrigation systems. And then the other issue is just improving the storm water runoff quality and we did that through high filtration.

And so with that I'm going to hand it over to Clara and she'll talk about the public realm.

CLARA BATCHELOR: Hi, I'm Clara Batchelor. And so here you have the overall site plan. This is the building facade as it faces Ames Street. And with the landscape we've tried to really unify all of Ames Street on this side and create a dynamic and inviting pedestrian realm. And we've -- we

can think of it into four parts:

This is the south end. This is Legal
Seafoods here. This is the sidewalk in front
of the retail space for the most part. This
is the Mead Hall end, and Broadway's here.
And first I'll talk a little bit about this
space.

Can we go back one? I forgot to say
one thing.

We've tried to -- we've used the
Cambridge city standards for the sidewalks
along here with the concrete scored into
five-foot squared sections and the brick,
brick edge, and that unifies the space. And
then in a few places we've added some
decorative (inaudible).

And so the property line is right here,
but we've widened the sidewalk into the
private area to create some best pocket parks

to add additional green to make comfortable

sitting areas for pedestrians to get them out

of the flow of the walking but make it

comfortable and add life and to look at the

activity in the street. We've also created

some more private spaces that will be

associated with the restaurants to give

seating areas for the patrons and we've

created decorative paving here.

And so here you see the vest pocket

park as it's defined by the broadening of the

sidewalk. It's definitely given definition

by the end of the building and the base of

the building where the retail turns the

corner and adds life to this area as well.

And the base of the building also relates to

the pedestrian scale of this area. And the

vest pocket park itself is a small pocket

park, has a steel edge to help define the

areas, contemporary benches, and some tall linear lights that gives some height but still keeps it very transparent.

Here we have the sidewalk and the public space in front of the retail part of the building. And another very important item to mention here is that the one place where we've changed the sidewalk paving in the pedestrian realm is at the entrance to the housing, and so we really wanted to announce that this is the entrance to the apartment building, this is where you come home to. So that's the one area where we've changed the paving.

And you see here the nice scale, the relationship of the sidewalk to the retail area. Here you have the entrance to the apartment building. The life of the pedestrians. We have bicycle parking in the

brick area, the two-way biking here that the VHP is going to talk about.

This is seen from across the street, the different bays of the retail areas. And the next one shows in more detail these bays that add scale to the architecture and into the space and that each entrance to the retail establishments, that's recessed in to give more room to enter and exit without interfering with the walking space of the sidewalk.

The south end: This is Main Street. This is Ames Street. You have the sidewalk here, and then we've created a small little pocket park here. Again, by -- this is the property line here, but we've continued the sidewalk into this space. A few planted areas that allow people to walk across and makes walking through it very comfortable and

also gives nice seating areas.

This is private seating for the restaurant and its patrons here.

And you can see that, again, the lower part of the building helps define this space, give it scale. The retail has turned the corner again to animate this space.

And then we have Pioneer Way which we think will become a really popular pedestrian space with -- it's going to be a nice cut through to get to the T. It's going to be a way to get to the lobby of -- the shared lobby that's right here. And we really enliven the space with decorative paving, with bicycle racks. There's a way finding sign there. We disguised the back of -- the back of the building of Legal Seafoods with a very attractive screen that I'll show you in a minute. And we put a lot of bicycle

parking in the bike shelter area here that --
and we feel that the bicycles will also
animate this space coming back here to park
and store their bikes.

We have lights, strung lights that are
relatively low that help bring the scale of
the space that you'll see in a rendering,
bring that down. We have the (inaudible) to
define that space.

This will be shared by -- it's the
access to the loading dock which will be
explained in more detail. It's also the exit
from the garage. We've done a lot to slow
these cars and vehicles down. We feel the
pedestrians will dominate the space in a very
good way. We have a sitting area here.
We'll have bollards here. There will be no
vehicular traffic passed this point here.
And this is also a cut through to the

elevator up to the fourth floor garden, and we have the green wall there and some graphics as well.

This is a view from Ames Street looking down Pioneer Way. You see the bollards here. You see this is daytime, but you can't see them that well, but they still do lower the height. This is the overhead lights. This is -- you see the edge of the little pocket park here. Bike parking's back there.

Next.

And then you see it at night with the lit bollards and the decorative paving here. So it will be a very animated, very filled with people, comfortable daytime and nighttime, as a cut through. It will become a popular little cut through in Cambridge. And you'll see the bike storage back there. And this is the screen that hides the back of

Legal Seafoods.

One thing that we looked at to make sure that the site lines for the cars coming out of the parking garage were good. So this is looking out and that you're sight line exiting the garage is very good and safe for the pedestrians. And then sight lines from coming out of Pioneer Way on to Ames Street, this one was looking right what your sight line is excellent there and here as well.

And this is an elevation that you see the attractive way that the bike storage has been presented. And this is the green wall we were talking about. And the entrance into the parking garage and up to the roof deck.

And this is the screen in front of Legal Seafood, the back of house.

And this is the overall view again. And Mark's now going to talk about some of

the traffic issues, etcetera.

MARK GUNGHANS: Not just traffic issues. I wanted to leave Clara's point out because it's a little more attractive, and the engineering plans that I'm responsible for.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Mark, you have to give your name.

MARK GUNGHANS: Mark G-u-n-g-h-a-n-s, Gunghans. I'm here with Sean Manning who is here somewhere, who is responsible for -- the train station engineer, there he is over there.

This project was subject to a TIS. Even though it's part of the Master Plan, we were asked to do a TIS and we worked back and forth with Transportation and Parking in coming up with a TIS that met their approval. We did an analysis of the local area, a

number of intersections. Even though this

project does not propose any new parking,

there was a rebalancing because, you know,

we're adding program, and that TS was

certified in August I believe or July?

SEAN MANNING: July.

MARK GUNGHANS: I wanted to leave

this up because this defines the street. The

city itself is working with a bicycle planner

to come up with a bicycle plan for Kendall

Square and that plan looks to bring the

bicycle access forward. And right now if you

go out to Ames Street, you have a bicycle

lane along the east curb. You have a parking

lane and then a travel lane, and then that's

mirrored on the other side. In the plan

that's shown on this plan -- the plan that's

shown on this plan, that's good, we have a

two-way cycle track along the east edge with

a three-foot buffer, an eight-foot parking

lane, two, eleven-foot travel lanes, and an

eight-foot parking lane. So those bicycle

facilities have been brought to one side

which is the preferred configuration by the

city.

This relates to existing bicycle

facilities on Main Street and Broadway, and

the larger design, which we haven't included

the whole thing here because it's part of a

larger Master Plan, integrates this quarter

in with the signals and bike access going

down Ames Street and up and down Broad,

Broad. I can't say Broad anyway. Main and

Broadway.

So this sort of set the table for us as

a beginning point for our design and

providing access to the site.

This is the access plan for the

proposed garage. If you went out there right now, what you'd find on Ames Street is you'd find the existing loading area here which is set back from the street, and a garage entrance that comes in here. The plan, as John noted earlier, was to take off the last bit of the garage and reconfigure the frontage. By taking out this garage access and this loading access, we eliminate curb cuts here creating a more continuous pedestrian environment. Taking sort of a side street and turning it into the main street if you would.

The parking garage access is relocated to here. This is a one way cardholder only access. So only people who are tenants who have a card can leave here. This is not for transient. Only with somebody who is familiar with how things work here can leave

and go out on Ames Street. This exit is for

coming out of the garage.

Access into the garage is from either

direction off Broadway into here.

Loading access is off Ames Street into

the loading area which is right here and

essentially been replicated on the south side

of the building.

This is a diagram based on how things

work from a pedestrian point of view. I

don't think this is going to be a surprise to

anyone. If you're a pedestrian at this

portion of Cambridge Center, these are the

ways through the site. I think the one --

for someone who is not here everyday or who

is not in the know, if you would, this is a

very important connection for folks who work

in the Google Connector and Three and Five or

park in the garage, they find themselves in

this hub and this is a great connection over

to the Broad Institute, over to the hotel, a

way for someone who works here to get around.

And this is an active corridor. And part of

what this project is about is recognizing

that and making that feel less like a service

alley and more like an important path through

the site.

An important part of the design --

well, really for any project in Cambridge, is

making sure that we accommodate bicycles

because they're an important part of getting

to a site that is multi-modal. It's broken

down into two basic bicycle types: You have

public and transient, visitors, couriers,

that sort of thing, which are the ones

highlighted along here on the street and

first part of Pioneer Way. Those are the

publicly accessible near the entrances

immediately and visible and accessible outdoor spaces.

The second type of space are of course the weather protected tenant and resident spaces. And due to the constrained nature of the site, the fact that we're into the existing structure and we have this garage here, the innovative approach that the Boston Properties is taken is the establishment of this bicycle multi-story -- I'm not sure we said that. This is a multi-story bicycle structure located on Pioneer Way. This is the ground floor. So we had 66 bicycles located here on the ground floor. We have 16 bicycles here. These are actually oversized spaces. If you have a bicycle trailer or a tandem bike or something like that, these will be set aside for you. There's also a repair facility here. If you need to add air

to your tire or fix your bike, those accommodations are here.

Moving up into the structure, this is the second level; the park -- the bike parking here, another 66 spaces are accessible from the garage side. You can access it through the existing elevator in the garage.

And moving up there's an existing freight elevator. Existing. There's a freight elevator in the proposed building that can be utilized for access up into the garage. This is showing -- this is showing access from the garage to that freight elevator in moving up.

This is -- on the fifth floor there's a space available that's going to be turned into a bike room for 148 bikes. Once again accessible to that freight elevator and then

located up here within the building and

immediate access to the site.

That is -- that's what I have for

access and bicycles, and I'll turn it over to

David Stewart.

Thank you.

DAVID STEWART: Thanks, Mark.

David Stewart with Boston Properties.

That concludes the formal part of our

presentation and we can now take questions.

If you have any clarification-type questions,

I'm happy to field those.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. The first

question I would have is how many floors are

in the building?

DAVID STEWART: It's somewhere

between 22 and 24 depending on whether it's

steel or concrete.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does the floor area

of the building change?

DAVID STEWART: It does not.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I guess I don't understand how you add two floors without adding any floor area.

DAVID STEWART: Well, the building gets -- if it's concrete and it's -- Dan? Where's Dan? The concrete --

DAN PISELLI: Floor to floor steel building has more beams and the beams are deeper, so to get the --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I understand that part. What I don't understand is if you have 200,000 square feet and the footprint remains the same and you have two more floors, how doesn't that change the floor area?

DAVID STEWART: Well, the footprint doesn't remain the same.

HUGH RUSSELL: So which one have you shown us?

DAVID STEWART: This is the steel building which is 22 floors.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the -- if it were concrete, the floors would shrink a little bit?

DAVID STEWART: A little bit, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: By how much, ten feet, five feet?

DAVID STEWART: In an area. Roughly a thousand square feet.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So it's maybe five or ten feet on a given side. So it doesn't -- the appearance of the building will be not very different.

DAVID STEWART: That's correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: If that shrinkage should happen.

DAVID STEWART: That's correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Second question I
have is what is the breakdown of size of the
units and number of bedrooms, types of units,
etcetera?

DAVID STEWART: So the unit mix,
we've programmed this for some microunits,
some microunits, studios, one beds, and two
beds. And I'd say we don't have an exact mix
yet. We're still working on unit layouts,
but right now what's shown in the report that
we filed is roughly 14 percent micros, 41
percent studios, 37 percent one beds, and
eight percent two bedrooms.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you have
approximate average sizes for each of those
categories?

DAVID STEWART: Dan, do you recall
what --

DAN PISELLI: I believe micros are somewhere between -- they range between 350 square feet and 475 or so.

Dan Piselli with FX Fowle. Just off the top of my head, remembering the areas I believe microunits on the low end are 350 square feet and the high end would be 450 or 475 studios start at about 475 and go to maybe 575 or 600 I believe. One bedrooms from there to as much as 775 square feet and two bedrooms are said 950 to 1100 square feet.

HUGH RUSSELL: So this is a kind of a unit mix that we've never seen for a building in the city. Could you explain the sort of your thinking as to why you want the units, this kind of unit mix?

DAVID STEWART: When we look at the demographic and the people we believe that

will be interested in living here, the focus

for them is more on the smaller unit size.

So I agree that microunits are -- I'd say are

A relatively new trend that are appearing in

more urban cities like, Boston, San

Francisco, New York. So we think they're

appropriate here and we're using a -- we're

trying to put in a small number of -- just to

satisfy I'd say that demand.

On the other side of what studios, one

beds and two beds, I would say it mirrors

what some of our competitors have been seeing

and what the market's telling us in terms of

the demand for those sizes of units.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just a comment that I

lived about four years in the city in what

now would be characterized as microunits and

buildings that were built in the last

century, and so it's an idea that comes and

goes.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: I think we
should say we recently executed this similar
size range in Boston, so it's not -- we're
not pioneering here. So this is where the
market is. And when you look at what the
consumer wants, you know, relative to cost,
they're prepared to take a location as long
as their monthly nut is low. And this is a
way to drive the unit size down and their
monthly nut into a zone that is affordable to
lease.

HUGH RUSSELL: Are there other
questions?

MARY FLYNN: Yes, I have -- I know
there's also listed micro-retail. Which I've
heard the micro-housing before. I've never
heard of micro-retail. So could you describe
what that would look like and what you

anticipate for the overall retail mix?

DAVID STEWART: Micro-retail?

MARY FLYNN: Yes. Did I see

something -- or maybe those were

micro-housing down near the retail level?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: That's right.

MARY FLYNN: Okay.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Microunits are

at the second and third floor.

MARY FLYNN: Okay, I misread the

drawings. Got it.

DAVID STEWART: If you look through

the report and we had some floor plans, the

retail is on the ground floor, the second

floor.

MARY FLYNN: Yes. This is on the

second where I'm seeing it, okay.

DAVID STEWART: There are microunits

laid out on this part of the second floor and

then on the third floor as well.

MARY FLYNN: Okay. And what do you anticipate kind of as the retail thrust for the project?

DAVID STEWART: So there are really two spaces available. The one on the corner of Pioneer Way and Ames Street is roughly a 2,000 square foot space, so you could see that being some sort of a quick serve, potentially a coffee shop or something of that nature. The other space, which is I think more interesting, is it's around 7800 square feet, the way it's programmed, and we see that use as some as hopefully some sort of like pharmacy, like a CVS or Walgreens or potentially some sort of a smaller grocery store format.

MARY FLYNN: Okay.

One other question is for hours of

delivery on the loading docks, what's your

expectation for the range of that? Because

quite honestly that is a concern to me, is

that the trucks and the people and that -- I

mean, I think you've done a nice job in terms

of trying to lay it out so that it's

attractive, but I wonder if it's really safe.

DAVID STEWART: So that's a good

question. One of the things that we will

have to do and we intend to do as part of

this project, which we've done on other

projects is assign a full-time loading dock

manager. So this loading dock will be very

actively managed. You do have the uses of

retail. The apartment building, people

moving in predominantly on the weekends, but

that's later in the day use, and as well, the

two office buildings, Four and Five Cambridge

Center are served from this loading dock. So

I'd expect that in the morning is when you

would get your retail deliveries, and then

you'd have office and apartment deliveries

throughout the day. I don't know the exact

hour that they'd start, but that's just one

of the things we have to come up with is a

management plan for the loading dock which we

intend to do and we'll lay that all out and

what we've done on other properties is we've

restricted the hours especially for retail.

You can restrict the hours for when the

retail trucks can come in and when they can't

come in.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: The other thing

I would add is we would have completely off

hours delivery. So special deliveries may

come in late at night or very early in the

morning. There will definitely being hours

that David's described during the day, but

you'll probably see some late night

deliveries.

MARY FLYNN: As well?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Yeah.

MARY FLYNN: Okay. And then one

last question. Obviously there's been a lot

of work put into this by you folks and by the

previous discussions with the Planning Board

and staff. I'm -- I noticed in the

redevelopment authority handout that there

was a discussion about, you know, various

meetings that were held for the design review

and there was one mention of a public

meeting. How well was that attended and were

there any other meetings with community

groups to review the design?

DAVID STEWART: Where's Ben? How

many meetings did we have at the Sierra.

BEN LAVERY: At the CRA? In total

half a dozen, and the public format took

place later in the process. That was an

evolving process I would say. We've also met

with the East Cambridge Planning Team. So

we've had a number of public discussions

about this.

      MARY FLYNN: Thank you.

      HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

      H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, following

up on the unit mix, we're finding a great

demand for three-bedroom units and a lot of

the buildings now are including them. Have

you considered any three-bedroom units in

this property?

      DAVID STEWART: Based on our market

research, we don't actually see a demand for

three-bedroom units in this particular

location. I think what our research is

finding is that as more of these, call it

newer format, residential buildings are built

with the smaller units. What's happening is

you'll pull people out of existing buildings,

existing residential buildings within

Cambridge that are actually occupying

three-bedroom or larger style housing format.

So there is a fair amount of supply already

out there. And if we provide, if we satisfy

the demand for smaller units, I think what

you'll see is some demand opening up in some

existing buildings that's more appropriate.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: The only thing I

would add there if you look at the profile of

some of newer buildings, for example, the

Twining Building, the kinds of users in that

building they're not necessarily families and

you think the three bedrooms would go to

family uses. We think this is a younger age

group in terms of leasing in this building.

And so as a result of that, I'm not -- and if were it not, you'd probably find these three bedrooms to three individuals that are sharing leases.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We realize that this is an issue, while you're working on what your final mix is, if you would consider the fact that there is a need for three-bedroom units throughout the city, and the population you're aiming for I'm not so sure that you're going to pull them from existing, you know, triple deckers of things rather than getting new people that are coming into the area. So I would like you to consider that.

Another question I have is what is the rationale for the monthly parkers to come out onto Pioneer Way rather than using the same exit on Broadway that everybody else is

using?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: It's just
another convenience route in terms of
providing circulation to the general area.
This is actually something that we do in the
west garage as well. There's an access route
onto the service road behind the Residence
Inn, and monthly egress and it allows you to
just get quicker in, let's call it the south
towards the river by coming out that way.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, my concern
is that now with all the effort to activate
Ames Street and the sidewalk there you're
going to have a lot -- and if I understand
correctly, a car coming out Pioneer Way is
going to have to cross two lanes of bicycles
and then a parked parking lane before it can
get to either turn right or left on to Ames
Street. And it seems to me there's going to

be an awful lot of interaction with

pedestrians and bicycles and the car. And

while I understand that's added convenience

for the cars, I'd be curious to know what

Traffic and Parking also had to say about

funneling everybody back on to Broadway which

is obviously, you know, going to be a wider

street when Ames is reconfigured and I think

less of a pedestrian way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a projection

for the number of vehicles that would be

using that in the peak hour?

FROM THE AUDIENCE: I'm sorry?

HUGH RUSSELL: The projection for

the number of vehicles that would be using

that exit in the peak hour?

MARK GUNGHANS: I don't know it off

the top of my head. Sean?

SEAN MANNING: I can answer it.

Shawn Manning with PHP. In the afternoon

which would be the peak exit time, and the

morning it's a non-issue, there's practically

nothing coming out. And this garage, which

is very characteristic of an office district,

it's very peaky. There isn't a lot of --

there's a lot of ins in the morning, there's

a lot of outs in the afternoon. There's not

a whole lot going on in the off peak hours.

It's around 90 vehicles in the afternoon in

the peak hour. It's probably something in

the mid hundreds say between 3:30 and 6:00

p.m. That's the vast majority of what we

want to come out during the entire course of

the day. And I think getting back to the

idea of, you know, Pioneer Way being

activated for other things, you know, there

could be ideas of, you know, when we might

restrict egress later in the evening or

something like that. There just isn't going

to be a high demand that wants to come out

later in the day anyway, so....

HUGH RUSSELL: Any other questions?

H. THEODORE COHEN: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Tom.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: What's an amenity

space?

DAVID STEWART: Amenity space is

fitness center, club room, places where

people can congregate. There's an outdoor

terrace that's connected to the amenities.

On this -- this fourth floor, the majority of

it would be all amenities we have a few units

facing Pioneer Way, but a combination of

inside space and outdoor terrace space.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So the questions

about the loading dock I think were covered

by a fellow Board Member here. I was looking

at the wind study and its relationship to the

open spaces. In particular I was looking at

point 12 which says it's adequate for

standing. And the rendering showed some

seated there. And the roof terrace is

suggested reference, not black diamonds,

that's the skiing reference, but red diamonds

which is fairly high black diamond like wind

conditions. I just want to understand what

the criteria is and whether there is

something that could be done with that, what

appears to be a potentially failing wind

speed of point 12 on the public plaza that

you described the landscape architect.

        DAVID STEWART: Well, the black

diamonds, the only place that failed were

actually the top roof.

        TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.

        DAVID STEWART: So at one point we

were considering whether we could make

amenity space at the top of the building. So

that's where the wind speeds were said, no,

you shouldn't do that.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.

DAVID STEWART: So I believe all of

the other, and, Mark, correct me if I'm

wrong, I believe all the other points in the

pedestrian realm are passed.

MARK GUNGHANS: The standing is

still within the acceptable range, but it's

when it gets into the grey if you would. We

don't have any of the unacceptables at the --

JOHN HAWKINSON: What figure is

this?

MARK GUNGHANS: Figure 1.16-A.

So primarily this is summer. Winter.

Winter is the one you expect to be a little

higher, because in the winter the predominant

direction is from the northwest. So that's

when you're going to get the strong winds.

So winter is always the more of a challenge.

But the summer is a better model of sort of

the outdoor, outdoor time if you would, when

you would have an outdoor cafe or an active

outdoor space and use. Having a 0.5 say a

walking at the corner of the building is

completely typical for a location like that

and within the acceptable range. So there's

no --

        MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Points. There's

no points within an unacceptable range within

the public realm.

        MARK GUNGHANS: Correct.

        HUGH RUSSELL: Can we define the

ranges?

        MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Excuse me?

        HUGH RUSSELL: How are the ranges

defined?

        MARK GUNGHANS: These ranges were

provided --

        ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Get up and

go to the microphone.

        MARK GUNGHANS: The ranges being

held there were defined by RWDI. RWDI is a

wind consultant out of Guelph, Ontario who

pretty much almost every project that I work

on has wind. We work with them because

they're the experts. They know that better

than anybody. And they have their own

standards which are pretty much national

standards for comfort, what's comfortable

when you're sitting, standing, walking. The

only places that have different standards are

actually us and San Francisco. They're

slightly different. They vary by a few miles

an hour. Since there's not a standard in the

city of Cambridge this is what our acceptable

winds are.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: What's the most

conservative position outside of Boston?

MARK GUNGHANS: The, what would be a

standing wind speed here is a little slower

than Boston so we're more conservative in

this analysis, not by a huge measure, but by

a few miles an hour.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: It's more

comfortable in this manner than in Boston or

San Francisco.

MARK GUNGHANS: Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Or more comfortable

here than at the courthouse, because the same

consultant in the courthouse study used the

Boston standard.

MARK GUNGHANS: There's a variation,

you're right. It's really a matter of

looking at changes and what you can do about changes.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Just on that, point Mr. Chair, I think we want some consistency here rather than talking about ranges of standards. It would be nice to know arithmetically what miles an hour RWDI is adjusting is acceptable and not acceptable and maybe there's way to compare that.

MARK GUNGHANS: There is actually. I'm just not prepared to do that right now unfortunately.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's fine. We can put that on the list.

MARK GUNGHANS: I know the Boston ones off the top of my head.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think maybe you should put that on the list of things to be furnished later.

LOUIS BACCI: Pioneer Way. Back to
Pioneer Way I guess. There's another
existing loading dock to the side of Five
that's shown. It doesn't appear that the
curb cut -- yeah, if you go to, I think
figure 126. Yes. You see where the, where
you've -- excuse me.

DAVID STEWART: Would you like this?

LOUIS BACCI: Yes. Right here.
This serves Five? There's also a path here
and it's not complete now. I don't know how
this vehicle makes it to that loading dock.
That loading dock exists.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: That's not a
loading dock.

LOUIS BACCI: I was there today.

DAVID STEWART: You're right. Today
would exist, Legal Seafoods uses this area to
store their trash and lift their deliveries

into their space.

LOUIS BACCI: Correct.

DAVID STEWART: And I'll just say
it's not managed as well as it should be.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: But there's no
trucks pulling up to that.

LOUIS BACCI: There are.

DAVID STEWART: So in the future --

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Not in this
plan.

LOUIS BACCI: Where do they get the
material they lift with it?

DAVID STEWART: So there's an
elevation, a grade change between here and
the floor of their space, so that's what this
X is. So....

LOUIS BACCI: Right, so it's a
lifting gate?

DAVID STEWART: Correct.

LOUIS BACCI: I understand that.

DAVID STEWART: When this project's developed, all the loading will happen, the trucks will pull in here, and we will have a full-time loading dock manager which we don't right now. And then they'll bring their deliveries over, open these two doors, pop it in the lift, and into their space, close the doors. So it's a much more about management.

LOUIS BACCI: On your drawings you call for the loading dock to be driving into this area and backing into the loading docks, correct?

DAVID STEWART: Yes.

LOUIS BACCI: Which means they cross from the egress from the garage?

DAVID STEWART: They front in here and go back in here.

LOUIS BACCI: And there doesn't seem

to be a lot of room for pedestrians and bicycles in that area while these trucks are pulling in and backing up.

And also I'm curious how many cardholders you think might be using that egress? Does that serve the whole complex?

DAVID STEWART: That's -- Sean said that -- you said at peak there's 100.

SEAN MANNING: There's maybe 90 in the peak. I think what works well between cars and trucks is the vast majority of the loading and service will happen pre-one o'clock. And the vast majority of the vehicle egress is kind of post-three-thirty. Not that there won't be some coinciding. And but there's very little egress when service wants to happen.

LOUIS BACCI: How many people -- there are 280 units in it building. Do you

think they're going to be leaving for work in the morning?

SEAN MANNING: We're allocating 140 spaces for 280 units. We think on the order of 60 to 70 spaces will empty from a residential building.

LOUIS BACCI: Is that on top of the 90?

SEAN MANNING: That's included within the 90. Some are gonna exit from this point, some are gonna exit via Broadway. Half of the 140 spaces will be storage so to speak. These are people who are either gonna work in the district, take the Red Line and take busses, etcetera. And that's very indicative of what you see in urban residential settings like this one.

LOUIS BACCI: How many truck trips you think will be making deliveries?

JOHN HAWKINSON: Can you use the mic?

LOUIS BACCI: Truck trips, deliveries.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can you use the mic?

LOUIS BACCI: Sorry, I forgot about the mic.

How many deliveries do you think you would be having per day in this area between -- and this, I'm not sure if I'm understanding this correct. Does that loading dock service the whole Cambridge Center?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: No.

LOUIS BACCI: Just the three buildings in the rear?

DAVID STEWART: It serves the new residential building, Four Cambridge Center, Five Cambridge Center, and that's it.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: That's it.
There's an underground loading dock under the
plaza on Main Street.

LOUIS BACCI: So we don't have
numbers on where you think you would be
generating for -- because there's a pinch
point there and I see another pinch point out
on Ames Street where if there's someone in
there, there's not very much room from the
loading dock egress to the road and then as
my colleagues would say the bike lanes, a
parking lane, a buffer. I don't know where
it backs up. So traffic --

SEAN MANNING: Agreed. It's a tight
space and the space has to be managed to have
it work the way we intend it to function
absolutely.

LOUIS BACCI: Is there some way to
manage outside of your property? That's the

real concern then. You can -- you may be
able to control your dock, but how do you
control the --

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: I'm not sure I
understand the question. When you say
outside the property?

LOUIS BACCI: Well, the road is a
very short distance from the corner of Main
Street to that Pioneer Way.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: We're typically
pushed to manage all the trucks on our
property not in the street.

LOUIS BACCI: No, I understand, but
they'll be queueing there.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: That's where
David's point is that we have to heavily
manage the truck deliveries, and so it's not
just a dock master that is standing at the
grade directing traffic. It's actually

communication with the times of deliveries

and when they're allowed and so forth. So

that the flow is smooth.

DAVID STEWART: So before they get

there, our loading dock manager will know

they're coming. When Legal Seafoods gets a

delivery, it's going to be in a small window

and he'll know that the truck's coming. And

similarly when the move-ins and move-outs

from the residences, those are all known

ahead of time so we can schedule those and

optimize the use of the loading dock.

LOUIS BACCI: It seems like the

daunting task.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I would

comment that the Traffic and Parking

Department memo on this subject states the

problem, it does not state that they're

satisfied with how they understand it's all

going to work. So I think we'd probably like

to see you work with Traffic and Parking and

with the CD Department to advance your

thinking on that.

DAVID STEWART: With the plan?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: If I could just

add. This is not -- we're not inventing the

wheel here. We actually do this on other

properties in -- you know, I think do it

pretty effectively. One of the buildings

that we just opened up in Boston called

Atlantic Wharf has a comparable loading dock

for more space than we're talking about here.

It's a mix of uses. We have experience.

We're acknowledging it's a small space and

tight space, and it needs management but not

withstanding that we'll work it out with

Traffic Department.

HUGH RUSSELL: Perhaps you can take

them on a tour to understand it.

MARK GUNGHANS: As part of the final
TDM package, we're going to be required to
put together a typical schedule and that's
going to be part of the package with TPD as
we move forward.

STEVEN COHEN: Moving on I had one
question. It appears that there was a
recommendation I believe by your traffic
consultant that you provide discounted
Charlie Cards for 12 months to the residents
of the building. If I understand it
correctly, that you disagreed with that
recommendation. Am I understanding it
correctly? And if so, what was, what was
your reasoning?

DAVID STEWART: That wasn't a
recommendation by our traffic consultant.
That was a recommendation by the city's

transportation, yes. It wasn't our

recommendation.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay. In that case

your reasoning?

DAVID STEWART: When you look at

this development, we're building this in an

urban area over a transit station, so I could

see where the rationale for providing some

sort of subsidy, if you're building a

building out in a Greenfield site and you're

generating all this new traffic, why the city

might take that position. We don't feel

that's warranted in this location.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, if you're

right, then they won't need the Charlie Card

and they won't take advantage of the

discount.

DAVID STEWART: Well what if they

use it for other reasons or if their

friends -- they want to sell it to their

friends or something like that? I just,

this --

STEVEN COHEN: We could ultimately

hear from staff on it, but I think part of

their reasoning is to reinforce and then

encourage the lifestyle independent of

vehicles, and to get people in the habit of

using the Charlie Card. And perhaps at some

point we could hear from somebody from

Traffic and their thinking on the subject.

DAVID STEWART: Sure.

STEVEN COHEN: Is there somebody

here? You want to tell us about it?

HUGH RUSSELL: You want to make any

comments now, Adam?

ADAM SHULMAN: You want me to come

up?

HUGH RUSSELL: Please.

ADAM SHULMAN: So, hi. Adam

Shulman. Transportation planner at the

Cambridge Traffic, Parking and Transportation

Department. Do you want me to -- I can talk

about that specific thing or if you want, I

could sort of give sort of a summary of the

comments. That -- we did submit a comment

letter and we could talk a little bit about

summary.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think a summary of

the whole thing is probably warranted because

not everybody in the room would have read

your letter.

ADAM SHULMAN: Sure.

So we submitted a comment letter on

November 26th and we, and as stated, we

certified the TIS on July 7, 2014. The

traffic study. The TIS had no Planning Board

exceedances. The project's going to generate

48 morning and 76 evening peak hour vehicle
trips. And 577 morning and 90 peak hour
transit trips. So a lot of transit trips.

TIS included other development projects
as all TIS's do. So because the project is
located right in the heart of Kendall Square,
the project's inherently transit oriented and
residents will have access to walking,
biking, transit, and so forth. So parking
for the project's going to be come on-site.
The traffic study demonstrated there's enough
unused parking in the garage to accommodate
the parking. Because the parking's going to
generate new transit trips, we have asked,
and I believe the proponent has agreed to
contribute $50,000 for the city to improving
transit in Kendall Square. So -- and similar
to all our comment letters, we recommend
transportation, demand management conditions.

One of them being the thing we were just talking about, which is transit subsidy to residents, exactly for the reason you talked about.

So we've been, we have been working with the proponent. There are three key issues that are outstanding. We're recommending the Board not make a decision until these issues are addressed.

No. 1 is the bike parking as discussed. We're recommending that the, that the bike meet the Zoning requirements.

Second issue is sight lines. We're concerned about the sight lines a little bit, but we'll continue to work with the proponent on it.

And the third issue is use of transit, and we do support as just said that residents be given a subsidy for transit.

So I could answer any questions.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's interesting that we're all worrying about finding our way, but that's not on your list of unresolved items. So how do you see that space? Do you think it's workable?

ADAM SHULMAN: So we do. It's tight as you said, but, you know, it's a shared street. It's -- I agree that the activity is going to occur with deliveries mostly in the morning and the vehicles exiting mostly in the evening. Or rather -- and I think --

HUGH RUSSELL: Do we have an idea of when -- what the pedestrian volumes are by time of day?

LOUIS BACCI: And bikes?

HUGH RUSSELL: And bikes?

ADAM SHULMAN: We don't know exact number of pedestrians. We hope it's

activated. But I think the whole notion of a

shared street is that it's designed so that

people know it's a shared street. When

there's pedestrians there and cars there,

they kind of just kind look out for each

other.

LOUIS BACCI: Can I ask a question?

Can you put up the 5.3?

HUGH RUSSELL: Can you put up 5.3?

DAVID STEWART: The turning truck

radius in your backup slides.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, pretty scary.

LOUIS BACCI: Yes, it is.

Especially when you put the mix of

pedestrians and bikes and cars.

HUGH RUSSELL: This wasn't one of

the slides that you showed today but it's in

the report.

ADAM SHULMAN: The turning radius?

DAVID STEWART: It's right near the end.

ADAM SHULMAN: Yes, we looked at this. And in fact, we asked them to produce it. They fit, the trucks can get in and out. It's tight, you know.

LOUIS BACCI: What about a couple cars egressing and some bikes and walkways and people walking. It's tight.

ADAM SHULMAN: Right. So if the truck's doing that, my expectation is cars would be, there would be some equipment. Cars would know -- if there's a car coming out, there would be signs and warning devices and flashing devices. There's an active manager who is there. We do expect this to occur mostly times when less cars coming out. The other thing -- and we did recommend to produce a plan. A management plan for this,

but I think one of the things about this is

that we -- and this could be part of the

plan, they could close the exit if need be

and not allow cars to come out at times when

there's a truck doing activity like this. So

they have control over these things. So I

think, I think it's tight. It's, you know,

but I think this is -- you know, you have

things like this in an urban environment and

I think it's feasible.

LOUIS BACCI: My concern is actually

the public safety issue there with the bikes

and the pedestrians.

SEAN MANNING: And if I could

interject just one point on this, the dock is

sized for upwards of a single unit 35-foot

truck. And what these diagrams is showing is

that you every bay filled with a 35-foot

trucks. So while one looks at the turns and

says, gee, this is really tight, and every

truck is going to have to make multiple turns

to get in. This is the absolute worst case

scenario where the biggest truck is trying to

get into the tightest docks or trying to show

the -- and it certainly is tight, and I don't

think we're trying to cloak that. But

certainly many of the trucks, and most of the

delivery vehicles that would go to an office

setting or a residential setting, are smaller

and aren't going to have that difficulty to

back in. But I think the idea is Pioneer Way

is to be slow. I don't think anyone should

be going more than upwards of five miles an

hour, something like that. It's the idea is

that everyone's moving slowly.

LOUIS BACCI: Is this also the area

that you'll be using for trash pick up and

dumpsters and so forth?

SEAN MANNING: The trash is located in the two right-hand most bays and it's actually on the dock itself. So those last two bays double as the loading dock and as trash, it's a roll-on, roll-off solution.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Correct.

LOUIS BACCI: Roll-off?

DAVID STEWART: One of each.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So you've all heard what we're concerned about that. And I guess we wanted to do some more thinking on that.

Thacher.

THACHER TIFFANY: Don't sit down yet. I guess I just wanted to hear a little more on your concern about the bike parking. My recollection, from reading this, is that the issue is the distance from the elevator? Is that the only issue or are there multiple?

ADAM SHULMAN: No, no, from the

Traffic Department's, you know, we'd like to

see them meet the Zoning sort of as Jeff had

talked about at the beginning. There were a

lot of effort put in, a lot of analysis put

in recently as to exactly why the very

specific conditions aren't Zoning for the

bike parking. One of the things that we're

particularly concerned about is the distance

they're proposing to put between the racks.

So Zoning requires each rack to be three feet

from each other. Next sort of, you know,

next to each other. So I think they're

proposing to be tighter. I think they're two

and a half feet. So our experience is that

when you have that, each bike rack generally

accommodates two bikes; one bike on each side

of the rack. So when you have another bike

rack next to it, you need to get two bikes

between two racks. So when you start putting

the bike racks too close together, it gets

too tight. Certain bikes have, you know,

handlebars that are, you know, way out and

certain conditions. And some people -- and

it's just tighter because you have to kind of

get in there to lock your bike and if

you're -- if you have to get in between

another bike, it's just a little bit less

convenient or not possible at all. So a lot

of times when you see these situations where

bike racks are too close together, it's just

essentially not used more than one bike per

rack. So with the notion of trying to meet

the required number of bike spaces, it's

important to get the proper distance so that

they're fully, you know, usable. So that's

one of the -- that's probably one of our

biggest, big concerns.

THACHER TIFFANY: So it's the

distance between the racks, not the distance

from the elevator? I thought that was

another --

ADAM SHULMAN: Well, we're, we're

less -- that's less of a concern. You know,

I think all of them are important. You know,

and we're always happy to work with them and

look at these details and make it better and

better. But, you know, that again to me, the

distance between the racks is one of the

things. The distance from exit doors to the

bike racks is not as important as other

things. But, for instance, one of the

things -- and I think the Bike Advisory

Committee wrote a good letter about this

also, and I think a good point is that one of

the things, some bikes, the Zoning requires

some spaces to be able to accommodate, like,

long bikes or bikes with trailers, things

with people -- kid carriages and things. So

those, the planning puts those furthest away

in the garage. And the feeling is that might

be better to be closer to residents,

especially if they're, you know, using it for

carrying groceries or kids or things like

that. So there are things like that that I

think could use a little work.

JEFF ROBERTS: Adam, I thought maybe

I would jump on that a little bit because I

realize this is an important piece of the

consideration for the Planning Board, and it

may be worthwhile to briefly look sort of

bigger for the benefit of those members who

weren't part of the rezoning that was done a

couple of years ago. So there were some key

goals in setting the Zoning the way it is

now. One has to do with wanting to have a

consistent set of standards around the city

so that when people are bicycling around the

city and they're going to a place to park

their bike, they have a certain expectation

for what they might be. I don't bike myself

and I don't have a car either, but I

sometimes I find it helpful to look for

analogs with auto parking. So, if you think

about the way auto parking is, it's fairly

consistent. You know, pretty much wherever

you drive you're going to find a parking

space that, you know, meets the sort of

certain width and depth requirements that you

expect it to meet. For bicycle parking we

were finding that people were designing it

and manufacturers create bicycle parking in

all kinds of different ways and

configurations. And, you know, if you were

driving a car someplace, and you said, well,

where do I park? Well, you can hang it up on

that hook over there, you would kind of think

that's kind of crazy. So we wanted to

establish some sort of consistency. That's

one issue.

Another issue was that we really are

trying to encourage bicycling around the city

and one of the key aspects of doing that is

really making it as convenient and usable as

possible. And to make it usable for people

who have all kinds of different bikes,

whether they're different makes,

configurations, adult bikes, kid bikes, bikes

with trailers. And, again, using sort of the

auto analog. I don't know if any of you have

ever been to Porter Square shopping center,

and I know that many people do drive there

and park there and know that it's designed

to -- it's a much tighter parking

configuration than you might expect in other

places. And as a result, I know I talk to

people sometimes who say well, I don't want

to go there, I don't want to drive there

because it's such a tight spot being able to

go in and open your doors and go out.

HUGH RUSSELL: You can never find a

parking space there.

JEFF ROBERTS: True. People do

drive there. But in some ways with auto

parking that's -- we don't necessarily see

that as a bad thing if it's a little slower,

a little more difficult to get in and out,

because we are trying to shift from auto and

other modes of transportation. When it comes

to bicycles, we really want to make sure it's

as usable as possible. Thinking about the

experience of a bicycle user, you know, not

just whether there's space to fit the bike

but can you get in to lock and unlock your

bike in those spaces and, you know, and can

you get there and thinking about the

experience of a resident who is coming, you

know, maybe from work and another part of

town. You know, how long is it going to take

them to get their bike parked and then get

back to get into the residents. And that --

those details, you know, while there are

certainly a lot of efforts have been made to

make this bicycle parking that they're

proposing very attractive, and there are lots

of positive aspects to it, it's really those

details that were worked out in the Zoning

that can make a big difference in terms of

the usability. I also want to point out that

Cara Seiderman is the bicycle transportation

planner who works on the city's bicycle

programs, and she was an active part of

working on it and establishing what the

Zoning standards are. And she's worked with

other professionals around the country on

those standards and I see you're jumping up

and down so maybe you want to comment.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I raised my hand.

MARK GUNGHANS: The spaces that are

less than the 36-inch standards are the

residents spaces not the public spaces. The

public spaces are all combined.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I'm Cara, C-a-r-a

Seiderman, S-e-i-d-e-r-m-a-n at the Community

Development Department. So I think that Adam

and Jeff did a really good job in lengthening

things out. And I know several of the

Planning Board members have heard the whole

thing have heard all the different

requirements. So a couple of things I wanted

to mention about this is that these, the

distance requirements in particular were

always there. They actually were not new.

And in fact, ISD had interpreted existing

standards that they were four feet apart as

opposed to three feet apart, and part of it

was trying to figure out, you know, is that

necessary? Or is it something that can be

rationally managed and although slightly

smaller distance than what had been

originally interpreted. And we spent a lot

of time talking to people around the country,

and these are minimum standards that are set

by the association of bicycle pedestrian

professionals in part because they look --

they too looked at all the standards and

situations and how people were managing and

realized that even though bicycle parking

manufacturers might say oh, yeah, sure, you

can do it, you know, two and a half feet,

they were realizing that just wasn't working.

They simply just don't work. And it's not

because we are trying to be difficult. We

all recognize that we're in a tight urban

environment, but they were based on like is

it actually something that's going to be

usable? And so we wanted to put something in

that's usable. And that's what those are

based on. If there's other questions I'm

sure we can all --

        HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I'd like to

actually take a step backwards and not to ask

you a question, Cara, but as I understand it,

there are 280 bicycle spaces which are

required for the apartment building. Right?

        DAVID STEWART: 296.

        HUGH RUSSELL: And then there are

some public spaces?

        DAVID STEWART: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And only the residents of the building will be allowed to park there?

MARK GUNGHANS: And --

HUGH RUSSELL: And a follow-up question is, do you have any other bicycle parking spaces for the thousands of people who work in the complex?

MARK GUNGHANS: These are the new spaces that are being created for this building, and there will be a combination of 296 spaces that are weather protected and have some level of security. And then there's 38 new spaces created with this building that are the publicly accessible spaces. So there are both.

HUGH RUSSELL: What if you work at Google?

MARK GUNGHANS: There are some

existing bicycle accommodations now. Which

we're not --

HUGH RUSSELL: Like ten spaces?

MARK GUNGHANS: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Hundreds?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: There's capacity

for hundreds of bicycles in nested spaces in

three different garages.

MARK GUNGHANS: We're talking about

the delta, the change for this building.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I'm trying to

look at the bigger picture, you know. While

I understand one bicycle parking space per

unit is what the Ordinance says, I wonder

sometimes of a building like this, you know,

whether, you know, it could cheat a little

bit in order to get the spaces farther apart.

I don't know how you accomplish that legally,

but if they're going to -- if these spaces

are going to be competed for by other people

who are working in the building, then -- so

that's what I wanted to know about the other

parking spaces.

I'm also aware that in this garage you

think there is significant unused parking

space, so you have the ability to create, to

shift car spaces to bicycle spaces physically

to accomplish that just so that as the demand

for bicycles increases and cars go down, you

can manage that. You may have to come and do

the redevelopment authority or whoever

authorized the garage to make it work, but

you've got some resources to go with the

change of what users want in your existing

buildings. And this is -- what you're doing

now is really going to be limited to the

residential folks.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Well --

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Can I make a
comment on this?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: This is a
circumstance what we conceivably take parking
spaces away. But we know exactly what our
demand is. And we are not, we don't have
excess parking spaces. We're actually
parking constrained. And so we're fitting
the last building in a project that has been
planned and foiling three-hundred square
feet. Not only wedging the building in there
but accommodating some of the other uses. My
understanding in some of the dialogue about
the parking spaces, I understand the need to
create standardization. I guess we're just
appealing, given the circumstances, we need a
little flexibility. One example that we put

up, we're building a project in San Francisco

where parking is allowed to be stacked. And

so -- bicycle parking's allowed to be stacked

as long as you provide a lift for the user of

the bicycle. And that's, I think a pretty

creative way to save space. So we're trying

to be flexible. We're willing to bear some

expense, and we understand the need for

standardization here, but we're also just

appealing to you in the sense of this is the

last space, we don't have much space left to

try to make it all comply.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Well, I'm

going to take my tape measure into Harvard

Square to see if the two parking bicycle

parking zones that I use which the city built

in the last year, in fact, are three feet or

whether those are cheated. And if they're

three feet, I can tell you they're pretty

tight. And, you know, they're -- Harvard

Square being Harvard Square and not having a

lot of bicycle parking resource is two ways

on J.F.K. Street and Brattle Street are

pretty full. So if I go out and measure

those things and they're 30 inches apart,

then I'm going have a different approach.

But I don't think I'm going to find that.

CARA SEIDERMAN: If you have

questions and there are further things, I

think we can certainly pull together all of

the information to explain why the Zoning is

the way that it is.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I think

what's needed here is some -- there's been a

lot of creativity over the parking -- bicycle

parking. It probably just needs to be a

little more to figure out how to make it

actually workable. And so you're either like

90 percent of the way there and it's that last full yard of that. I don't usually make sports analogies, so....

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a quick question for Adam or for Cara. Maybe I missed it, but I don't see anything here having a Hubway station. Is there one planned for this vicinity or are there already others nearby which are considered acceptable?

CARA SEIDERMAN: There is a Hubway station on Main Street right -- that Google actually supported. There's a little Google sign on it, and it will be moved slightly with the reconstruction of Main Street and expanded slightly. I will say the Kendall Square is -- represents some of the top use of Hubway in the entire network, not surprisingly. So we could probably use more,

but we don't have one specifically funded for this location right now.

Does that answer the question?

But there is one around the corner right by the T station and on Main Street, and then there's another one at One Broadway at the corner of Third. And then next nearest one is maybe down Main Street and on Vassar Street.

Does that answer the question?

HUGH RUSSELL: We'll probably be hitting MIT up for some in their new development I would imagine.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I think are also big -- well, they are big users of it, so we certainly look to expand it.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we're actually still in the question section. We haven't gone and had public testimony yet. We

haven't actually opened the comment section

although it's hard to, I know hard to

separate those out. I'm not expressing any

criticism for what we've been through, but if

we got through the end of questions, let's

try to do the public testimony.

We'll have a five minute break.

(A short recess was taken.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, if people would

resume their seats. We're going to start the

next portion of this meeting.

So the first person who signed up to

speak is John Hawkinson. I'll remind John of

our rules. He's probably the one person who

doesn't need reminding. Three-minute time

limit, give your name and address, and make

sure that it's spelled correctly for the

record.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Good evening,

Members of the Board. John Hawkinson, 84

Massachusetts, Avenue. And I really try not

to address you and sometimes I fail as I am

tonight. But I will be brief, and I was

going to speak to you primarily about wind.

And I think you covered the highlight of my

concern, which I had addressed to staff and I

asked the petitioner about previously, but

they haven't responded to me about. But I

think the concern is two recent studies from

RWDI use two different criteria and somebody

should be paying attention to what criteria

is used in the city of Cambridge. The BRA

criteria, to me reading, roughly twice the

miles per hour from the RWDI criteria.

However, one's an 80 percentile and one's a

90 percentile number. They may be

comparable. But if you just look at the

state numbers, 13 miles per hour is

comfortable for the standing in the BRA

criteria, but it's uncomfortable for walking

in the RWDI criteria. So the difference is

significant.

The other thing I wanted to mention is

I think there's some context that the Board

should be aware of on this project that we

haven't heard about, and I'm a little

surprised we haven't heard about it, and that

is, of course, that Boston Properties has

proposed the redevelopment authority that

they've had a Zoning change to construct

additional stuff on this block both

residential and commercial. And I'm afraid I

missed their meeting -- I missed the first

half of their meeting where this was covered.

Oh, I'm wrong.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Not on this

block.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Not on this block?
Okay, very close by.

I thought Three Cambridge Center and on
top of the north garage, which I thought
would be on this block. But maybe it depends
on how you define block.

In any event, there's very nearby
proposed additional construction and Zoning
from Boston Properties that will be making
its way somewhere, and presumably will be
before the Board later. And I do think it
may be important for the Board to understand
the context of how this development fits in,
which that proposed future development, even
though it's not directly germane to the
specifics of this Special Permit. So I just
hope that there could be some clarity on
that.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you, John.

The next person on the list is Margaret Drury.

MARGARET DRURY: For the record, I'm Margaret Drury. Hello. Good evening. I'm the Vice Chair of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority and I'm here because our Chair couldn't be present tonight. So I'm here to express the enthusiastic support of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority for this project.

We've been, as you said, Mr. Chair, waiting a long time for this housing. The East Cambridge residents, housing advocates, the CRA, and the city have been waiting a very long time and we are really enthusiastic that we've gotten to this point now and we're hoping to get as soon as possible to the

point where it's actually going to be built.

The Cambridge Urban Renewal area has undergone lots and lots of changes in the 45 years of the urban renewal project, but it hasn't created a neighborhood in the MXD District and it can't create a neighborhood until there are people living there. And so we just think the difference is gonna be amazing. 280 new units of housing with people coming in and out, going to their houses, getting rid of that huge cave-like garage entrance that dominates the block, and instead replacing it with people coming in and out going to the place where they live, having restaurants and other ground floors that people are walking to, other retail. Having a narrower street that cars cannot speed down and where residents can sit comfortably or pedestrians can sit

comfortably outside. We hope that you agree that this will be an enormous important changes in the urban renewal atmosphere or the urban atmosphere of that block.

I wanted to talk just a little bit about design review, the process, and then my fellow Board Member Barry Zevin who is next on the list will talk about the design that we're very enthusiastic about.

The process, I want to highlight that because there was a very high level of collaboration of CDD and the CRA staff on the design review. The CRA design review committee which includes board members, CDD staff members, as well as CRA staff members, and had six design review meetings of -- to consider this building. And two of them were public review meetings. Let's see, a little history here.

The first, the first design -- the initial public review took place in May, but there were earlier, at least four earlier design review committee meetings. And the -- so that was in May. The CRA's had this project on its Board agenda for every month for ten months. And let's see, what else? Well, I think that's enough.

I know that the -- and the CRA knows that the Planning Board has a real understanding of the need for more housing, especially housing with an affordable component. And we know that the Planning Board takes it seriously, its planning and design review as does the CRA. I'm hoping that the CR -- we hope that the CRA, that the Planning Board will feel that the process of the amount of project of design review that took place at the -- in the CRA process

before it got to the, this Board was really valuable. You haven't had a whole bunch of questions about the actual design review of the Board, and I think that speaks of how well the process works.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, Margaret. Barry.

BARRY ZEVIN: Barry Zevin, Z-e-v-i-n. CRA board member as well. So I don't really have a whole lot to say, but I'd like to compliment the architects and the landscape architects. This process has been going on for about a year now and it seems to me it's actually getting -- it started very strong, but the design's been getting better and better instead of sort of flat lining at some point. I'm really particularly pleased to see a building envelope that's actually

rational rather than a (inaudible) of
arbitrarily placed materials. This thing
actually responds to the conditions of the
existing building surrounding it. And the
fourth floor roof space I think gives a real
chance for there to be some exchange with the
street and the separation of the tower from
the base building likewise. The little
pocket parks have been honed now I think to a
very good point form wise. And so that all
seems to be coming together quite well. And
I think just as Margaret has already said,
that the redevelopment authority is very
pleased with this. And I personally feel
like I've been chasing this building around
this block for a decade and a half at least
and waiting for some housing here, and
hopefully it will actually start to generate
the kind of retail that everybody has been

saying for decades that they want around

there along with what might come on the Volpe

site and the other Boston Property sites,

both of which I guess I would hope would be

more suitable places for three-bedroom and

family condo, family-friendly sized and

placed units. This is a very difficult urban

site to think about kids in. So I think

there's some, you know, some excuse for not

doing the full range of unit sizes. But I

think it's come a long way and I hope it goes

on.

        HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

     Next we have an entry for Catherine

Hornby and Jonathan Adams. Is this a -- just

Catherine.

        CATHERINE HORNBY: My name is

Catherine Hornby. It's C-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e.

Hornby is H-o-r-n-b-y. I live at 37 Gurney

Street in the western part of the street.

John Adams had to leave at nine o'clock, but

I'll try to carry the weight for both of us.

So, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the

Board, first thank you. I'm a member of the

Cambridge Bike Committee. John is the Vice

Chair. This clearly has been a long process

that a lot of thought has gone into and, you

know, it seems like a really interesting site

and a real technical challenge to fit

everything in. I'd like -- we did a memo to

the Board dated November 17th which I believe

you all had, but I wanted to focus

specifically on our concerns over going to

30-inch bike spacing as opposed to 36-inch

bike spaces. This has been pretty well

addressed earlier in this meeting, so I won't

go on at length, but I wanted to reinforce

that there's a public interest here. There

was a lengthy public process that was used to

set the Zoning standards that are in force

today. As Cara pointed out, those distances

actually were not a creation of the 2012

standards, but are of longer standing. But

there was in 2012, as I understand it, a

discussion about should they go to 30. MIT

was a proponent of going to 30, and the

decision at the time was essentially no, that

36 inches is the minimum standard necessary

to have those spaces be really usable. I

think that was the proper forum for that

discussion. I don't, I don't think that --

it doesn't appear to us, to members of the

committee, that the spaces in this project

are sufficiently comparable. That there

hasn't been this sort of evolution and design

evolution in technology which would allow

some kind of configuration which is an

entirely compliant, but in the spirit of the

standards, rather I think in this project

developers are making a real effort to deal

with the complicated space and to try to sort

of squeeze more into less. But I think from

the public perspective, this is a test case

for whether we are serious about these new

standards for Bike Zoning. I think that if

we want to change the culture away from motor

vehicle usage and away from single vehicle

trip, you know, vehicle trip reduction, I

think we need to make biking not just

possible but convenient; to make it easy, to

make it quick, to make it such that if you're

gonna, you know, pop into -- you need to zip

over to Whole Foods down, down by the river.

That it's as easy or maybe even easier to

grab a bike and go as it is to pop into your

car and go. I mean, that's sort of the

comparison. It's not impossible to squeeze

your bike into 30 inches. Is it's more will

the bike be readily used? Is it accessible?

Is it easy? I think right now there's a

small percentage, significant but small

percentage of the city that bikes, and it

will bike in the winter and it will bike if

it's icy. They will bike no matter what the

conditions. At least one of you. But that's

not the target audience. The target audience

is how do we get sort of the broad middle?

The people who could bike, maybe even do

bike, maybe they have a bike that's stuffed

in the corner that's hard to get to and the

helmet's not with it. And so, yes, they

sometimes bike, but really only one Saturday

a summer. How do we get those people to get

their groceries by bike? To go to, you know,

a Red Sox game by bike? And I think that's

where the Zoning matters and where design
matters. So I would ask you, I would refer
quickly to just other points of the distance
to the residential area to the trailer
parking. And it seems to be a little long.
We also like you to evaluate -- we don't,
this is a technical question. We'd like you
to evaluate whether the size of the freight
elevators are adequate for bikes and the
access ways the doors are adequate. And just
leave it at that time.

John Adams who had to leave early, he
had a horrific story about his brother age
seven was trying to yank a bike out of an
inadequate biking spot and another bike fell
over on him and injured his cheek
sufficiently that he doesn't bike as an
adult. He found this really an alarming
thing. So I think there's a huge difference

between a spot that you can just about yank a

bike out of versus a spot that's just as easy

to get into a car is for many people.

Thank you for your consideration and

thank you for what looks like actually a

great design. I hope it comes together

quickly.

HUGH RUSSELL: Could you hold up a

second?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm a little

confused. Is the standard that Zoning

requires three -- okay, so it's three feet

not 30 inches.

CATHERINE HORNBY: Yes, the standard

is 36 inches. This one proposes 30.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, yes. I'm

sorry. Because I'm confusing myself by

three-foot point zero inches, and thinking it

was 30 inches. But we're talking about 36

inches and the proposal the proponent has I think is 30 inches, two and a half feet.

CATHERINE HORNBY: That's what I understand.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

Next speaker Heather Hoffman.

And after Heather will be Alec Papazian.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi, Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. And the first thing that I want to say is that I was incredibly impressed by the questions that you guys asked, and so that leads to my first piece of advice which is don't let up. Boston Properties will do as mediocre of a job as you let them. The reason that this building is any more aesthetically pleasing than the other stuff that they've built in Kendall Square is because people have hassled

them, especially the CRA, but I count myself

in that group as well. I've been calling

this proposal the Vaporware Arms for a long

time, and I have vowed that I will not stop

until it's actually built and someone's

living in it. But we're certainly much

closer.

So the -- I wanted to fill in a little

bit of history that some of you may not have

been around for or may not have been aware

of, because this building started with the

Planning Board giving the 200,000 square

feet. It has been used as a way to extract

benefit after benefit from the city while not

building this building. That's why I call it

the Vaporware Arms.

So, first they -- they were gonna put

it over where the second Broad Institute

building is, but they decided that they

didn't --you know, apparently no one has been building any large apartment buildings in Cambridge in the last decade so they -- the market was not good for it.

There was an offer to buy the site by a whole bunch of people who wanted to build it and they wouldn't sell it from what I understand.

Then came the Broad proposal and all of a sudden they needed an increase of 300,000 square feet in the Zoning. So because that's what the Broad needed. And, you know, many of you were here to opine on that Zoning. Well as it turns out, the Broad didn't need 300,000 square feet. The Broad needed 250. And so now Boston Properties had 50,000 square feet to play with. And the misnamed Google Connector is the result of that 50,000 square feet. Now they were showing you the

stuff in the front where they took out the

planters that people used to enjoy that were

in front of that building. People used to

congregate there in nice weather. The

farmer's market was there once a week, and

there were lots of people around there. The

other place that was really popular was the

roof garden. And --

HUGH RUSSELL: Could you wrap up

your comments?

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Yeah.

So there isn't a connector there.

There's a 25,000 square foot building that's

instead of a big chunk of the roof garden.

And this is something that is really

important that is germane to this building.

We have first off, how much shade is gonna be

there? So I hope you will add that to your

list of questions. How much is that going to

shade the roof garden?

And the second thing is to understand that they shoved the Google building over because they said there had to be 50 feet between the Google building and this residential building. Take a look at your plans. There's 25 feet.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, Heather, could you --

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- your three minutes are up.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Take a look at these things and make sure that you are getting what we all have paid for for all of these years.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Alec Papazian.

ALEC PAPAZIAN: Hi. My name is Alec Papazian, P-a-p-a-z-i-a-n. I live at 105 Norfolk Street.

I wanted to say how happy I am to see proposed housing going on in Kendall Square most especially because we will not be building any new parking and we're actually reducing some parking. I know it's quite difficult, and I don't know the exact powers that there are for this, but a simple solution would be to allow this building to go below the 0.5 even just slightly to 0.45 or 0.4 and use that space parking that may involve the City Council which I know will complicate it beyond measure. But it's just sad that this simple solution is staring us in the face but because of legal issues we can't really do it.

I also second the Planning Board member

who ask had about why there is secondary egress for residents. It doesn't seem necessarily needed and kind of seems more trouble than it's worth since there's already is an egress on Broadway. The benefits don't seem that great considering how many pedestrians are expected to use it. And while I like the design, it does somewhat remind me of water in the area and I encourage you to look at the materials that were used for that building. It looks quite cheaply constructed, and I would not want to see something like that. While I support the increased density and the design, I would just -- I don't know what materials were used but it definitely for a new building it already looks like it's kind of not going to last very long. I wouldn't want to see something like that in Kendall Square.

So finally, as far as incentivizing the T passes, while agree with that in context given the location in Kendall Square; two stops away from Park Street, two stops away from Harvard Square. I really don't think you're going to have to incentivize the people to use the T. Anyone moving here is probably already going to be a heavy T user and I don't see it being that big of a difference.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak? Sure, red jacket.

PAOLO PISELLI: My name is Paolo Piselli. That's P-a-o-l-o P-i-s-e-l-l-i. Disclosure, I'm the brother of the architect from FX Fowle, Dan Piselli. I am not a resident of Cambridge, but this is a highly

relevant development for me because this is

my daily life, this site, and has been for

several years actually in many decisions.

Excuse me. I've worked at Google. Before

that I worked as a research assistant at MIT

in the Stata Center. And so the vision of

the whole development of this area is

basically why I'm at this meeting today. I

have been a patron of many sites at this

location whether it's Chipotle or Legal

Seafoods, Sage, Champions, the Marriott

Hotel. Even before I worked at Google, I've

kind of -- I've existed in this space for

many years. Recently I bought my first

property and I was considering locations in

Cambridgeport, but instead I chose to

purchase in Arlington because of prices. And

even that decision purchase was driven by the

increase in rental rates all throughout the

city. And so the story here, and we can hear
from the concerns about commuting and all
that, is the vision for the development of
Cambridge. And really the severe lack of
inventory, both rental and more broadly as
far as other living space goes, is something
that needs to be alleviated. And the, you
know, the country favoring policy that would,
you know, staunch this kind of development is
not very forward thinking. And I can think
for most of the comments that people have
made so far, there's a lot of support for
this in the community. Excuse me.

So long story short, I just feel that
the vision that has led to this building
shows that the process is working. I mean
the community is obviously having their
feedback. They've given constraints. Those
constraints have been heard. You know, the

developer, the developers are actively

interested in investing in this area. That

investment has paid off. It's why I work

here. It's why I shop here and do business

here. So I just wanted to say that I am

evidence of the success that is ongoing in

the Kendall District.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Someone else? Sure.

ERIC STEINLAUF: Hi. I'm Eric

Steinlauf, S-t-e-i-n-l-a-u-f. And I live in

Cambridge and also work at the site and I

actually just had one question. In the

diagrams of the egress into Pioneer Way it

shows a new egress location from the parking

garage, and I believe that's where the Google

private bike storage currently is in the

parking garage. So I was wondering if that's

being relocated or if their plans address

that bike storage?

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure, thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So now it's

time for us to raise any other concerns that

we have, make any comments.

LOUIS BACCI: Is the existing

outdoor space --

HUGH RUSSELL: Use the mic, please.

LOUIS BACCI: Excuse me.

Is the existing outdoor space in front

of Five Center for Legal, is that already

existing?

CLARA BATCHELOR: They have outdoor

seating on the other side so that's enlarged.

That's additional.

LOUIS BACCI: Because I know there were some....

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's currently the street. This is the alignment after we do -- redo the street.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm going to jump in here. The -- I guess I'm astonished that you come to us without knowing how many floors will be in the building and that -- and I'm wondering whether the proper response to that is not trying to maximize a 250-foot height by simply saying if you want to build it out of concrete, the building would just get a little bit shorter but will have the same footprint, because I think in my view it would -- the building would not be worse if it were, you know, 20 feet shorter. It wouldn't be much better, you know, but I think it might be a simpler approach.

The comment on the unit mix. I think one way to look at the large number of studios and microunits is sort of -- and the very few two-bedroom units, and I would preface this by saying I'm an architect who's done 30 or 40 multi-family housing projects, mostly in the burbs and in Boston. Most of the two-bedroom units I'm told to design are built to design for roommates. So I can -- I look at the micro and studio thing as saying well, if you put a micro and a studio together, you get, you know, 900 or 1,000 square feet, you still have two people living there. It's just the same as the two people sharing a two-bedroom apartment. And I have again as a former micro apartment resident, have shown my preference as I have my own space, however small it might be. My micro apartment was 240 square feet and had two

wonderful south windows and I couldn't have

been happier.

So, I'm not -- I'm also not -- I feel

like there aren't a lot of microunits yet and

there's a lot of housing. There's crazy

amount of housing. So this -- there would be

more small units in one particular building

that seems particularly suited for them,

doesn't seem to have citywide implications

except that it's providing a kind of housing

that's in apparently high demand. And if,

you know, the buildings that I were in that

were 100 years old, it's a demand that's not

a new demand. It's a demand that wasn't

being met for a number of years, 60 or 70

years. And that may be a function of how

lenders or HUD or other people who guaranteed

mortgages viewed housing.

The average -- in mid-Cambridge I think

the average number of people per dwelling

unit is like 1.3 or 1.4 which implies that a

lot of units have a single person in them.

And mid-Cambridge is a residential

neighborhood that a lot of people who work at

Harvard are in.

And so I'm not -- I ask the questions

about the mix and the sizes. It doesn't

concern me to hear the answers.

I thought the rendering of the pocket

parks showed the least imaginative

landscaping I have ever seen to us. And I

hope those are generic rendering landscaping

and not the real proposal to have some, you

know, some little shrubs that are pretty

boring and pretty insignificant. I think

there's a lot more potential there for making

something that's interesting and may show

some seasonal color. It may, you know -- and

the fact that none of the landscaping was

higher than this table and it's sitting next

to a building that's four stories and in some

places ten stories, all seemed like there was

again an opportunity to do more there. And

I'd like to see that opportunity.

It's hard for me to judge the

architectural quality. I'm certainly aware

of the reputation of the architect. They've

done a lot of work, although not as much in

Boston as in other places. It's something

that I think that still needs to have some

work done on it and some better understanding

of the materiality of it all.

We ordinarily ask that residential

buildings give some clues to their domestic

life. So for the building that was supposed

to have been built across the street, we

asked for -- we asked that question, and the

response was some I think French balconies

and other -- there might have been some real

balconies. I don't remember that design.

But I think Mike is nodding that he remembers

that discussion. And so I'm just wondering

about that. I have a feeling that, you know,

the whole balcony and the 18th floor is

probably not very valuable or very useful or

very pleasant, but something that

particularly helps to define the lower

building as a residential four-story piece in

the street. Again, it's hard for me to tell

if the renderings are -- don't tell me I

guess everything I need to know. So those

are my comments. And I guess you can infer

from the lack of other comments that I think

this is terrific that we're actually moving

forward on this. I think this is a, in my

mind, although there's other things that need

to be worked out you've got a fundamentally very sound proposal.

Other comments?

STEVEN COHEN: I just have to get in a few comments. First of all, well, I think it's a great design and a great proposal. And we're just, you know, you're talking around the edges here and some of the details to address. My sense is very strong. Procedurally I also want to acknowledge and to some extent defer to the process that has taken place to date. I mean, it sounds like you've been through a fairly robust design review with the CRA, and I think that the outcome of that is laudable, and out of respect for the CRA for that process, I intend to be a little bit perhaps more differential to the outcome than we might otherwise be.

In substance, I think it looks great.

I really like the way you use that reveal and

to segregate the podium from the tower.

Picking up at one point that Hugh alluded to,

in your materials that you show a nice pallet

of materials in your materials, but I'm not

sure where you're using those materials. And

I'm not sure exactly what that represents, or

maybe next time around you can enlighten us

or maybe even show us some samples in person.

But in any event, explain how and where

you're using the different materials.

And beyond that, I mean clearly we have

a few details that we're going to work on,

but I don't want to lose sight of the fact

that it looks like a very strong, you know,

very, you know, good design and good project

and I want to thank you and acknowledge that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Other comments?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Just a few
comments. I, too, am concerned about the
north facing park with the low shrubs. I
wonder if that is a landscape that couldn't
be more readily used for bike parking in some
portions of it. Bike parking.

Pioneer Way, I think we have to come to
grips with the fact that it's basically a
loading zone served on both sides. And let's
not fool ourselves that it's not going to be
any kind of grand pedestrian way. And so I
think we should think about it in a different
way and say, okay, well, it has these
functions that you need to serve this block
and that's fine, let's mask those, let's
control those, let's deal with the fact that
that function's going there and not try to
ignore it. And so I think that might change
the way you think about the way you design

that, the opening, the opening to that, to

that area which is a loading dock or maybe it

isn't something that you highlight, that's my

opinion. That there was very, very good and

lengthy questions about how long that was

working. I'm sure many in the room have

taken notice of that.

And the suggestion that in San

Francisco it's acceptable to have a second

little bike parking, I'd like to think of

ourselves as a progressive city like San

Francisco. Maybe that's a solution to add

more inventory to the bike, bike parking, and

still keep an adequate dimension between the

bikes. I would like an answer to the

question of what was raised about the Google

public parking or the Google inventory of the

bike parking potentially being affected by

this design. I'd like to know where those

bikes might be going to.

And lastly on the building design, I guess I disagree with my fellow board member. I really think it's a shame that the build to tower doesn't come to the ground in someplace. To me it looks slightly unstable architecturally. And I understand the marking of that cornice line is something that's supposed to give scale to that street, but at the same time the ensemble is split pretty dramatically by that, and I think there could be wonderful moments where the building came down, the tower came down to the ground at some point to express this verticality, its excitement, its reach to the sky.

What's the public interest in that? This, and I'd like to try to not make the comments on the architecture really on the

level of taste, but rather really to what's

the public interest here.

So this is the innovation district, and

I'm not so sure it's a great design. It's a

strong design and maybe a good design, but

it's not a great design. This is an

extraordinary place and getting more

extraordinary day by day in its program and

its activity and in its urbanism. And so I

think the standards for the quality and the

level of the architectural solutions probably

should be following that innovation district

and be leading the innovation district. And

I mean this in the gentlest way. I know this

is a very, very skilled design team, but the

building looks -- doesn't look -- it doesn't

match those aspirations. I don't think it's

nearly as plain as the one next-door. I

think it's a good building, but there's a

hope that that architecture could begin to

express a kind of newness and an innovative

quality. I think it's very close but very

difficult to give specific direction. And so

I for one would disagree with that slice.

That's it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, not to get

involved in the architectural debate, I

rather like the building and mostly I like

its sleekness, but if it could be even

sleeker, that would be great. You know, I

don't know how that happens. I'm glad it's

not brick. There's enough brick in that

particular area and there's, you know,

terra-cotta across the street. So I think,

you know, the glass and the spandrels and

aluminum do bring it into the innovation

district, an idea, and so I applaud that.

I would like to see a rendering, though, as I counted, this has 22 floors. I would like to see a rendering of what it might look like at 24 floors, because I'm not quite sure, you know, what's going to happen at the top where you change and you get the stronger horizontal and whether the -- if you keep, you know, the reveal between the podium and the tower, whether it's still going to match up as you claim it will with the building next-door. That's all I can say about it, you know, design-wise.

I am still, you know, concerned about the egress from Pioneer Way, and testimony seems to me not necessary for the residents to have the right to exit there. You know, if you need it as an emergency exit, fine, but I don't see any reason why everybody in the building can't enter and exit off of

Broadway and then you take those cars out of

the mix on Pioneer Way and then you're just

dealing with the loading dock and, you know,

what the indication was is that when the

loading dock was in great use, it is, you

know, not in time with the cars and use and

you free it up and it makes it easier for

pedestrians. Because I'm also concerned

about the cars coming out, having to cross

the two bike lanes and the parking lane and

then get into the center of traffic.

I expressed my comments about three

bedrooms, but there's been discussion about

why this might not be the most appropriate

place for it. I just ask that you think

about it a little more and maybe have some

further comments about that.

You know, I think it's great that it's

going to happen. You know, I think it will

be a very good addition to Ames Street and to

Kendall Square and really hoping that the

retail was successful. That's my only

comments now.

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

just one tactile question. The egress on

Broadway, is that median out or are you able

to make a left turn there?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Not able to make

the left turn.

STEVEN COHEN: No, okay.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Left turn in but

you can't make a left turn out.

STEVEN COHEN: I see. So one

advantage of having an egress here is to

facilitate that kind of left turn?

HUGH RUSSELL: Because people trying

to go west, I don't know what you do.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: You have to go

around the block.

SEAN MANNING: You go around the
block.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The residents
will have to do that.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Not just
residents.

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Any user of the
garage that has a pass.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's a monthly
pass?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: Monthly.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The
monthly passes are not limited to the
residents. They have offices.

HUGH RUSSELL: So people who work in
the offices?

MICHAEL CANTALUPA: But there's a
significant number that populate that garage.

But you've heard the volume. That takes that

into account.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I take it that --

I was going to say I would ask that you,

somebody tell us about why it's impossible to

make a left turn out of the Broadway garage

because that would then take the cars

presumably off. So not right now, but think

about it and talk to the city staff. I

expect there's a compelling reason why that's

the case, but if we know that as part of the

puzzle.

Other comments before people wish to

make at this time? Mary.

MARY FLYNN: I really don't have a

lot to add. I just want to kind of echo some

of the positive comments that have been made

about the project. I think it is wonderful

that there will hopefully finally be housing

in this part of Kendall Square. Personally I

like the design. I am not an architect or a

designer, but it does seem to be appealing.

Perhaps it could be tweaked, you know, I

think to my colleague's point, you know, we

want to make it as good a building as we

possibly can. So I would ask that you take

his comments very seriously and look at it

and see if perhaps there is something that

can be done to just push it a little bit

towards the great design that we're hoping

for.

My biggest concern really is the

Pioneer Way. I don't think it works. I

think it's a -- it would be wonderful if it

really was a pedestrian way. I just don't

see it. To me it's just going to be, just

kind of a mish-mash of -- and I understand,

you know, the coordinator will help, but I

don't think it's going to help enough. To me

it seems to me we're going to have to reduce

the amount of vehicles that come out through

that area. Again, it doesn't really help

with the loading zone issue, but I second or

third the many comments that my colleagues

have made that we need to take a hard look at

that space.

          HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

          LOUIS BACCI: I'll agree with my

colleagues again about the needs to have some

kind of residential identity. It doesn't

look like a residential building, but -- and

I don't know how you do that, but something.

     I guess that's about -- and the

landscaping touches, yes, more of a buffer

than a park atmosphere. I don't know, it

could use a little bit of work I guess. And

the Pioneer Way thing, I don't know what the

answer to that is, but it seems like there's

a lot of congestion in a very small area. I

don't know how you control it. And the

vehicles, yes, you can control the vehicles,

but the pedestrians and the bikes, how do you

have someone keep them out of the traffic?

So that's what I see.

THACHER TIFFANY: I'll add a couple

of comments. I guess I would just emphasize

that I think the message you're probably

getting is that we probably can't approve

either steel or concrete, we have to pick

one. And that is going to have significant

design implications I would think. You know,

if it's going to be concrete, we need to see

a rendering and because it will look a

little -- I'm not -- I don't totally

understand how it will impact the actual

articulation, but my sense is that it will

look different and the rhythm will be

different.

On Pioneer Way, I want to be

optimistic, but I -- I'm having trouble

getting there. I'm going to be looking

around, I'm going to be looking around town

for things that are good comparisons. You

know, I think I've seen a lot of great shared

streets around the city and in other cities,

but the point, I'm hard pressed to think of

one that has quite as much going on but I'm

going to be looking closer. And if you have

any comparisons for us next time, it would be

helpful to think about it, that might be

good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I think we're

done.

Jeff, do you have anything else you

want us to address?

JEFF ROBERTS: Not particularly. I think we've -- and the rest of the staff have been keeping a list of what's been brought up both in the questions portion and then in this portion of discussion, so I guess it's just a matter of -- because we will offer to meet with the proponent and go through the list of issues as we generally do.

So if there's anything that you feel hasn't been said that hasn't come up in comment before, that that should be addressed, then please let us know.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So thank you very much. I think we're actually quite excited about all of this. And so even if it's not a hundred percent endorsement, it's pretty close to that.

Thank you very much.

(At 10:00 p.m., 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: 12/2/2014
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 183 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 9th day of January, 2015.

_____
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.