


## PROCEEDINGS

(Sitting Members: Hugh Russel1, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, H. Theodore Cohen, Steven Winter, Ahmed Nur.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening, this is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And the first item on our agenda is the review of the Board of Zoning Appeal cases.

LIZA PADEN: This is an agenda of the cases that are going to be heard on January 24th. The first I would like to point out to you is 8 Mill Street. Harvard College is going to be putting a small addition to provide accessibility to the building. The proposal has been reviewed by the Cambridge Historical Commission and Charles Sullivan, and the Board writes that they have made a determination that the second floor connector, which is the subject of the Zoning relief, will have no adverse affect on the major exterior features of the
building. And they are looking for forward to having approved accessibility to the building.

If the Board wants to look at that case, I do have a set of plans here.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does the building have a name?

LIZA PADEN: It's called -- yes, it does. It's called McKinlock Hall. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. I have no --

LIZA PADEN: It's the one --
STEVEN WINTER: If the Historical Commission feels it's ready to move forward, then it's fine.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I feel it's not visible much from the street. It must be connecting the dining hall. There's a plan, I don't know how I've seen this, but maybe there -- Harvard has an agenda to convert al1 of their 1930's dormitories into accessible
faces which involves reconfiguring major project. I don't think they've done an enormous amount of work on them because they were built really well.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: And so now they're kind of, you know, 80 years after they're built they're going back and fixing things.

LIZA PADEN: So the complication for this case is that the connector that's going to bring together the two buildings is in the front yard setback.

HUGH RUSSELL: Because the building is enormous and it has a Residency 3-D District with a formula setback that is ridiculous.

LIZA PADEN: Yes, that's it.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
LIZA PADEN: And there's also a case on the agenda tonight for 238 Main Street, Mr. Sousa is here for Sprint. This is a
replacement of the telecommunication antennas on the building. Do you want to look at that?

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess we have the owners here, too?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, we do.
HUGH RUSSELL: So the good news, you're putting a lot of new stuff on the building, and the good news is you can't see it. Is that basically the story?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Fairly close, Mr. Chairman. We're actually substituting just three of the existing CDMA antennas operated by Sprint, and we're replacing them with multimode antennas. So we're not increasing the number of antennas in any way. And so we're just substituting three of the old stem antennas for new multimode antennas.

STEVEN WINTER: And the difference between the two are?

## ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: They are

 longer. The new antennas are longer, and they operate two different frequencies, both 1500 and 900 megahertz. Much like the previous modifications that I've done for Sprint.And so we're not increasing the number, we're also adding remote radio heads to this installation. A11 of the antennas, the existing installations consists of six panel antennas operating both the Sprint and ClearWire signals, and three of those, the CDMA antennas are going to be taken out to replace some of the new ones. They're all facade-mounted. There are two large -- if you look at the photo sims, there are two large black screen walls up there hiding HVAC equipment, and four of our panel antennas are on the facade of that -- those screen walls. And so the new antennas will also be facade-mounted. They will not extend beyond
the height of the screen wall in any fashion. STEVEN WINTER: And they'11 be black as well?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And they'11 be black as well. And then two of the panel antennas, the only place you can really see them are from the first view, which is the back parking lot of the building. Two of those -- there are two antennas that are facade-mounted on a brick penthouse just to the left. You can see it pointed with an arrow. And once again we're just substituting, taking out one old one and putting in one new one.

STEVEN WINTER: And I know you've had helped us with this before, but what does a radio head look like?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Radio head is a box. It's about 18 inches wide and about one foot tall.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And these are going to be placed down at the bottom of the penthouses.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So that they're below the parapet wall. So they're not visible to the public.

And the remote radio heads that go with the antennas that are on the black screen walls, those remote radio heads will actually be inside the screen wall so they will not be visible to the public at all. So what we've tried to do is design this modification so that it has as little....
(A short recess taken due to technical difficulties.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So do you want to repeat your answers --

Attorney RICARDO SOUSA: I can.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- and she can write down the questions.

## ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: You asked

 with we respect to the model that's here before you, Kenda11 Square has a proposal before the -- the Board has a proposal before it where additional buildings will be built close to the subject building at 238 Main Street. And what will happen to our installation if in fact those new buildings are built and block our signal, and my response would be that this happens on a fairly regular basis in an urban environment and we often have to find an additional location to solve that blockage problem so that we can provide not only coverage but capacity to the customers in that location.And with respect to your other question as to whether or not buildings can be built to accommodate or better accommodate in advance some wireless installations. Each of these networks is to a great extent dynamic. It's -- they're unique to the carrier and
there's so much going on between carriers relative to the consolidation, and it would be hard to predict for a building owner exactly where a particular carrier needs coverage. That being said, most buildings are built with screen walls around the HVAC equipment, and that's usually a perfect location for our antennas from an aesthetic perspective.
(William Tibbs Seated.)
HUGH RUSSELL: And probably the top two floors of the biotech buildings are going to be entirely mechanical equipment and so they might be located within the building.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Provided, you know, there were places that the radio waves could get through.

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, that's right, Mr. Chairman. If you use RF transparent material as the screen material,
you can replace the antennas materials that behind and still transmit the signal.

HUGH RUSSELL: And then arguably you
would have to come to the city for or --
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We would.
Under your current by-law yes, we would.
HUGH RUSSELL: Even if it's hidden inside the building. We could --

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: My understanding is that yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: We could probably work on that.

Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: I have -- I had a comment which is that I think that we should forward this with a note to the Board of Zoning Appeals that this proponent came in with everything looking really good and that this reflects a trend that we're seeing now which is the proponents are coming in extending a lot of effort to try to make
these -- this infrastructure not visible to the public and we really do appreciate that. And the other thing is when -- do you know if when the infrastructure is decommissioned, does the carrier always remove it or does the carrier, in your practice sometimes leave it there and it must be removed by somebody else?

ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Typically it's the carrier's obligation both under the 1ease agreement --

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: -- and very
often drawn by the by-law --
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: -- to remove any obsolete equipment.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: There have been instances where there have been sort of fly by night companies that have left their

| 1 | dishes here or there. But in most cases the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | reputable carriers, the larger public |
| 3 | carriers remove their equipment. |
| 4 | STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thank you. |
| 5 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: You're |
| 6 | welcome. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: So, do we want to |
| 8 | send a message to the Zoning Board that we |
| 9 | are happy with this and that? |
| 10 | STEVEN WINTER: And that the |
| 11 | proponent made every effort, yes. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 13 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Convincing. |
| 14 | ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you, |
| 15 | Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Anninger. Thank you |
| 16 | members of the Board. Have a good night. |
| 17 | Thanks for your time. |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, do we have any |
| 19 | comments on any other Zoning case? |
| 20 | (No Response.) |
| 21 | HUGH RUSSELL: So I don't hear |

anybody. So I'd say that we'11 go on to the next item on our agenda which is an update by Brian Murphy.

BRIAN MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
After tonight's hearing the next hearing will be January 22nd. That will have a public hearing on medical marijuana interim regulations as well as a continuation of the Forest City hearing at which time we would expect to have a favorable recommendation for the Board to approve -- that answers the questions that were raised at the last hearing.

In addition, there will be additional discussion under general business for bike parking zoning.

February 5th the Planning Board goes on the road. It wil1 be Town Gown reports at the Central Square Senior Center, and then we've also have hearings February 12th and 19th for the month of February.

| 1 | Also just to let you know at |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | yesterday's City Counci1 meeting they took |
| 3 | the cafeteria amendment to the Zoning and |
| 4 | moved that with a favorable recommendation to |
| 5 | a second reading. So that's moving its way |
| 6 | along. And this Thursday afternoon the |
| 7 | Ordinance Committee will have a hearing on |
| 8 | the Forest City proposal. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. |
| 10 | Liza, are there any new transcripts? |
| 11 | LIZA PADEN: Yes, we have the |
| 12 | December 18th and it's been certified as a |
| 13 | complete document. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Is there a |
| 15 | motion to accept that? |
| 16 | AHMED NUR: So moved. |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those in favor? |
| 18 | (Raising hands). |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: Everybody voted in |
| 20 | favor. |
| 21 | So the next item on the agenda is a |

public hearing on what's called the MIT Zoning Petition which creates a new planned unit development District 5.

I guess I would comment that this is a matter that's quite complicated and the Board does not expect, I think, to make a recommendation tonight on this. I think looking at our agenda it looks like we might discuss it February 19th. And so our goal tonight is to hear this proposal officially. We've heard it unofficially in December. To hear people's comments. And it is to get all of the issues out on the table. And then we'11 choose through them on February 19th.

So when you're -- and we're not -we've sent a recommendation. We're not the City Counci1. The City Council is the one who acts on this. So one thing that's helpful to us is if you just want to voice your agreement with things that people have said before you, that you just can get up and
just say that rather than repeating what's been said before. Because, again, the idea is to get everything out on the table and to get a rough sense of what people think.

So, what's the first order of agenda? Are you going to kick this off, Brian?

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure, just with a little bit of an overview. And that is to emphasize that this is a petition that while it's coming before the Board formally tonight, this is hardly a case of a first impression. This is something that's been discussed before, it was previously filed, and it's gone through some different iterations. I would say with the extensive discussions between CDD staff as well as with representatives at MIT. In addition MIT was an active participant through the K 2 process. And I think what you're going to see tonight is a proposal that is much more, that has been changed dramatically by the Kendal1

Square process and it's one that is very much in keeping with the spirit and the goals and sort of the initiatives of the K2 process. That there's really a stamping amount of alignment. I think you all should have a memo that Jeff Roberts going through the section by section analysis. While it's voluminous in many instances, it simply sort of high1ights the agreement between K2 and this proposal. In other instances it sort of just shows a difference of approach, and we just start the process of providing greater context for the Board and highlighting some of the issues for additional discussion. But, again, despite the memo's length I really do think this is really a significant amount of agreement between the K2 goa1s and this petition. And one in which it was clearly very much shaped by that process as well.

Our thought would be that for tonight
after you've got the MIT hearing and then after public comment that it might be helpful to have Roger and Iram go more into some of the details of some of those pieces from Jeff to provide a little more context if that's helpful.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, we'11 see how the time goes because we have one other item on the agenda that we'11 probably not want to take up after 9:30.

So who's going to start? Welcome, Steve.

STEVE MARSH: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I do want to recall that I think I was the person who broke this podium the last time I was here. I did offer to pay for it. I would be happy to reimburse the Planning Board for that. We had a heavy agenda that night I guess.

Good evening, members of the Planning Board and members of the public. For the
record, my name is Steve Marsh. I'm the managing director of real estate at MIT. I'm delighted to be joined tonight by Israel Ruiz, our Executive Vice President at MIT; Professor Marty Schmidt, Associate Provost; Michael Owu, the Director of Real Estate; Sarah Gallop Co-Director of Office of Government and Community Relations, and the office of the President; and David Manfredi from Elkus Manfredi Architects. So it's great to be here tonight to discuss our new Zoning Petition which has been recently referred to you by the Cambridge City Council.

Michae1, do you want to -- why don't you give me that.

So our agenda tonight is pretty straight forward. We hope to present a clear picture of our petition tonight and be responsive to some of the issues that you've raised in some of our earlier discussions
regarding our Kendall Square initiative. You will recall that we were here in December prior to the filing of the Zoning to give you a preview of our petition. Tonight we'd like to take the opportunity to walk through the language in the petition with you as it has been filed and sits before you tonight.

In December you also had some comments and questions regarding academic planning context at MIT, the role of the MIT innovation model in Kendal1 Square and elsewhere, and as well as some questions regarding MIT housing in this area and in general. So following my review of the Zoning tonight Israel Ruiz our Executive Vice President will speak to some of these issues.

Before I begin, I do want to say thank you to the Planning Board. I think you have dedicated an extraordinary amount of time and attention and patience with this petition. We have had an opportunity to get quite a lot
of thought-provoking comments from you and have spent time with the community, City Council, and the administration of the city, and the CDD staff, and I think as a result of this and the comments along the way, that this is a much more comprehensive mixed use vision of Kendall Square so we're very grateful to that.

I would like to walk through the Zoning Petition sections in their basic form. I assume you all have copies before you of the petition. And in our material tonight we have included a chart later in the presentation outlining the differences between the 2011 petition and our current petition which we can discuss further after our presentation.

Turning to the Zoning Petition itself, the first section is 1380 which is the purpose section. The major purposes of the PUD-5 District include, first and foremost
advancing Kendal1 Square as a world renowned center of innovation. We all know that Kendall Square plays a critical leadership role in the world regarding innovation. We know that the essential work that's done here improves the well-being of our citizens, and this has a tremendous positive influence on our local and regional economy. At the same time we're facing tremendous competitive pressures from around the globe. As others seek to emulate the model that's carried out in Kendal1 Square, and it's important for us to maintain a competitive edge.

The second major purpose here is we want to create a vibrant mixed use district. If we've learned nothing in this process, I would say the one thing that we've learned has been loud and clear, is the fact that this is a community. And it is about connecting to the community, and it's important for us to further build and connect
with our local community through this initiative. By making the right places for a community, academia, and business, to mix, collaborate, and socialize, we think it's critically important. Sharing and developing ideas together and developing relationships we think what makes this area special, and we want to try to create the infrastructure and the space that helps enable that. I think third and equally important here is enabling MIT's academic mission. Part of the innovation piece -- we're gratified to hear that so many people share our view on the importance of sustaining and protecting MIT's academic activity. So this is not one in lieu of the other, this is both. We need to maintain what's going on the at MIT and protect that capacity so that MIT can evolve and prosper in the future as an important anchor in this community.

The next section of the petition
outlines a PUD boundary and delineates some sub-districts. As you can see here, there's the 26-acre PUD district and it's broken down into four subdistricts; the Memorial Drive height subdistrict along the river here, the transitional height subdistrict along Ames Street and Amherst, and the Main Street subdistrict south of Main, and the Third Street transition subdistrict. And these components are broken out really and affecting allowable heights in Zone within the PUD. And I'11 talk further about them later in the presentation.

The next section specifies the allowed uses in a district, and all of these uses are allowed across the entire district, and they include residential, retail, 1aboratory/office and other uses supportive of mixed use innovation district.

The next section identifies the floor area ratio. The maximum FAR across the
district is 13 -- 3.9, and ground floor retail is excluded in that calculation number.

The next section limits the new commercial development to 980,000 square feet. Again, we want to make sure that we're protecting the academic as a critical use of in this district. And it also controls the floor plate sizes consistent with the K2 conditions where there were lower floor plate sizes as we went up in the scale of the building.

Sections 13.845 control parcel sizes and setbacks. We've established the minimum parcel size of 25,000 square feet and a setback of 16 feet is required along major streets. Pedestrian bridges are allowed in the district.

Our height regime is fairly straight forward. Starting from the Memorial Drive district we have the height going to 150
feet, and we have extended that Zone along the front end here as recommended.

The transition subdistrict has a height of 200 feet, and the Main Street subdistrict and the Third Street transitional subdistrict goes to 250 feet which are quite consistent with the current allowable heights in the north side of Main Street. In each of these 250-foot subdistricts one building is allowed to go up to 300 feet as long as the area over 250 feet is dedicated to residential. And furthermore, any residential square footage above 250 feet wil1 be subject to a moderate income housing requirement.

The minimum open space across the district is 15 percent. And you've seen this image before, it high1ights the potential for open space connections across the district.

This would work with the community and the city to identify areas of opportunity within Kenda11 Square area.

Our parking ratios reflect the latest recommendations from the Traffic Department by way of the K2 study. They are 0.9 for office, 0.8 for laboratory, a range of 0.5 to 0.75 for residential, 0.5 for retail, and 0.25 per hote1 room.

The Zoning requires development proposals to include a shared parking study as well. It also requires all structured parking to be below grade except we are allowed to extend the above grade garage at One Broadway to take advantage of the looping system inside. The Zoning also includes some provisions to deal with temporary and existing parking which we will continue to work through with Traffic Department as we think about the logistics in the plan.

Sections 1389.1 through 4 are some standards and conditions, and this is an important catch-all section of the Zoning. One very important concept included in the
section is the requirement that construction must commence on 240,000 square feet of housing before more than 600,000 square feet of commercial development is permitted to ensure that housing is not an after thought in the execution of the Kendall Square plan. As part of these sections we have made both the inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and the incentive Zoning payments a requirement.

Section 13.89 .3 relates to innovation requirements. It requires that the PUD District include innovation space equivalent to five percent of new commercial gross floor area in perpetuity.

The K2 process has been very helpful in helping to define the characteristics of these important spaces including the nature of short-term leases and shared spaces that help innovators and entrepreneurs in Kendall. We have been a leader in creating innovation space certainly over our time, but most
notably for the last 14 years at One Broadway and elsewhere. And we plan to meet our requirements through our ongoing innovation activities for this particular component.

Our next section deals with
sustainability. It requires LEED Gold as a standard for all new office and laboratory buildings, and incorporates best practices across the district. We have been working with the Tellier 10 to help us plan appropriate measures.

The next section deals with the Sign Ordinance. The PUD District must be compliant with all provisions of Article 7 as applicable to business, office, and industrial districts. This is in contrast to the MXD language we had used previously.

We all know that active use is critical to this district, it's one of the areas that we are focussed on. This section requires that 75 percent of first floor of new
development must be devoted to retail or other uses open to the public.

The next section is focussing on the community fund requirement. The general principle of this has come out of discussions at K2. It has been a topic of discussion at City Counci1, and at this Planning Board about how we're handling community benefits over time. So this section helps us to find a committee that will oversee this activity. It requires a contribution of $\$ 10$ per square foot of commercial space. It outlines three policy components that we hope to target which are open space, transportation improvements, and workforce development. And it does allow pre-approved credits.

So this completes the overview of the language portion of the petition. I do want to just reintroduce two other slides to you that we did share in December. I just thought they were appropriate to bring back.

The first outlines the differences that we had between 2011 and the 2012 petitions. And as we've discussed here, I think this petition has benefitted immensely from the community input and the Planning Board input we've received over the last 18 months.

The second slide, which again, is a revision of the slide we had here last time, is a comparison of the K2 study versus the MIT Petition with respect to scope and massing. You know, I don't want to spend a lot of time on both of these slides because I know you've seen them and we've talked about them at the last meeting, but I did want to remind you that they are here in the package and are part of the conversation tonight. So we are willing to address and engage wherever you fee1 appropriate.

I would like at this point in time like to take the opportunity to introduce Israe1 Ruiz, the MIT's Executive Vice President who
wi11 address questions about academic context, speak to innovation at MIT which I think most people have asked us about over time, and present an updated status of MIT housing.

ISRAEL RUIZ: Thank you, Steve. My name is Israel Ruiz, and as Steve said, I'm the Executive Vice President and Treasurer at MIT, the institute senior officer for all the administrative and financial functions, including financial and capital planning and support of the institute's mission. I am pleased to be here. I've been here before throughout the process before April of 2011, and to talk with you all again.

I, along with President Rafael Reif and Provost and Chris Kaiser. I'm very excited about this new initiative, and I would like to briefly cover three topics today. MIT's tradition of innovation and partnership with
industry. Our east campus area and integration with new commercial development and this proposal with our existing and future academic uses, and in particular, a third topic, MIT student housing.

Let me begin with MIT's tradition of innovation. Innovation is in MIT's DNA. In fact, it's the magnet that brought me to MIT from wonderful and sunny Barcelona. It is MIT's motto mens and matter, mind at hand. MIT's founder and first President William Barton Rogers launched MIT in 1961 with a revolutionary educational vision. Rogers wanted to accelerate America's early industrialization and recognized the need for people who could grasp the principles of science and engineering firmly enough to devise the new technologies of new materials require us it to speed industrial proper. This juxtaposition illustrated for the first time the power of proximity and getting it
all together. Today real world problem solving and innovation happens everyday. At MIT and in our labs, in our classrooms driven by our faculty, some of them here tonight, students, and with collaborations with industry that are pushing the boundaries and continue to advance the mission and strengthening our DNA.

Just as Arthur D. Little did 100 years ago today we have recent examples like Novartis, Pfizer, (inaudible) locating close to campus, close to MIT, to benefit from this power. In fact, the research connections that have always existed among these firms are strengthened and amplified, and in particular transformed by this power of proximity.

I've used this slide before, I think about a year ago, to indicate the evolution of MIT's mission. It is in our DNA to evolve. It is in our DNA to continue to be
defining the future of our mission and innovation. And it's not only done through our mission, but it's also done through our spaces, through our laboratories, through our buildings, through our surrounding neighborhoods. You can see here one of the original General Electric laboratories, in fact, that looks very much like the one I grew up in Barcelona doing engineering with, that's been transformed today in the Papalopulu (phonetic) lab you can see that our beloved building 20 where the MAT lab occurred transformed today to the Stata building and the original cancer center from 1974, which today it's integrating the sciences of engineering and biological sciences into one building at the Koch Institute for innovative cancer research. So it not only stops at the laboratories in the buildings but it's also surrounding neighborhoods. To the bottom left you can
see Technology Square and the transformation together working with the city and the partnership. You can see University Park in the middle. And you can see today's aerial image of Kendal1 Square and what we envision and imagine for its future.

As we think about all of this in context of campus development and the context of our evolving mission and transformation of innovation model, we take into consideration several planning principles. You can read here three of them, the dynamic relationship when the campus and enhanced mixed use district. The redevelopment of growth and the redevelopment of the facilities and the growth of our campus. And in particular today as we talk about more and more complex problems and real world issues, the large scale and specialized research facilities that are necessary to connect and interact and collaborate on the building level. You
can you see the image of a typical floor plate for the Koch Institute, our most recent laboratory building.

We strongly believe in our Kendall
Square proposal nutures and propels this critical partnership with academia and industry. This petition will enable us to meet the future academic needs of our east campus area, and advance innovation opportunities in the Kendall Square area.

We wanted to continue to grow our robust local economy which has been heavily influenced by MIT's participation. In fact, many of you recently saw the Forbes article quoting and describing how MIT driven research has brought about $\$ 2$ billion of research funding to the Kendall Square area. Moving on to my second topic for tonight, I wanted to give you a sense of the context for the east campus, and in particular of how the east campus fits
contextually and frames the Kenda11 Square proposal. This is a current image of the east campus which has a healthy balance of facilities supporting academics, housing, student life, and administrative functions. I don't need to, again, you know perfectly the area. And what I want to do now is I would like to quickly walk through a series of floor plans illustrating the several uses that MIT has today on the east campus.

Here in this light you see in blue all of the academic and research facilities currently in the east campus of MIT. Highlighted at the top, two of our newest buildings for which we are very proud of and we're very proud of the work that we were able to do collaboratively with the city. S1oan building E62 at the bottom right and media lab at E14 our (inaudible) at Ames Street. Two magnificent facilities that bring together, again, our fabulous faculty
and students to do the collaborations with industry that happen to be around the Kendal1 Square area with the Google, the Microsoft, and others.

Moving on to the second views, you can see here high1ighted the residential and institutional housing. You can see some of our undergraduate dorms, the paralle1 dorms on the east campus. You can see some of the other institutional uses as well as East Gate, to the right of this map. The east campus and senior house are up there. These are undergraduate dorms. And incidentally I'd like to mention that right next to Kendall Square, the district we're talking about, we have about 1300 students and families living today at MIT in the housing.

In green these are the facilities that support athletics at MIT from the Sailing Pavilion all the way to the alumni pool to the Stata Center to the top, left of this
diagram, as well as student life. A Walker Memorial being a center for student life for undergraduate and graduates.

Here you can see uses that we relate to service and administration, importantly right in the middle of this light labelled E23. It's our health center. And you can see in the buildings along Main Street how you may recognize some of those buildings as administrative uses, that's where some of our offices, including our successful MIT press is located. And it creates the combination of these uses in the current east campus landscape.

I wanted to high1ight also for all of us the areas in which we think is our, today, existing parking lots which we see as possible future academic development sites. These are prime sites for development and for interaction and connections with our current existing facilities. And you can see also
how important we think about the connections, not only within the district but also together as we look at what we refer is the Infinite Corridor extending to the left of this diagram and then moving on to the neighboring sites all the way north of Main Street and certainly along Third Street, major drivers for connectivity for this district.

Importantly as I said, I wanted to contextualize the east campus of MIT and the context of this proposal, you can see here in red and gold to the north of the diagram, these are the proposed sites of development that are part of the Kendal1 Square proposal.

I wanted to kind of highlight and visualize what we refer to as the Gateway and note this is a very important area. This is where the Kendal1 T stop, you can recognize it's not in here, but it's a very key point and highlight of the east campus today. This
is a key area for us for the creation of an eastern campus gateway. And in fact, I wanted to link this to summarize this context which I just outlined for you that the existing condition. As you know, Provost Chris Kaiser convened a faculty task force to examine our Kendal1 Square proposal. The task force recommendations focussed on the importance of this particular gateway I showed you, and the integration of the proposed commercial sites with the existing and future academic plans that I just contextualized for you on the east campus. Today we're beginning to define the scope of this study which we envision will take place in two parts.

The first part will involve the internal MIT community, faculty, staff, and students, and will envision the creation of this eastern campus gateway and the excited possibilities for these key part of MIT's
campus.
The second part will broaden engagement to include the Kendal1 Square community at large, including properties owned by others as we work collaboratively to create a series of gathering places in Kendall Square.

In terms of integration, we want to be sure to emphasize the proper relationship with nearby neighborhoods. That we build the longer Third Street coming into Kendal1 Square as a critical extension of the East Cambridge community. And in conjunction with this the continued support for active residential and retail development.

Going back to the east campus study, in terms of the gateway and note, we see that there is a principle focus in the short term of the study, and we want to make sure that we explore options with and without the historical buildings in cooperation with the Historical Commission and other stakeholders
as shared with the Planning Board in the past.

Moving on to my final topic, I just want to spend a few minutes summarizing MIT's student housing program. I think you are aware that we house nearly all of our undergraduate students in a variety of residential hal1s; fraternity, sororities, and independent living groups. Housing is guaranteed for all undergraduates, and we're currently evaluation the physical conditions of our existing undergraduate residences. Some of which are in significant need of updating.

We're also very proud of MIT's record because it relates to housing our graduate students. We currently house about 39 percent of them, although that percent it fluctuates depending on graduate enrollment, which in turn fluctuates depending on our sources of funding, some of which we're
working. In particular I learned personally a lot about federal funding and support.

Since 1997 we've been able to house a significantly higher number of graduate students at the creation of a graduate/resident community near

Cambridgeport. Since then we have added 1300 new graduate beds plus 468 new undergraduate beds.

We have heard the question of graduate student housing raised several times. Here is our graduate students in context with some of our peers. And during this dialogue, and now with a recommendation of the faculty task force, will examine the current housing needs of our students. In particular our graduate students.

At present we're finalizing the charge for this group, this is another of the recommendations of the faculty task force. We expect to identify the chair for this
effort this current week and be ready to begin the process as the semester starts. It is our intent to populate the group with faculty and student representatives, and we expect that the evaluation will take anywhere from 12 to 18 months.

With this I'd like to turn back to Steve's presentation.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
STEVE MARSH: As you know, we've been here many times before regarding Kendall Square. And as we said, we appreciate the time in that. Tonight, though, we felt it was really important to walk through the fine pieces of the petition to help you understand our approach and our intentions about what we're trying to do in Kendall Square. And I think we recognize that tonight is a start of a formal process, and we look forward to your comments, questions, and the direction you may have regarding any additional materials
that you think you need to help you understand this petition better. So we're at your beck and call with regard to helping you with any of the materials or questions along the way. So we look forward to working together with you, the City Council, and our stakeholder communities to make Kendall a place that we can all be very proud of. So I'11 be happy to take questions.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Do we want to have questions now or shall we continue on to the public?

Okay, so there's probably a sign-up sheet.

Bill.
WILLIAM TIBBS: I was just wondering if you at least want to comment on the letter we got from the representative, some of the MIT faculty members? I think it's appropriate for you to at least comment on it.

ISRAEL RUIZ: So we acknowledge the letter and we acknowledge that MIT -- as we've presented is a very diverse and varied community with lots of views, opinions, and needs. And we certainly have worked very strongly, very hard with the faculty task force that Provost Chris Kaiser put together to make sure our proposal reflects the needs of the majority of our community, including the faculty and students. We believe that is what the task force recommended moving forward with, and some of the views are recognized here, but we also recognize that some of the views may not be totally represented as well.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Okay, if someone could get the sign-up
list to me, that's the way we will start.
So, we'll go from the list to start with and you can come forward, please give
your name for the record. Please spell your name if there's any possibility that there might be some assistance or ambiguity in how your name might be spelled, and please limit your remarks to three minutes. Remember, the idea is to get the ideas out on the table, that's the most important thing that we want to hear.

So the first name on the list is Brian Spatocco, Pacific Street.

BRIAN SPATOCCO: I've actually prepared remarks. Can I leave those?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. You should leave them with us, though, and not with the recorder. Although she may look like the most important person, she is not.

BRIAN SPATOCCO: Good evening. My name is Brian Spatocco. I live at 70 Pacific Street here in Cambridge, and I speak today as somebody that served on the Kendall Square Advisory Committee and currently serving as
the president of the graduate student body at MIT. Although I've been involved in student government, this evening I'd like to speak to you all as if you were my research advisor. Over the last four years I've learned that the unique value we can add as graduate students does not lie along the lines of politics but in an objective, quantitative analysis. Thus those looking to hear whether the MIT graduate body is for or against the MIT Zoning Petition may leave somewhat dissatisfied. Rather the major take away we'd like to leave you with is that before any development there is already a housing crisis in the City of Cambridge. However, the lack of comprehensive citywide analysis impairs our ability to assess whether or not MIT's petition provides sufficient amounts and types of housing to prevent the growth of this crisis.

For the last ten years our team of
graduate research just poured over the housing numbers and that's transpatially, chronologically, and demographically. We've had access to and analyze the largest suite of complete housing data for any one group within Cambridge, and we've done it with some of the best minds at MIT.

My colleague Nathaniel will go into more detail, but here's what we know for sure. Last year rental rates in Cambridge grew by 7.95 percent. It's one of the largest in the United States. Cambridge's rental vacancy rates are at an all time low. And three, further development without appropriate provisions of affordable housing to account for both the existing shortage and the increased demand as a result of any new project will exacerbate the problem.

So how much housing do we actually need?

We don't know and we don't think many
others in this room have any idea either.
Put differently, because the housing market is still equilibrating from the recent development and there have been no citywide studies in the last year or two, we have little predictive power at this point to make any recommendations or cast judgment on this petition. MIT has already explicitly acknowledged this problem internally, and as a result as we've just heard, is commissioning a study of housing needs for its off campus community. My expectation and hope is that the output from this group will arrive at a time prior to any hammers swinging in Kendall.

But why should it be just MIT that does this analysis? Tonight I'd like to ask the Planning Board explicitly to consider recommending to the City Council that further decisions on up zoning in the city of Cambridge be first placed in the context of a
targeted housing study looking at the interplay between current development and affordability and availability. We the graduates of MIT are ready and able to assist. Though I love to be able to stand before you this evening and give you an impassioned judgment of whether the Zoning Petition is in the best interest of students or not, I cannot as a scientist do so in good conscious. Tonight rather, I ask that Cambridge aspire to act as intelligently and predictably as the types of people it hopes to attract.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: The next speaker is Nathaniel Schafheimer. NATHANIEL SCHAFHEIMER: Good
evening. My name is Nathaniel Schafheimer, S-c-h-a-f-h-e-i-m-e-r. I live at 3 Ames Street in Cambridge. I'm a PhD. student at MIT. And I'm also one of the graduate
student council's housing and community affairs co-chairs this year.

Even in the absence of the citywide analysis or the study that was just brought up by MIT's party, we still know a lot about the housing needs as our community. There are 6,510 of us, including visiting students. 4,050 of them are off campus, and 2400 of those are living in Cambridge off campus. The GSC in collaboration with MIT's IR and the Dean's offices analyzes a lot of data from different surveys relating to student expenses, transportation, and academic life. I'd like to share with you guys tonight some relevant insights from these and several other data sources.

So the question often comes up during conversations about housing. Why do graduate students need to live in Cambridge? Isn't this a luxury? Most graduate students would say no. Our research projects many times do
not end neatly or in a timely fashion. In addition to those scientists that are required to check in on experiments throughout the night, those that could work from home are increasingly in need of interdisciplinary action with those same peers that work directly on campus. Indeed this interdisciplinary mixing was a goal of the Koch and Stata Centers.

Sorry. I gave you the transcript for this.

So for this and many other types of research, power of proximity is really vital for graduate researchers. In terms of our daily lives half of us leave campus after 6:30 p.m. 28 percent of us leave after 8:00 p.m. And when we're leaving, we're mainly walking. Some of us combining public transportation and biking. When we do leave, nearly 90 percent of us are commuting alone which leaves us with a number -- a large
number of students which leave late at night, walk, and are alone raising a number of important student safety concerns which only get worse when the commute distance to campus is increased. And perhaps most unsettling about our commute is the fact that there really is no transportation option home between MIT and several places where students like to live, like Inman Square, after 7:30 p.m. Beyond our daily commute, housing for grad students off campus is hard to find. Vacancy rates in Cambridge are about two percent, according to the American

Communities Survey and local rental websites, far lower than the Boston area average of five and a half percent. And in some Cambridge neighborhoods it gets down to one percent. That's Manhattan level demand.

The MIT off-campus housing office estimates that the number of postings for grad student accessible apartment rentals
have declined about five-fold over the last ten years. And of course there is the biggest issue for grad students around MIT, housing getting really expensive.

This year according to MIT's off-campus housing office, graduate student rents rose 7.95 percent upon average. And because rents make up nearly half of the grad students pretax income and it's unreasonable to expect stipends to grow in step, students living off campus are facing a lower standard of living and a lower purchasing power going into the future. This situation is even more dire for international students and graduate students with families.

So what can be done then to approve availability and affordability? The two most important problems graduate students face in finding housing Cambridge, while a comprehensive study of housing and development in Cambridge will help clarify
our options, which may include things like increased quantities and increased affordability of on or near campus housing show the lines of expanding the practical commuting distance and reducing commuting time. Innovation housing -- and like the others we haven't thought of yet.

The one path Cambridge and MIT together can't take is doing nothing in the face of the housing crisis. It is a -- going to -that is the one option that will assuredly not solve the problems we face.

I'11 close my time now and reiterate Brian's points. The GSC believes further citywide study is needed to understand the housing crisis in Cambridge for any new development decisions are finalized. Thank you very much. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Next speaker is Richard Krushnic. RICHARD KRUSHNIC: Richard Krushnic,

K-r-u-s-h-n-i-c. I live at 20 Oak Street in Inman Square. I'm here as an individual tonight, but I am a community development professional. I work for the Boston's equivalent of the Cambridge Development Department, Development Department City of Boston.

I was not involved -- well, only just a little bit indirectly in Boston's recent efforts which was to a certain extent job owning, but also some negotiating on various matters that involved, you know, city infrastructure and land and so on and so forth. But I think it's, I think -- and this is me speaking, not because I don't know the exact numbers, but I think it's fair to say that this resulted in several thousand extra units of on-campus housing in the city of Boston because the city was being pro-active somewhat. And the Mayor was being pro-active. I was indirectly involved, I
think, in some stuff where, you know, recently Northeastern developed something, something like around 1400, you know, units, additional units on campus. And I'm -- thank you, guys, you're raising the same points, you know, that really are striking to me.

My primary value in a certain way about the city of Cambridge is its diversity. That goes into all kinds of lofty considerations about what's wrong with the entire planet earth that I think can -- aren't going to be solved unless important communities remain diverse communities. It's without diverse communities you're not going to ever reduce the inequalities that are increasing all the time economic inequalities in particular all across our world and all across our country. And I think that while I applaud everything that's good about what MIT is doing and the innovation that its in genders and the benefits it brings to the world, there's also
a balance about the community that this is happening in. And it all -- I know, it's pretty obvious, whether it's all true or half imaginary. A11 of these firms want to be in Kendal1 Square. We11, I guess there must be some real value to it. But I don't think they all have to be there. It's okay if some of this goes on elsewhere in the Metropolitan area. And I think that if the city continues down this path of higher density, higher height, I think it's, you know, I've been looking at all the up zoning proposals that are floating around and what can be built under current Zoning and elsewhere in the city. If all that stuff gets built out, you know, and all of a sudden all of these up zoning petitions that are floating around get passed, and if as the Community Development Department and these other assessments, you know, project this is gonna happen by, you know, 2030, 2035, around in there, I think
that's the end of city, of Cambridge as a diverse city. Cambridge is just going to be an upper income city, and you guys got to start looking at the big picture and it's -and here it starts really with graduate student housing has got to be a part of this. PAMELA WINTERS: Sir.

RICHARD KRUSHNIC: It's important if you don't have graduate housing as a certain part of it. Sorry, I went over.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Next speaker is Jarrett Barnos.

JARRETT BARNOS: Good evening, Mr . Chairman, and through you to the committee, my name is Jarrett Thomas Barnos. I'm the CEO of the American Red Cross of Eastern Massachusetts. We are the ones in that empty space on the slide that you saw next to the 300-foot tower on the slide. We're here to talk about -- I'm here to talk
a little bit about that.
You see, we have a five-story historic building at 139 Main Street where we have been and where we do the people's business we like to think. We are a volunteer-driven organization, 2,000 volunteers that does a lot of things. We are also the other educational institution in Kendal1 Square. We graduate 1600 low income women a year through our nurse assistant training program, and they take classes on the second floor which would be well, if you reached out the window of the second floor, you could reach the 300 -foot building which would be under this Zoning petition right on the lot line with our building.

So we have some concerns. We have some concerns about the light, the air, the quality for those who volunteer with the Red Cross and come to our building where we coordinate New England's largest food shelter
that feeds 125,000 families a year. Where we work with veterans and international refugees through our international services programs. Our nurse assistant program which graduated last year 1600 women for their first job career ladder in the healthcare industry, and obviously for our disaster work.

We want the classrooms and the places where our volunteers work to still have light in them, and we are very concerned on how you decide here where MIT decides to mass that building on that lot means everything for us. I also want to say one other thing, you probably saw a lot about super storm Sandy in the newspaper. Red Cross pays for those disaster response efforts. We fed 12 million after Sandy through the generosity of donors. If the donors are not generous, we have go into our savings. Our one asset in Massachusetts, other than a very small building we own in Brockton, is this
building. So I've called a few of my friends who are real estate industry brokers and lawyers and ask what would it mean for our ability if we had to dip into our resources, what would it mean to jeopardize our mission? What would happen to the value of this building? And there's a lot of concern. We have a lot of concern as to whether or not a structure one foot from us towering 300 feet over our five-story building what that would do to the value of the property and our ability should we hit on hard times, to continue our mission. And our mission is simple, we're here to help everybody who's in need. We feed the hungry. We educate low income women. We help anybody that's been affected by a disaster including the 28 Cambridge families who were burned out of their homes last year, whether it was at two a.m. or two p.m. We were there. We gave them cash. We put them up in a hote1, all
done by volunteers, run out by 139 Main Street. And we really need your help in making sure that our mission isn't jeopardized in this regard.

Thank you very much. I'd be happy to answer any questions if there are any.

The -- all of these comments are in there. One last point which is that what we are asking is not opposing this, but simply that through your guidelines, as you amend this petition, that you try to ensure that that tower is not one foot from our structure, that it is massed towards the back. We've provided a number of suggestions in that letter as to how that can be done. And thank you very much.

We've also attached the engineer's report which talks about the damage that happened to our building, the old historic structure, when the Sloan School was built across the street. So we're also very
concerned about structural damage that wasn't, because I have three minutes and Pam is the time keeper, that wasn't something that I chose to focus on the advice of a friend. So, but that's all in there as well. Thank you very much.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you, Jarrett. Jarrett, would you do me a favor and point out where your building is?

JARRETT THOMAS BARNOS: On this?
PAMELA WINTERS: Can you point this out?

HUGH RUSSELL: You can't see it because it's hidden by the 300 -foot tower. JARRETT THOMAS BARNOS: That, that is us. And under the petition there's no side setback requirement so it could be built right on the lot line. And we are right on the lot line.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Thanks, Jarrett.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
JARRETT THOMAS BARNOS: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Carol O'Hare.

CAROL O'HARE: Good evening. My
name is Carol 0'Hare. I live at 172 Magazine Street. O'Hare like the airport.

The gist of my words is captured in two trite expressions: The devil is in the details, and words matter. I'm going to point out on that plan what the Memorial Drive 150-foot height subdistrict is. It is those -- there's the river. It is those two yellow buildings right on the river, the L-shaped one and the long L-shaped one. Right. And that, which is not owned by MIT. Which is not owned by MIT. And then the Sloan complex, and then another academic building.

So, from the right starting blue all the way to the second yellow and -- is the so-called Memorial Drive 150-foot height
subdistrict. It is eight-and-a-half acres. It is one-third of a mile along Memorial Drive of riverfront property, and it's included in this petition. And we have no idea what's planned for that, and I assume that it's being used to -- as transfer of development rights to the other more bulky portions of the parce1. But if MIT changes its plans or if administrations change, buildings 150 feet in height, that's 15 stories with no setbacks, could be located along that riverfront property. And just to give you an example of why words matter, when MIT was presenting its case, Mr. Marsh said that 16 -foot setbacks would be imposed along all major streets. But in fact, it's only Main Street, Broadway, and Third Street. There are no setbacks imposed in this district, in this subdistrict at all I believe.

```
Is that correct?
```

And so I'm worried about, you know, the silence about that district. In fact, the middle, the yellow building that's in the middle, that's not even owned by MIT. It's 100 Memorial Drive. It's an apartment building. And it is -- I don't know how many stories is it now?

## STEVE MARSH: Ten?

CAROL O'HARE: Ten stories. So theoretically they could add five more stories to that complex. It's owned by New England Mutual Life. And I mean I would like to urge you to focus on restricting that banking, that transfer of development rights area when you consider this Zoning.

PAMELA WINTERS: If you could wind up your comments because it's over three minutes now.

CAROL O'HARE: Really? Oh, did that count setting up the --

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. You're almost

## four minutes.

CAROL O'HARE: Okay.
I wanted to say that I'm very appreciative that MIT has said this evening that it intends that all sign restrictions and illumination restrictions that would be applicable in the rest of Cambridge will apply even though the original, the language submitted does not say that. And I will supplement that.

I would like to urge you to ask the BZA to consider that Article 7 about signs and illumination applies in Cambridge and that they can't change the law Variance by Variance.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.
CAROL O'HARE: Thank you very much. So you don't have to see me anymore.

HUGH RUSSELL: We do read you also.
Robert Simha's the next speaker. And after Bob will be Heather Hoffman.

ROBERT SIMHA: Good evening. I'm Robert Simha, Six Blanchard Road, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

I -- the Board has heard me on the subject of this petition before on a number of aspects of it, but this evening I'd like to submit my objections on the following basis, because in reviewing not only the petition, but also in reviewing the CDD staff notes to you, which I've read with some care, there had been some very major exclusions which I think are important for your consideration. So first, I'd like to object to the MIT petition on a number of grounds, but primarily because I believe it will do irreparable damage to both MIT and the city of Cambridge.

It will abrogate 50 years of responsible planning that has occurred between MIT and Cambridge.

It will terminate the years of
providing a careful balance of institutional needs and adjustment of the community.

And let me just quickly review for you, since I was involved in most of this activity, in the 1960 and 1965 land use goals published by the Cambridge Planning Board, it recognized the need to provide defined areas for institutional and commercial growth in the city. MIT cooperated by agreeing to concentrate its academic growth in designated areas south of Main Street, and at the same time facilitate reinvestment in the city's economy by initiating Technology Square in 1960, financing the Kendal1 Square urban renewal project in 1965, building over 700 units of elderly housing for the city in the 1970s, and creating the University Park development in the 1980s. The creation of these economic and social assets were based on a trust that MIT and the city would continue to do the right thing by each other.

The city for its part sought guarantees that institutions in Cambridge would be restricted to certain areas by seeking and getting home rule legislation under chapter 565 of the 1979 Act of the General Court, which empowered Cambridge to restrict institutional development in areas that were not appropriate.

The Planning Board and the City Counci1 reinforced, based on these powers created in 1981, the Institutional Overlay Districts and the Institutional Use Regulations which are embodied in Sections 4.5 of the Zoning Ordinance and are designed clearly to identify that land within the MIT Institutional District which would be used primarily for institutional and institutional service purposes.

In 1981 with updates in 1993 and 2007, the Cambridge Community Development Department published, with the approval of
the Planning Board, an institutional growth management plan which states in clear language on page 17 and 18 , policies that clearly state that it is in the city's interest to concentrate institutional expansion at MIT in the areas immediately adjacent to the existing campus south of Main Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Bob, could you wrap up your remarks? You're substantially over the time limit.

ROBERT SIMHA: I will. I will submit this document.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
ROBERT SIMHA: I think the important conclusion I would like to share with you is that there are implications for this petition which in the long term will be injurious to both the city and the institute. If these commercial buildings are built, they will stay in commercial use in terms of my
experience with MIT for probably under ten years. That means that at that point the pressures for academic space needs will prevail, these buildings will come off the tax rolls, and the city will have to pick up the burden of the taxes that are currently or proposed being paid by these buildings. Academic space wil1 be restricted -HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

ROBERT SIMHA: -- and it will do a disservice to the city.

PAMELA WINTERS: Bob, I look forward to reading your comments.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Heather Hoffman. And after Heather, Julian Cassa. HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. My name is Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street just half a block from Third Street but a few blocks from where you're talking about.

When I start hearing about 300-foot
buildings and things I think of something that I've said a few times over the years, but I guess I haven't said it recently enough which is that I did not sign on to live in Midtown Manhattan. I signed on to live in Cambridge which is much more of a human scale. And I mostly wanted to talk about what Carol O'Hare just started to talk about which is signs. There should be nothing whatsoever in this Zoning mentioning signs unless of course we're kind enough to say no signs except for a little bitty plaque so you can see what building you're in.

No matter what people think about the signature gatherers or what was said by anybody when the sign ordinance was overturned by the voters of Cambridge, it was very clear that the one thing everybody agreed on who signed those petitions was we don't want all of these giant signs all over our city. So whether you think they were
lied to or not, it was clear what they didn't want. There should be absolutely nothing in this that suggests that any kind of sign that is not otherwise provided for under the

Cambridge sign ordinance that applies to the entire city except for the MXD District and maybe even there, if you actually read the law, should be allowed here. Nothing. Take out anything that mentions signs, please. Other than that, with respect to what Bob Simha was saying, I'm just reminded of something that's become clearer and clearer to me, which is that for the citizens any agreements that are made where we have given up something, are binding on us forever. Any agreements that are made where developers give up something, are temporary and they only last until the developer comes back and says well, you know, it wasn't such a good deal for me so I want more. That's a really rotten way to run a city. And I hope that
the Planning Board will start stopping that. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Next speaker is Julian Cassa.

JULIAN CASSA: Hi, my name is Julian Cassa, C-a-s-s-a. Tonight I come speaking exclusively on behalf of the leadership committee of the Area 4 Coalition. So I live in Area 4 and I'm on their leadership. We just wanted to mention couple things. I thought it was wonderful -- very quickly I just want to say that Mr. Marsh talked about community early on in his presentation, and he talked about talking with the community. So one thing I just wanted to mention on behalf of our community we have had very little conversation. We have had a presentation or two, but we've had no dialogue or no conversation, and we not only abut this area, but we are inherently part of this area.

One other thing I wanted to mention before just saying the things that are important to our community is that we share the grad students' concerns. Of the 60 percent of the grad students that do not have housing, that does not also include visiting researchers and post-docs which could probably be another couple of hundred to a thousand people, and so Area 4 houses in the neighborhood of two to three thousand students. So we are a very much a transitional neighborhood. We are one that is extremely diverse. We happen to be the youngest neighborhood in the city, and we also share many concerns about that. So specific to the concerns that we have about this proposal are: That there is not enough housing. That there's not enough grad housing or any kind of affordable housing or something that might be -- might help our community.

Two, our concerns which no one has mentioned tonight, is safety. This was in the MIT faculty report, which I assume the Planning Board has but we should get you a copy of it. For example, adding large, dense buildings I did not hear anything about adding additional busses, additional trains, doing anything when there's an emergency. I wish Jarrett was still here. I don't know if he's here. If we unfortunately have a serious environmental or weather catastrophe in this area or in the lower part of Cambridge, when you add such density and not enough parking or not enough roads or egress, which of course is a challenge, that puts pressure on safety. So it's one of those kind of things when you have it, it's wonderful, until that it's inert.

The last thing I wanted to mention on behalf of our community is community. In fact, so retail is interwoven into community.

What your retail is says something about the community and the culture that you breed. And they say that they're concerned about that, and I think that's wonderful and it's obviously an intelligent concern. There wasn't, and has been very little discussion, has been very little dialogue between our neighborhood and this development, and there has been nothing offered or suggested in any way, shape or form. That they would employ anyone from Area 4. That it would give any access to anyone to open up any of those retail space from Area 4 or in the lower part of Cambridge. So we have some legitimate concerns. The thing that I also found wonderful tonight -- I'm glad to hear that this is a bit of a process, and that people would like to hear what people like to say. And I hope that the Planning Board understands, as well as the City Council, that if this is a process, then this is going
to take sometime and that this is the start of something and hopefully we'11 come to a wonderful conclusion at the end.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next speaker is Steve Kaiser.
STEVE KAISER: Again, for the record my name is Steve Kaiser, K-a-i-s-e-r. My time is short as is obvious, only three minutes, but in order to get all the issues out there that I might want to talk about let me just list ones that I can't talk about. Under Zoning, floor area ratio, heights, setbacks, the role of the architect, historical issues, the issue of MIT as profit and non-profit, traffic details, parking, the Main Street connector and other road systems, the overall plan for the project, housing, Red Cross, transfer of development rights, and we just heard safety.

Those are the ones that I can't talk
about because there's not enough time.
What I did put into your package is a couple of reports. The one on the left is an update of the traffic report which you may be familiar with. There were some numerical calculations having to do with transit which needed to be fixed, which those are on page 27. But the important thing is that you have the report, it's been updated, and there's no other entity in this city as far as I know who has produced traffic study for Kenda11 Square .

CDD has contained -- has retained a consultant and produced PowerPoint presentations but no report. And the report itself is not -- the work that the city has done is not useful because they didn't look into any bottlenecks. They didn't consider the real limitations on the traffic system. The rest of the situation is we have no traffic submissions from MIT, Forest City,

Chamber of Commerce of Cambridge or any other development groups. You have just this one.

The second report is what I mentioned last week, which is a report on Article 7. And the main point at issue there is whether up zoning activities we are seeing at Kendall conflict with Article 7 of the Declaration of Rights in the State Constitution and are, therefore, illegal. I believe they are. Article 7 says there could be no government action which delivers profits to special interest -- private interests. Up zoning increases property values. That is the illegal profit that results. Now any violation of law can be subject to legal challenge in court, and what Bob Simha did was give you a long listing of some of the legal issues that are a problem here, and there could be legal violations. They're piling up.

Let me give you just one more. And
last Apri1 I brought to the attention of the this Board the failure to comply with Mass. General Laws Chapter 91, Section 18, on tidelands and waterways. The Board is required to review and render a judgment on all waterways license applications. As far as I can tell, that's never been done in 25 years. I wrote a letter last April, it disappeared within the law of bureaucracy. It's a shame that MIT has no law school, we might be able to have some independent lawyers who could come in and give the institute advice on how to deal with all these legal issues. And maybe the Planning Board feels that legal problems are not their work, but they're absolutely vital in terms of the integrity of the city and what it does.

So, I don't know who on the MIT side deals with traffic, I haven't the faintest idea, but I suspect on the matter of Article

| 1 | 7 that Anthony Galluccio will be the one who |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | will have to deal with that issue. So I will |
| 3 | give him a copy of the Article 7 report. |
| 4 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Steve, Steve, Steve. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: Steve, Bill has a |
| 6 | question. |
| 7 | STEVE KAISER: Yes. |
| 8 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you provide |
| 9 | Liza with an electronic version of these? |
| 10 | STEVE KAISER: Yes, I can. |
| 11 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay, thank you. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Believe it or not |
| 13 | some of us are getting out of the paper age. |
| 14 | Not I. |
| 15 | Okay, next speaker is Mike Connolly. |
| 16 | ATTORNEY MICHAEL CONNOLLY: Good |
| 17 | evening. My name is Mike Connolly, spelled |
| 18 | C-o-n-n-o-1-1-y. I'm an attorney and a local |
| 19 | organizer, and I live in an apartment on |
| 20 | Harding Street with my fiancee. And I'm very |
| 21 | hopeful for the opportunity to speak before |

you this evening. I've never actually come down to the Planning Board before, but I feel very strongly that we're in the midst of a residential housing crisis, and I think the proposal on the table by MIT, it misses a tremendous opportunity to address that crisis by creating graduate student housing. We heard from some of these graduate students this evening. I don't think I can do a better job of expressing all of the different issues in that area, but you know, I'd just like to say that the housing crisis is getting worse and there's no real sense in the community that there's a plan to deal with it or that any of this development will necessarily help solve the problem. In light of all this, I think we can do better than to accept a plan that will transfer MIT's unique remaining campus land resources. Resources that were acquired for MIT's future educational and research needs over to
commercial applications for at least the next 50 years. Instead my hope is that MIT wil1 go back to the drawing board and come up with a vision for its campus that better supports the needs of its students while helping to alleviate some of the unbearable pressure on our rental housing market. And, you know, I've talked to hundreds of people in the East Cambridge neighborhood and the Area 4 neighborhood all the way down to Kendal1 Square, Central Square, and the pressure is really there. There's a lot of people who are afraid that they have to leave the city because of the pressure on the housing market.

I actually had the good fortune to attend Duke University in Durham, North Carolina on a football scholarship believe it or not, and I know from that experience that if you want to create a vibrant gateway to your campus, then student housing is a
wonderful way to do it. So, you know, that makes me wonder whether the motive here is simply profit and whether that's in the best interest of the people of Cambridge and whether that's in the best interest for the students who go to MIT.

So just to wrap it up, I mean in sum, you know, if this plan goes forward without the addition of this graduate on campus housing, then thousands of MIT students will continue to have to fend for themselves looking for market rate apartments here in Cambridge and in turn we will all miss out on a unique opportunity to alleviate some of the pressure on our housing market.

Thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Next speaker is Hailey Krushnic.
HAILEY KRUSHNIC: I'm not speaking, sir.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, I misread the

1ist.
Jonathan King. Sorry about that. JONATHAN KING: Good evening,
members of the Planning Board. Thank you for hearing us. My name is Jonathan King. I live at 40 Essex Street, Cambridge, Mass. I have taught and directed biomedical research laboratories at MIT for 42 years. Among U.S. research universities MIT is a preeminent engine of scientific and technological process. As you know, the research projects are not funded by MIT. They're funded by taxpayers whose dollar are allocated by Congress through the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, NASA, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Defense, and other federal agencies.

Last year these federal grants to the campus totaled -- direct federal grants totaled $\$ 472$ million. The research grants
and contracts that my colleagues in biology and the cancer center, 75 of us, received were in excess of 133 million. These grants a11 responded to national research priorities to improve the health and welfare of our population. Reduce mortality and suffering with the cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, right, these are all people working on national priorities. Together with the industrial support and another 500 million yield from MIT's \$10 billion endowment overal1 R\&D operating budget last year was over $\$ 1$ bilition. Now the human engine of this billion dollar research and technology enterprise are MIT graduate students. It's these individuals selected from across the nation and from around the world, according to their extraordinary talent, willingness to work hard, persistence, and commitment to their chosen field that do the work. They are among the most talented and most hard
working people in the United States. As you heard, in the area of biomedical research, my own area, these students have to spend long hours in the laboratory. They're not sitting in classrooms. They are the skilled labor that is carrying out the actual research, making the observations, developing the hypotheses of new understanding. They grow cells, isolate proteins, characterize proteins, all often lengthy and laborious procedures. They cannot work at home. Maybe some of the computer science students can. Maybe some of the economic students. But the people in biomedical research and material science and neuroscience, they have to be physically in the lab. In fact, a key component of the overall productivity of a place like MIT, and Nathaniel alluded to this, is the fact that the graduate students post-doctoral fellows and research technicians spend long hours together. They
have to talk to each other and interact with each other even when they're tired and weary at the end of the day. This is a major reason that all of the leading research universities in the United States are residential campuses. It is extraordinarily difficult in the commuter campus where students have to travel from far to get the density hour by hour by hour that you need for this kind of -- for the innovation district that you hear all about. Innovation doesn't happen in the Cloud, it happens by people sweating together and talking together and working together, and not when they're commuting from distant sites.

I won't go through the numbers, thousand of graduate students forced to be off campus. They don't want to be off campus. They want to be on campus. For 10 years graduate students have written reports, they have written letters to the
administration, they have demonstrated, they have written articles, said we need more housing at MIT. They have the best data that exists anywhere in the United States. The notion that an 18 -month committee study is needed to get this data, which is the best that exists, is absurd. What's needed is a 18-month study why do we need three big commercial buildings when right across the street in Kendal1 Square, Boston Properties and Alexandria and Forest City are building commercial buildings.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sir, sir.
JONATHAN KING: Yes, let me close, okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: Your time is up, please.

JONATHAN KING: Thank you.
PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
JONATHAN KING: So, you know, it's unfortunate MIT has no campus planning
committee. It's done by the real estate group and MITIMCo as Mr. Marsh said, perhaps not surprising that real estate people think real estate returns is what happens in the university. They've never been in my lab or any other 1ab. They don't have any sense of what you need for university.

So let me close, first I want to remind you that the provost's own task force, not the faculty task force, this was the provost task force, said that financial return should not be the principal criteria value creation and success for this area of the campus, equally important are the gateway of the housing student life, etcetera. So let me close, the campus is a unique resource along the river for MIT, for Cambridge, for the Commonwealth. This petition which uses precious irreplaceable campus land for redundant commercial office development is not in the interest of MIT's faculty,
students, or staff. It's in the in interest of the Cambridge community. It's not in the interest of the nation. It should be rejected in its present form and amended so that the new construction is for graduate student housing, academic and research activities, and of course this is so obvious to the faculty, that the faculty doesn't even know, didn't even receive an announcement that this plan, that this meeting is held tonight. Has not seen the presentation. Even those faculty whose offices and labs are in that region of the campus have never seen this presentation.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you, sir. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. JONATHAN KING: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Next speaker is Frank Solomon.

FRANK SOLOMON: My name is Frank Solomon, S-o-1-o-m-o-n. I'm at 71 Vassa1

Lane in Cambridge. I want to speak tonight in support of my graduate student colleagues who spoke first, and most of the points that I would have wanted to make have already been made. I want to add onty one.

I've been involved in graduate
education in my department at MIT institute-wide and in a variety of national endeavors as we11. And what I know is that the intellectual ferment that draws the Novartises and the Pfizers and world attention to a place like MIT depends heavily on our graduate student and young researchers. I think that it is difficult to understand the kind of career structure and work relationship that happens in a situation like this, but briefly let me tell you that one of the ways we attract brilliant young faculty is that they know that the cognitive graduate students that we attract are among the best in the world. The institutions that
were listed on that percentage housing histogram several slides earlier, we all compete for graduate students. We will lose that competition if we can't provide students with proximal, safe housing that's part of our community. And we as a community, meaning MIT, and we as a community meaning Cambridge, take a big risk by not putting explicitly into this plan, facilities for graduate students and their support.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Travis McCready.
TRAVIS McCREADY: Hi. My name is Travis McCready. I am the executive director of the Kendal1 Square Association. I have not been before you yet in my role as ED, keeping my powder dry I suppose.

The KSA -- just about 30 seconds about the KSA. We are a 135 member association representing the Kendall Square District. We
are an a little bit different than the 10 other business associations in Cambridge in that we're not a business association. We were specifically designed to address the interests of the entire Kenda11 Square District; residential, commercial, institutional, research, you name it. So our membership actually reflects that. A number of our members are in the room. A number of our members are board -- my board members are here in the room. So I have the inauspicious task of trying to thread a needle representing many different views that have been expressed here already. And there's a way I'm going to do it, and the sort of the mean I'm going to use is porosity. I'm not going to touch the residential piece. I'm not going to touch the exact number of housing or any of that stuff. I'm just simply going to say -- suggest to you as you look at the MIT proposal going forward, that
the paradigm that might have existed in prior institutional developments may not exist here with this MIT development. We don't think of life in terms of what's commercial, what's residential, what's institutional, what's research. And there are no hard and fast walls in between any of those vertical sectors, because it's all flat and all intermingled in the Kendall Square District. That value proposition that we are talking about with respect to graduate students and MIT, that value proposition is pervasive throughout the entire Kendall Square District. It exists not for the institute but exists for Google. Not just for the tech companies but for biotech. Not just for biotech, but for the professional service firms. What we see a lot is a graduate student that might go to class during the day, grab lunch, talk about ideas over at one of the 19 new independent restaurants that
have opened up in the past three years, pop on over to VM Ware, spend a couple hours programming over at VM Ware, and then pop right back to class. There is a complete porosity of all these functions that exist in Kendall Square.

So what I would challenge you to think about with respect to the MIT proposal is one, we've done our job wel1. The Kendal1 Square Association was formed about five years ago with the goal of preserving, protecting, and promoting Kendall Square. There are articles over on the windowsill over there that goes into some of the articles that have been printed over the past couple of days. We've done our jobs well in promoting Kendal1 Square as being an innovation district that is the gift to the world. No good deed goes unpunished. Now we have to deal with the consequences of that which is hi demand. People want to be here,
and it's not just the graduate students. It's not just the companies, it's the residences. It's not just all -- it's not just the people who are using Kendall Square that are the natural users. We've created a Hollywood of innovation and entrepreneurship. In that respect when you take a look at this MIT proposa1, what I think you have to ask yourself is where's the value proposition and how do you continue the value proposition for a11 of the users of Kendal1 Square? And I think, and I would submit, that the mixture of uses is right, is right on. You have residential, you have commercial, you have an innovation and entrepreneurship layer at five percent that will ensure balance between the startups as well as the name brands. We always celebrate our name brands. We have to celebrate our entrepreneurs. We have the workforce development piece which is absolutely critical. So we have these
companies that are trying to pull talent from MIT, pull talent from international, but we need to be generating our own talent internally from the Cambridge Public School System so we have the workforce development piece. So you have all these layers that exist here within that proposal. Is the formula right? I mean, that's up to you guys to determine. But I think all of the pieces of the puzzle are absolutely in this proposal.

With that, if you have any questions, please let me know, but otherwise that's my time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.
TRAVIS McCREADY: You're welcome.
HUGH RUSSELL: Next speaker is Tom
Stoh1man. And if somebody can find if there's a second sheet.

TOM STOHLMAN: Hi. My name is Tom Stoh1man. It's S-t-o-h-1-m-a-n. I'm a

Cambridge resident and an MIT graduate and I attended every single meeting of the K2 Advisory Committee. I'd like to say that I agree with some comments and we'11 just put it there at that. I think that housing is an important fertilizer for a lively city, and I think there should be more housing there for graduate students and for workers, too, who work in Kendal1 Square. I think you have to have some -- a little bit more sensitivity to the neighbors. Red Cross is one, but also the Kendall Hotel. If you look at the model, there's some pretty big buildings right up against them, and we have to do something with the Zoning to protect those neighbors.

Some details about what was proposed -I'm a little concerned about new terms that have appeared in the proposed Zoning;
publicly beneficial open space, commercial buildings, the this new concept of a community fund. I think you're going to have
to be very careful to make sure that these things are well-defined and that later on people aren't back here saying I want a Variance because there's some disagreement over the terms.

And finally, I think that -- I don't think that there's a black and white conflict here between institutional and commercial. I don't see any reason why MIT shouldn't benefit just like Cambridge does from the -from the commercial side of things. However, you shouldn't do all of one or all of the other. In this proposal you really have to do both, and I think that's important. And I think that's where this Zoning is going to be so crucial, is to get that right mix, but I think you can do it.

Finally, the first meeting of the Kendal1 Square Advisory Committee I spoke, and I spoke about being a freshman at MIT and coming out of the Kendall Square station and
being totally lost. I could not figure out how to get to the institute. And low and behold 40 years later that's still the case. And so far I'm not seeing -- I think there's -- the words are there and the intention's there, but we really do have to extend the Infinite Corridor all the way to Kendal1 station. And I think it can be done. You'l1 have to deal with that Whittaker building, but I think that's an essential part of this plan, a very important part, and I hope that the Zoning contributes to really connecting that Infinite Corridor.

Oh, and there's one other thing. If we can get this under lighted building stuff going on in Kendall Square, I think that would be terrific. So I support that, too. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Next speaker is Carol Bellew and after her Charlie Marquardt.

CAROL BELLEW: Carol Bellew,

B-e-1-1-e-w, 257 Charles Street.
As you know, we at the East Cambridge Planning Team have been working hard to put this stuff together and I hear the housing that's why we asked for 300 feet of housing on the sites that they're going to be doing housing on. This is a huge project. This is going to take a lot of time, a lot of years. I think all the things that were said today were reasonable, and the important things were stated, but I think that we've come a long way with MIT in getting them to do some of the things that we thought they were lacking in when they started this process and we're hoping that they will continue to work with us and move it forward so that everybody is -- you never get 100 percent, but at least we're trying to get a win/win here.

Thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Charlie.
CHARLES MARQUARDT: Hi, Charlie Marquardt, 10 Rogers Street in East Cambridge Kendal1 -- sorry. East Cambridge Kenda11 Square. I just want to come back here because I was at one of the first meetings for this and I want to reiterate, replay that this was a process that it started out as a proposal that really not many people liked. Many of you at the table didn't like, I know I didn't like it. They were asked to go back and take a look at it again, wait until the Kendal1 Square study went through, and then bring it forward actually at the request of a lot of different people said let's put this Kendall Square study to work. And we look at 60 units of housing, and maybe 300 or 300,000 square feet of housing. That's a multiple of five. I think we've done a pretty good job of moving in that direction.

From a retail perspective, I look at
all the wonderful stuff that's been going on in Kendall Square with retail. It's all about local retail. That's what we need. Paul McMorrow (phonetic) said it wonderfully today. Everybody else has to take a look at what they're doing in Kendall Square for retail and try and copy that instead of copying the mall approach. That's important, and you've done a good part of that.

And then you take a look at the housing that's already gone in there, and that I believe is a big part of what's going to jump start for all those restaurants and everything. I'm working on opening a business down there myself. I like the idea of more housing. I live on the eleventh floor of a 15 -story building. I'm okay with tall buildings. I actually look every day at Watermark II and say that building's beautiful but for 100 more feet. Sorry, Roger.

But I look at that. I go to the Mayor's Silver Ribbon Commission presentation and start hearing about people needing to live in buildings with elevators. And then the last thing I look at is, I look to Central Square and I see $\$ 32$ million for a parcel of land or a series of parcels. If we ever want to get to a point where we can do more housing and more of this development that will allow people to live, whether they be students or future students or maybe older students, I like to go back to school again at some point. We can't keep building five-story buildings on a $\$ 32$ mil1ion parcel of 1 and. We need to go higher. Other than we're going to be left with short buildings that don't work. We'11 be stuck with the DC effect where we're looking at can we stick another building on -- another floor or two on top. And, again, we've had a great process of 18 months. We've done an awful
lot of work as a community. There's still more to do, but I think what they've done is what they've been asked to do. So, please, let's keep this moving forward. The City Council's is where we can talk about which benefits we do or do not want, but from here and with your guidance, I'm sure we're going to get some great buildings.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak? James.
JAMES WILLIAMSON: My name is James Williamson. I live at 1000 Jackson Place in Cambridge. Given all the talk about innovation and talented young people, I think it's fitting to take a moment to remember -to acknowledge and remember Aaron Swartz who was buried today in Chicago, who worked with Sir Tim Berners-Lee who has been at MIT developing and popularizing standards for sharing data on the web. He was about
sharing not about taking.
I think that I worry about what's going to happen to the Rinaldi building under this bulldozing of this whole area. I wonder about heights. If you look at this model and you try to appreciate the scale of this model, if you walk out this building and look down, you'11 see what's happening with this building right here. The building that's going up here. It's eclipsing. That building that's eclipsing that so-called Google roof garden. You can see down this street and you can see it down if you look down Hampshire Street. I'm startled by the height of that building, and all these other buildings are going to be about that same height. So welcome to the new Cambridge, and you're not gonna not have it in Kendal1 Square, you're gonna see it when you walk out your door right here in Inman Square. So I worry about the heights that you're looking
at allowing.
As far as housing, are we now at the point where all we care about is housing MIT graduate students? What about the people who have lived in this city all their lives who never had a chance to go to MIT? Anything you can say about MIT graduate students, you can multiply by a factor of ten of some factor of ten for the rest of the people who live in this city.

There are two things I want to close -focus on in closing, and they have to do with things I've been privileged to learn from someone who teaches at MIT, Fred Salvucci who focuses on transportation. And it was actually Fred who first suggested to me that I think about transferable development rights. I brought it up at the Central Square Advisory Committee, but it got distorted and completely bent out of shape. The original idea, as he presented it and as

I presented it, which seems like a great idea, was to have a transfer of development rights from Central Square which we want to protect, the scale of which we want to protect, the character of which is important, the modest scale there that we want to foster and be able to sustain with resources that we could get by transferring development rights from Central Square through Kendal1 Square where the juggernaut is well underway and may be unstoppable. Let's get them to pay for this and use those proceeds to protect what we need and want for Central Square and make it affordable with those subsidies from transferable development rights.

And finally, on transportation, city of Cambridge wrote a letter endorsed by the entire City Council dated November 29th to Rich Davey of the Department of Transportation, I have -- I mentioned this, I think, at our last hearing. I have the
complete four-page letter and the City
Council Order adopting it. And also
highlighting the three paragraphs that have to do with the willfully and adequate transportation system that nobody seems to be talking about at all. Although now we have some talk finally from the governor reported in today's newspapers. It talked -- but this is a very good letter.

PAMELA WINTERS: James, your time is up.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: It's a very good 1etter.

PAMELA WINTERS: If you'd like to leave a copy of the letter, that would be great.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: It talks about how woefully inadequate the Red Line is and I think everybody knows that, so thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak?

## CHRIS MATTHEWS: I'm Chris Matthews

 at 26 Sixth Street, Vice President of the East Cambridge Planning Team. I just wanted to say that we're in the middle of a long process and I'm just very heartened that each time we've seen this project, it's gotten better. And I'm sure it will continue to as we get into more of the details but beyond this Zoning process.I like Travis's metaphor of porosity very much. I see that, you know, the more that we can break down the barriers between university and the neighborhood and all the commercial stuff that's going on here, the better. It will feel much more like a coherent community. And the place I think where that will happen most convincingly is at what they were calling the gateway.

Kenda11 Square's always suffered from not having a recognizable center, and I think the gateway where the T stop is, where the

Infinite Corridor comes to where Main Street is is really the key. So I'll be looking at that very carefully as they develop the project.

And I would just point out there's a lot of talk about graduate student housing. I think it's a very important issue because students also bring life to the streets late at night which is great. North Point has 18 blocks of undeveloped land, and they may want to take a look out there. The thought of MIT students taking the EZ Ride down First Street which doesn't have enough people on it entivening the neighborhood in a much more comprehensive way would make me feel very happy.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to speak?

Charles.
CHARLES SULLIVAN: Yes. I'm Charles
Sullivan. I'm director of the Cambridge Historical Commission. When I was a graduate student, I have to tie this to previous testimony, in the middle 1960s Kendall Square was undergoing urban renewal. And what was considered to be an act of creative destruction, 3,000 manufacturing jobs were lost and a vast area of manufacturing district was cleared. All perhaps well and good, but the Planning decisions that were made at that time are ones that we're still recovering from. I think it's safe to say that Kenda11 Square's recent success is almost in spite of itself, in spite of its urban design and the architectural decisions that were made in the 1970s and '80s. I've participated in the Planning process for -this the commission jumped into this because the three remaining significant buildings at

Kenda11 Square were threatened by MIT's first petition. In the last couple of years I've participated with the Community Development Department and meeting many, many times at MIT with the K2 process, and I commend this petition to you because it establishes a framework in which historic preservation can take place. We do hope to protect the three significant buildings in Kendall Square. We're open to changes that's sort of the public interest, and we recognize the goals of the gateway and of other things. But this petition is very balanced. It creates a viable commercial district along Main Street, a lot of street level retail, creates more housing, and on and on. So I think this is very much a positive for the city.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
STEVEN WINTER: May I ask a question of Mr. Sullivan?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
STEVEN WINTER: Charles, the part of the comments from our staff at CDD indicated that in addition allowing existing GFA to be demolished and reconstructed without penalty may complicate historic preservation efforts. What does that mean to you?

CHARLES SULLIVAN: We11, I think you'd have to ask your staff. But we have a landmark designation process underway to protect up to three buildings in Kendal1 Square. And if that's adopted by the City Council, then those buildings are protected regardless of the Zoning GFA provisions. STEVEN WINTER: Okay. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Barbara.

BARBARA BROUSSARD: Barbara
Broussard, President of the East Cambridge Planning Team. I'd like to thank everyone. I'11 just reiterate what everyone else has
said, it is the beginning of a process and I know everyone is going to really look at things with a fine tooth comb. But for the most part there is a balance. We need the open space. We need -- I personally need all of the low commercial development on Third Street. It's now safe to walk. I appreciate that. I appreciate a place to go so that I understand it has to be paid for. I know there's a need for housing. Graduate students do need housing, and so do other members who would like to live in the community. So if we all work together, I think there will be a balance and it will be -- the outcome will be fantastic and thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one. So we'11 go on to the next step. I think the
next step is going to be a break. So can we try to get back here by $9: 15$, half the normal time.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: So we're going to get started again. If people would resume their seats and terminate their conversations. I have a solid commitment from Iram Farooq that she will spend five to ten minutes giving us the highlights and crucial issues and the city's analysis of this. Just a bullet point sort of analysis.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I was going to say we can do that at the beginning.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'd like to sort of get things out on the table. So she will lay out the things in that report, and then what we can do is throw anything more at it that we want and then we'11 look at it before our next meeting and then we'11 go on to Cedar Street.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Hugh. Iram Farooq, Community Development.

I just wanted to just start with the focus of what I'm going to talk about is really looking at the MIT proposal in the context of the Kendal1 Square planning process and the recommendations that emerged from that, and where our, where there are any divergences. But I wanted to start by saying that this is actually remarkably consistent overall with the recommendations of the Kenda11 Square process. And partly, of course, because MIT was at the table, part of the committee, and so they're very familiar with the recommendations and so, hence, strong consistency overall in terms of the mix of uses, building in retail at the ground floor retail, building in a housing component, emphasis on open space. Those kinds of -- and overall goals many people have talked about those elements, so I'm
going to that. So I just want to focus on where the differences are or where something may not have been mentioned where it could be detailed a little bit more.

So most importantly the idea of having a conceptual master plan for each of the PUDs was a really important theme that as the -that the Zoning would build into place something that provided ful1 Planning Board staff as well as the broader community, a sense of master planning, so that you wouldn't see things emerge just building by building without a lot of thought to how the ancillary open spaces, connections and so forth worked. So we would like to suggest that that component be explicitly talked about in here.

The minimum parcel size is small enough that you could in fact have one or two buildings at a time that's proposed in this petition. So if we can have some language
that talks about a conceptual master plan, similar to what you have worked with for North Point or Cambridge Research Park so it doesn't have to be 100 percent firm but it talks about on the loads of blocks and general uses, and there's an understanding particularly with academic and the less -the even less certainty that is associated with academic uses than with other commercial uses. The understanding that things will change over time, and that there's a mechanism to come and discuss those changes with the Board.

The second piece has to do with referencing the Kendall Square plan, the design guidelines, and the coming open space plan that work is going to be starting on this year. Those are -- those big picture pieces that really help to knit not just this PUD together but also the broader Kenda11 Square and East Cambridge area are important
to be thinking about. And while something like the open space plan is in the future hasn't really been adopted yet, nor have the design guidelines officially been adopted, but one of the -- one model is what you saw in Forest City's proposal last week where they talked about referencing all of the existing plans and additional plans that would be adopted by the city for this area or conducted for this area by the city. So that's one model that might be utilized.

Ground floor retail very important and really has been incorporated in here, but just a couple of small pieces that are different is one that the Kenda11 Square recommendations really require retai1 -ground floor retail along certain key streets; Main Street, Broadway, Broad Cana1 Way, which are mentioned in this petition, but also at Third Street and Ames Street between Broadway and Main which are not
mentioned. Plus that's an explicit retail requirement for 75 percent of the frontage of buildings along those streets. Whereas, it's a different formulation under here. It's unclear if you would get the same activation result at the frontage, because this petition references 75 percent of the gross floor area at the ground level and there's formulation that invokes an activation space and active uses which I think the Board might want to discuss some mechanism to have additional flexibility beyond retail. But the results of the two might be different, so I just wanted to call that out.

And secondly, the K2 recommendations create an FAR exemption for ground floor retail, but created only for smal1 spaces that are smaller than 5,000 square feet per establishment, and they have to be on the ground floor. Whereas it's a much more open door in the petition -- in the MIT petition
which essentially exempts all new retail and does not reference either location or floor plate.

Going to housing, again, much has been said today about housing. And MIT has actually, in this proposal they're proposing more -- the minimum housing requirement is higher than what was proposed by the K2 recommendations. They're proposing 240,000 whereas K2 recommendations only propose 200,000 so that is a good deviation.

That there are a couple of things that I wanted to point out about the inclusionary and middle income housing components. The petition exempts the parts of buildings above 250 feet from inclusionary provisions which there really isn't a reason to do. And we have a strong policy in the city that all housing is subject to inclusionary. So that would be what we would recommend here as well. units are noted as being distributed through the building but only below 250 feet. And once again our policy has always been -- the intention was to have a policy that learned from inclusionary where the units are distributed throughout the buildings. So we would recommend not calling out below 250 and thinking of the whole building as the canvas for spreading those units.

On the sustainability provisions end, the petition does recommend LEED Gold for future lab and office building which is consistent with the K2 recommendations, but Kendall Square recommendations also talks about that across the board for all buildings. So this leaves out several categories, most notably institutional and housing, and I know that the Board has some thoughts about some of those pieces, especially housing, but I just wanted to call
that out again.
Building energy tracking and reporting was another important piece. We think that's really a critical way for us to understand how the buildings function. Particularly commercial buildings are such high users of energy. For us to understand as staff but also for building facilities management folks to understand and be able to influence energy use over time is a really critical piece. This has become easier and easier using Energy Star tools and, you know, off-the-shelf tools now that it shouldn't be a big barrier to jump. So, again, we are proposing including that.

And then there was also a requirement to do a district steam feasibility study for the Kenda11 Square area because the steam lines run here and that is so much, such a sustainable kind of energy to use where you're using waste to -- transforming it into
a utilizable resource. So -- and it's only a feasibility study requirement. So, again, we urge that that be included.

The shared innovation space provision, it's great to have that component be included here, but one of the key pieces of that requirement was for us to be able to define it. And we had worked hard to come up with what the components of that definition would be working with the operators of such shared innovation space. And that included things like percentage of space dedicated to shared amenities, the average size of individual rentable suites, lease terms and limits on space. And while those are conceptually called out, all of the benchmarking of that is not included in the Zoning, and we think that's a critical piece to be able to make this real and manageable over time.

The K2 recommendations had also offered exempting 50 percent of that shared
innovation space FAR from GFA which is a, which is an exemption that hasn't been incorporated here. So hopefully that can offset any hardship that comes from the definition.

And then contribution to the community fund, which it's nice to see that the $\$ 10$ figure is consistent with the K2 recommendations, the categories are consistent. It just needs a little bit more clarification in terms of the fact that in-kind contributions, while permitted, may not include the kinds of things that are typically mitigation to Special Permit projects, and that decisions on what counts and doesn't count would be made by whatever committee gets established to be the decision-maker for such a fund. And also finally, that the transportation improvements should focus on transit which was the key theme as you've heard also from several of
the people who have commend today that transit is really an emphasis area for this.

So that was -- those were all the changes -- I mean, all the differences. And mostly in the overall districtwide provisions there was only one difference which is the heights that are proposed. So that's the one district difference between the K2
recommendations where in two areas the Memorial Drive subdistrict, the K2 recommendation keeps the height at 120 feet whereas MIT's petition calls for 150 feet. And then in the Main Street subdistrict, which is the area around Eastgate, again, the K2 recommendations keep that at 120 , whereas the MIT provision calls for 250 feet in that area. And, you know, I think those are certainly worth discussing and can easily be resolved, but that's our set and hopefully I didn't exceed my time limit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

I guess I would make a comment. One comment is when people come back to us, any of those matters can be resolved by discussion between the proponent and the staff. That would make our job easier. I suspect not too many fall into that category because they're kind of policy questions.

The other thing that strikes me is that there's a lot of -- there's language in the MIT petition which comes out of the K2 report which I think may not belong in Zoning. So, for example, there's a page on defining innovation space. I think that might be done through guidelines, and the reason I'm worried about putting details like this that normally aren't in Zoning and it's hard to get them changed and hard to get them out, and particularly something like the innovation definition may be something that needs to be adjusted over time and to force the City Council to enact those things over a
process that takes six months or a year may not be the best way to do it. So I would ask you to look for things like that that might be best.

And the other thing in that category is the language about the committee and setting up a committee and how it all works. That might better be in an agreement say, but I think as part of Zoning it's unusual. The 1anguage is in Harvard Square Overlay District, it's upper committee. The committee's been essentially obsolete for five years and we can't get rid of it. I'm a member, I stopped going, but it's like the regulatory processes and the discussion and the square have changed, all of these things that are written into the Zoning are sort of 1ingering on.

And I would add one -- so my own personal additional thing I would like you to look at is a provision that would exempt any
residential development south of Main Street in the PUD within the FAR limits because it strikes me that right now it's unclear what the institute's priorities are going to be after the conclusion of a study that's only starting. And that there are also opportunities that might envelop relatively sma11 amounts of housing, but, you know, I look at the historic buildings and I think, you know, wouldn't it be nice if there were apartments? Somebody said this in this room and I don't remember who it was.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It was me.
HUGH RUSSELL: It was Bill.
Think of the thing that's right on the street being housing in the buildings. Well they're a little too deep for housing to work, but that's something you can negotiate with Charlie. And so, I'd like to look at that.

Now are there other items that people
want to have looked at between now and the 19th of February?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have one quick question that you don't have to answer now. But if you could give a brief summary of what current Zoning would allow --

## WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- so that we could really understand, you know, what MIT could do now versus what they would be allowed to do if this goes through, that would be very helpful for me.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Bil1.
WILLIAM TIBBS: I had the same -that was on my list, too. I was wondering, Mike, could you put it on slide, I think it was 23. It's the slide that had all the pictures of the various evolving MIT -evolving areas. And the old one. The next one.

HUGH RUSSELL: No, the next one. The numbering in our book and the numbers up here differs by one at some point.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, that one. I was -- Charlie Sullivan stole my thunder because he went back to the sixties, but I just wanted to say that as an MIT freshman coming out of the subway system in the early seventies, which was over 40 years ago, I remember being very disoriented, too, and didn't know where MIT was. And I looked up Main Street, and if you look in Tech Square there's a building right in the center of it, and that thing -- that looks surprisingly like the MIT student center for a confused freshman coming out of the subway.

HUGH RUSSELL: The old Polaroid building.

WILLIAM TIBBS: So I dragged my bag, which didn't have wheels in those days, all the way up Main Street for quite a distance
before I realized, whoops, I've really made a problem. And after asking a few people and stuff like that, I got to where I was supposed to be. But I just thought that was -- I think the freshman coming out of the Kenda11 Square station is quite the experience, and has been going on for quite sometime.

I also just wanted to remind us of some of the things that we said before. One of which that this parcel, if you look at the K2 study, this parcel is a critically important one because it's really one that's most actionable I guess if that's the word I can use. Clearly the -- what we used to be -the one that's part of the MDX area is very built out as we know. The other parcel is kind of has the Volpe center right in the middle of it, and that has all kinds of issues that we -- it's going to be -- it's going to be a while that no matter what we'd
like to do there, it will be a time before we can do it. And the other one is built up, too. And MIT owns a big portion of this land so that it is actionable. So it's a very important one to focus our attention on.

The things that I -- one of the things about the K2 study that I'm stil1 thinking about and that is what is its residential strategy? One of the things I liked about the CBC study, which was very short and brief, was that it kind of looked at the whole parcel and tried to kind of come up with some strategies. It had some -- not only did it have the gateway and the focal point in this area, but it looked at some potential. But I'd like us to think about what is the residential strategy for the whole parcel. I think that putting the residents where they show it on the other side of Main Street right at the tip there, is a good idea, but I just wanted to know how
does this PUD contribute to the current problem we have on Main Street? Because currently on Main Street we have a slot of Main Street that just doesn't have a lot of residential presence. And clearly it would be improved if it did. And in my mind either it's the old buildings or having some housing right at the Main Street in this parcel would be -- it makes sense to me but at least I think that's something I'd like to talk about.

The other thing I wanted to -- you know, the difference in height that Iram just mentioned, I think -- I was particularly interested in and I want to make sure we at least talk about our strategies for development rights and transfer development rights, because we also talked about the fact that the places where the 150 Memorial Drive zone is, I mean we really have to look at the parcel in terms of not necessarily what are
the parcels that are currently available and how they'11 be developed, but what is the potential for the future? MIT has some properties that I would think that they're not going to be changing for quite sometime in some of these parcels, and does that mean by going up higher in their development rights they got transferred and go there and look at the language about an overall FAR but it can get higher in parcels as long as the overall FAR -- I want to make sure we're not just putting height in places that just allow for excess development and other places that there's some balance there. So these are all things that I'd like to make sure that we at least touch upon as we're going. And I'11 leave it at that for the time being. HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, I was just wondering did we receive a traffic report from Sue or maybe I lost it or I don't know.

| 1 | WILLIAM TIBBS: There wasn't a |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | report. |
| 3 | PAMELA WINTERS: There was no |
| 4 | report? |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: She might help us to |
| 6 | interpret Mr. Kaiser's report. |
| 7 | PAMELA WINTERS: Pardon? |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: She might help us to |
| 9 | interpret Mr. Kaiser's report. |
| 10 | PAMELA WINTERS: We will be getting |
| 11 | that in the future then at some point. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: I think we should ask |
| 13 | for a discussion of traffic. |
| 14 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, could I add |
| 15 | one more thing? |
| 16 | I just wanted to say that as we talk |
| 17 | about housing and we talk about graduate |
| 18 | housing which I think is an issue, which |
| 19 | obviously a lot of people brought up here. |
| 20 | One of the things that I'm aware of, |
| 21 | particularly when you look at the things that |

the graduate students brought up, which is there's a raise in rent, there's lower vacancy rates and affordable and middle income affordability of housing, the other issue that I want to make us aware of is that the firms that we're bringing here, the people who work there also are a pressure among the housing market, particularly relative to the fact that in a lot of cases they can afford to --

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
WILLIAM TIBBS: And the immense amount of housing development that we have going right now is actually being done at pretty high cost and at high either rent or cost levels, because I think that the developers are looking at, you know, with looking at all these potential people who are going to be work in these, quote, unquote, high tech firms and biotech firms that can afford to live there. And, you know,
particularly from affordability since we here a lot about the fact that the regular, the regular folk in Cambridge just can't afford to live here anymore. So it's not just the students who need to be on campus to get out of the sort of the housing market, it's also as we build so much development in these areas there's also -- we're bringing in a population that if they, too, want to live nearby would also be an issue. So I just want to make sure that we at least discuss that as part of that housing strategy that they talked about.

PAMELA WINTERS: And one of the things in talking about housing that we had come up before was the issue of micro housing. And one of the professors that spoke this evening said that a lot of the graduate students really work all day, work very, very hard, they just really want a place to kind of crash. And so you can fit a
lot more housing in a smaller, you know, amount of space and for cheaper rents. So that a lot more of students can afford to live nearby where they work. I think that that would be great.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I think that you probably characterize Ashdown House as micro housing. That is to say --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The old Ashdown.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- you don't get in
MIT graduate student dorms.
PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I guess we'11
move down this way. Steve or Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with you that the way that the innovation space looks shouldn't be in the Zoning language, but I do think that we need to get back to this folks who helped us with this initial letter. Tim Rowe, Johan

Freuhause (phonetic), Mark Castove (phonetic), Katie Ray, and this guy from, I love the name, Dogpatch Labs. I think we need to get back to those folks and make sure that whatever we to create as an addendum reflects their wisdom. I think they were on the right track.

I'd also like -- I'm not looking for this right now, but we heard from two or three folks, there's little or no housing studies in the City of Cambridge. There's no comprehensive housing study, and I just think we need to have some kind of a response to that.

And I also want to say that graduate housing is a big deal. It's a big deal in the innovation ecosystem. These entrepreneurs who are doing startups and getting this really high level of technical assistance from graduate students -- see, you're getting a post-doc who lives in

Romania and she's been here for ten years studying and has this huge content level. And that entrepreneur who is broke and who is funding this startup pays actually very little to that post-doc. It's not -- I'm not being pejorative but that post-doc is also gathering huge content, expertise, and depth to take back to where ever it is that they're going. But there's a relationship there that we have to be very, very careful of that we don't disrupt it because it's a big part of what happens in the innovation economy and on the entrepreneurial and the startups. And I don't want to be casual about it at all.

I also think that we owe some due diligence to the Red Cross building and the Kendal 1 Hotel to make sure that our -- we do existing Zoning really well to protect neighborhoods and to secure the feeling of a neighborhood, so I just want to make sure that we're doing that with this.

HUGH RUSSELL: So if you could go through Jarrett's letter and pull out pieces that we need to attend to or maybe make suggestions.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It also deals with how we deal with setbacks, too.

STEVEN WINTER: Correct, correct. It's all stuff that's there. It's already there.

And, $\mathrm{Bill}, \mathrm{I}$ agree that the transfer of development of rights issue is an interesting issue, and I too want to make sure that we're not setting up a district that's a donor district for transfer for TDR, height somewhere else. I just -- that's not the way it's really supposed to be used.

And that's it, Mr. Chair.
HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: I think Steve just went over my points. But in addition I just wanted to -- two graduate students that came
in on behalf of the student body and the petitioner (inaudible) but to put in front of us their concerns, which is an extremely legitimate concern. I do expect that of MIT students to come out and challenge what is proposed or rather support. I think that's the only comment that I wanted to make. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Tom.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess my first comment is that I think this is, as a number of people said, I think this is an improved version of what we saw the last time, substantially improved. And I think it's a well-balanced and well-written petition. I read through it today, and I think on a first read it was actually carefully crafted. Somebody spent some time writing the words, and most of them are helpful, but what I guess my interest is, because there are a lot of perspectives on what we should do here and I think we should spend sometime particularly
in the next session looking through the words and the concepts and seeing what's here and what isn't here. And my interest is very much in what these buildings are going to look like; whether it's the architecture or how they relate to each other and so on, and there are words here that help you on it and then there are parts that say nothing. And that's fairly typical of Zoning petitions, but let me just point out a few things that I noticed, and it's something that, for example, right at the outset there are the purposes or objectives of this petition right at the outset. And Iram and others who critiqued this or made comments on it said that the objectives didn't take into account studies that might come in the future that might define the objectives. That's somewhat of a weird concept to me. I guess I want to understand what the staff meant by future studies guiding us on what we meant when we
originally wrote this. How does that work? Can we somehow in the future alter what we meant when we wrote this? That's a little bit interesting and bizarre to me, and I guess I want to understand what Iram and others had in mind.

HUGH RUSSELL: But not tonight.
THOMAS ANNINGER: But not tonight. But not tonight.

There is a lengthy section that I think is very interesting of height over 250 feet. There's a lot of stuff there. The most blurred paragraph perhaps in the whole Zoning section that I'm tempted to read here: That increased height would not adversely affect and would result in increased sensitivity to the visual and physical characteristic of the particular location through more harmonious relationships to the terrain and to the proposed and existing buildings in the vicinity that have functional or visual
relationships to the proposed building. And that's a mouthful. That's a tough one. I had to read that a few times and I'm still not sure I've quite got it, but a lot of these things are good. They -- I guess I wonder why they only relate to things over 250 feet. This could have -- help us in other ways, and I guess I want to dig into that language.

Bridges between the buildings I think is a very important subject. You can imagine these buildings all being connected by all sorts of tunnels above ground and so on. I guess I'd like to know how we evaluate those bridges. There was some discussion about how high they should be and so on. But what criteria should we use to decide? Is it going to be from time to time what you and the Planning Board thinks are good? There are good and bad things to say about bridges. Bridges connect buildings, particularly in
the tough climate that we live in. On the other hand, they keep people off the street. And so you' 11 want to think about whether you really want to do that or not, and how often you want to do that. So bridges I think is an important subject.

Architectural diversity, there isn't a word about that and probably there won't be. We usually don't talk about that in the Zoning itself, but it's something that's near and dear to my heart, and it's something that we've talked about in other context and I would like it to be a theme here, too.

An issue that I have with MIT is the way they sometimes raise funds for buildings and then rush to get them into the ground and they move too fast. I think the Koch building is an example of that. You got a lot of money from dare I say a bad guy, and you wanted to run before he changed his mind or the politics changed, and it didn't come
out right is my view. I want to be sure that doesn't happen here anymore. There are other examples.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's sort of like an architectural quality is universally proportional to the fundraising time. The media lab being the other extreme.

PAMELA WINTERS: I was just going to say that. You took the words right out of my mouth.

WILLIAM TIBBS: That took a long time.

PAMELA WINTERS: That was ten years. THOMAS ANNINGER: And an important point that $I$ noticed in reading about it if I understood it right, and maybe it was in the comments, maybe it was in the Zoning itself. I think it was in the comments that Iram and others wrote, was the first time we have a building we will be looking for a master plan to decide what the whole area will look like.

That's going to be a critical moment if that's the way it plays itself out, if that's really the order of things, is that very first building will sort of decide just like what we did for North Point in a way -WILLIAM TIBBS: Right.

THOMAS ANNINGER: -- we'11 have a master plan at the same time. So I guess we want to think how that master plan gets developed and whether we are in a position to even do such a thing in such a vast scale. That's almost a scarey proposition to do a master plan for a number of acres of such critical acres as this.

HUGH RUSSELL: Particularly when you don't know what half the program is.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right.
HUGH RUSSELL: Because it's the academic entitlement that's going to play out.

THOMAS ANNINGER: So I guess I
wonder what the staff or MIT meant by doing a master plan at that very first time. So those are some of the thoughts that ran through my head as I was trying to think what is this going to look like? And that is sort of where I'm going to spend some of my time about it when we talk about it again. HUGH RUSSELL: You want to bat cleanup?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have one last question. When we were talking about traffic, whether this presupposes a particular use of Main Street, because I know Sue had a very different points of view under the two plans for Kendall Square as to traffic on Main Street and whether we need to address that now or whether that's something that's still going to come at some point in the future.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, any last thoughts? Things we want to talk about next
month?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: If not, I think Tom said something that is, I think, represents probably the views of the entire Board which is that this is another stage in a proposal that seems to be generally in conformance with the Kendal 1 Square study. And it's a reasonable proposal that needs fine tuning. Maybe.

STEVEN WINTER: I concur.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So with that, we will send you off to the hall to do your homework. And we will try to take up case at 54 Cedar Street.

Thank you very much.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the Board is going to discuss a Special Permit case at 54 Cedar Street and this is a case we heard quite sometime ago and there have been, I
believe, some changes and so I think the first what we want to find out from the Petitioner what's changed and then we'11 go from there.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening, Mr. Chair and members of the Planning Board. For the record, attorney Sean Hope, Hope Legal Law Offices. I'm here on behalf of the Petitioner, LaCourt Family, LLC. And with the project architect Jai Singh Khalsa. In the revised drawing plan and the material change from the previous design was an alternative roof plan. The original plan had a flat roof, and the revised plan has a pitched roof. This was based on some feedback with the neighbors, but as well as we are proposing it as an alternative plan and there's been some sentiment in recent conversations that maybe the pitched roof may actually make the building seem larger so that we are open to either one. think which speaks to two structures versus one structure and some of the identifiable benefits. But just briefly, based on the comments from the public and from the Planning Board, we actually took a fresh look at the lot and the proposal for putting the structure on there. One of the things that -- and Jai will talk about maybe more specific, was that we looked for a superior design. And so we actually looked at the site, and wanted to look at, even if it meant going for a Variance or a hardship, what would a 2800 square foot building look like if it was connected as an accessory unit or a townhouse to the existing unit? So you see the existing structure which is 822 square feet. That structure is non-conforming in terms of the setback. So when we looked at that, and we actually have some models here, which Jai can go to the next slide. We
actually did a general massing study. And so we looked to see if we added that 2800 square feet as an adjacent building to the structure that complied with the setbacks, what that would mean in terms of the experience from the street and as well as the occupants. And one of the challenges as part of the -- and this is the new structure, this square here. One of the challenges under 5.53 references incentives to put the building and parking in the middle of the lot as well as to have the parking shielded by the public view. So if you -- we modeled the 2800 square feet. What you have here is you have -- because these would be connected townhouses, you are allowed to be greater than 75 feet from the street, but you had the example of having the parking in the rear yard.

We did discuss with the rear abutters the idea of having the proposed building in this location. There was strong opposition
to having any parking in the rear lot. As you remember, at the previous hearing there were two abutter at the front of the lot, and there was some suggestion that moving the parking, excuse me, the building to the rear lot was going to be a preferable design. We also did another study where we actually moved the parking out of the rear yard, and as you would see for the dimensional requirements of the compliant parking spaces, there was -- another option was to site the parking along this property line here and then you still have a conforming structure. Now the reason why you have to have a conforming structure is, as the Board knows, is when you have a connected townhouse, you're allowed to encroach the 75 -foot setback line. I think both of those proposals are in fear of design. One because it still leaves this vacant open lot in the front as well as the experience from the
street. As one way you'11 see, driveway and parking and the house in the rear. Also from the owner's point of view in terms of marketability, and you'11 hear some of this from the rear abutters, part of this open large lot allows for, you know, light and air and access to this rear yard which is really what part of 5.3 seeks to preserve. As you'11 see one of the criterion is maintaining this contiguous open space and rear yard vistas. So putting in this 2800 square feet structure in the back actually precludes. Now in this example with the parking along the side, you do have most of this ample and rear yard space still open, but the experience from the street is one where you're going to see these cars parked. This first car is actually parked within the front yard setback. And so really the second car is really a compliant space. So that there may be an opportunity to move
this back, but we said we were looking at different options even if it meant a Variance. So we wanted to show really if we were really trying to preserve as much of this rear yard space, where can we put the parking?

Another aspect that we looked at in terms of what would be the appropriate design on this as opposed to what we propose, was the experience along Cedar Street. And as you'11 see, you know, within the neighborhood you don't see 60 feet or more of open front yard space. What you see is houses to the front of the lot, and you'11 see usually these majority of these 5.53 Special Permits are asking to add additional houses to the rear of the lot. So I do think this is a unique case because the existing house is in the rear. And so in order to do an attached townhouse, you really are going to be putting the massing in the middle to the rear of the

The other, which is a highlighted in the narrative, the reason for the 5.53 Special Permit is that this corner portion of the house is rated 75 feet from the line. And so the Petitioner, if he demolished this front corner of the existing single-family, he could, by application for a Building Permit, place the same structure in the front of the lot. It would mean actually taking off the corner of this house. Now this is not a favorable option for him. This is an 822-square foot house, so the living area is very sma11. But just in terms of what the options are. So, you know, part of our analysis would be, you know, what is the burden and what is the cost of demolishing this front structure of the house versus all the other options that were available on the site? And Jai can walk through this in terms of the architectural, but just in terms of
the massing and what's allowed on the lot, we really feel that even after review and even with the Variance, just briefly I wanted to walk through some of the challenges for going for a legal hardship.

So one, Article 8 takes non-conforming structures --

HUGH RUSSELL: I just assume not have a Zoning primary right now.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Oh, sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: We're later than we want to be. Can we go to Jai's presentation? ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Sure. WILLIAM TIBBS: And in particular can you make sure that you start with the site plan? And do you have a plan that shows the adjacent buildings?

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, I was going to say that, too.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Because this cannot be looked at out of context with the
buildings that are right next to.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: Jai Singh Khalsa, Khalsa Design, the design architect for the project. And give me one second here. The computer's a little slow scrolling back but it will get there in a minute.

Okay, here is the locus plan of the neighborhood and the site that we're talking about is in this area here.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you do a 1ittle better?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: I want to zoom in. I'm going to zoom in a little bit in the area so you can see more clearly what the locus is for that area.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: And so the lot we're talking about is highlighted in brown here or red. This is the existing house. This is the proposed house. And this over here is Mr. Bingham's house next-door. And
you'11 seat footprint of Mr. Bingham's house is about the same size of the footprint of the house that we're proposing to put up front here, okay?

So you've got the general sense of the shape of the homes in the neighborhood that you have a pretty consistent rhythm of homes along the street frontage and as well as on this side of the street, you pretty consistently have homes fairly close to the street. And we're taking what is a hole in that and filling it. Now interestingly enough historically there were homes in this location, and we had shown in the past a Sanborn maps and the historic maps of this area showing that there were two homes on this lot in the past.

Let's go to the next one.
And so we went to street view and we pulled up what was available for the -- a view down the street today, and we dropped in
our building. And this is Mr. Bingham's home here. I don't know the name of the abutter here, but you have a garage here and then you have the next home down the street here. And this is the proposed building that we had here, the one with the flat roof. We also have a pitched roof design that we'11 show you in a minute.

So you can see the house, yes, it's a story taller, but it's not tremendously out of scale with what is going on on this side of the street.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It's the width of this house and what's the width of the Bingham house?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: They're both around 16 feet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Your proposal of house is on7y 15 feet.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: We have to wait for it to catch up to the next screen. OKAY,
here you can see -- here you can see this is Mr. Bingham's house, the existing house here, and in this location we're proposing close to the same footprint over here in the lot here. This is the existing house on the applicant's lot, and then the garage back here which we're proposing to be demolished. WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess my question was what is the width of both of the houses, not that they're approximately the same, but what is the width of both houses?

JAI SINGH KHALSA: We11, I'11 give you the exact width, hopefully the exact width of Mr. Bingham's house and I'11 give you the exact measurement of our house in a minute. Well, I can't give you the exact on Mr. Bingham's. He's got a lot here which is 24 feet wide, and this is taking up a little bit more than half the lot. So this is probably in the range of 14 feet wide back in this area here. You'd be about 16 feet wide
in this area here. I can give you in a minute the exact width on the house that we're proposing.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It's 14 feet.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: It's 14 feet?
HUGH RUSSELL: 14 in the main part.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: And then it bumps out wider the back.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: It's been a couple months since I've looked at the exact width of the house.

You've seen the Zoning diagrams. I'm not going to repeat what Sean discussed with you, but it's, you know, fully compliant in terms of the setbacks. And as Sean said, you have an area over here of this existing house that potentially one approach would be to demolish that part of that house. It would then bring it into conformance, and the house here would then be totally conforming in
terms of the approach of the project.
I don't have much to add -- I'm sorry, Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can we just -- I'd
like to give -- do you have any other street views of the alternative design? I really don't want to go through the same testimony.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Okay, here's the same design alternative. I don't have any other three-dimensional -- 3-D renderings of it. This is the alternative design. And what we've done on the alternative design was to put a pitched roof on it, which we thought would make the house seem smaller. Some of the abutters who reviewed it actually felt it made the house seem larger. And their preference was stated that they preferred the flat roof version rather than the pitched roof version. The pitched roof was an attempt to architecturally bring the scale of it down a little bit. Okay?

The height hasn't changed from this to the flat roof version, okay, but you do get the shingles in the sense of a slightly lowered roof out of it and a series of dormers happening on it.

I think we did adjust the window pattern a bit in here, and we did take away sort of the mock bay break down from a lot of the side of the building as well in terms of the detailing on this.

And I can zoom in on this to tell you what the dimensions are on the building.

Okay. The building at its widest point in the back is $16^{\prime}, 1^{\prime \prime}$, in this area here and it is -- give me one second here.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's --
THOMAS ANNINGER: This doesn't really matter.

JAI SINGH KHALSA: Wel1, I was just responding to the request.

HUGH RUSSELL: So could you put up
the street view? The perspective rendering?
JAI SINGH KHALSA: Yes.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, it's not a bad place to start.

HUGH RUSSELL: What do we think about that?

WILLIAM TIBBS: One, the Bingham house is basically, and if you look at it, I have a picture of it right here. I can share it if you want. The Bingham house is basically -- it's a two-story house, but it's actually one full story and the roof kind of begins to cut into the second story, so it's relatively low. So even though it's relatively narrow, it's relatively low. And from my sense I just can't get a sense of the context of what this really will look like. I mean, yours is two stories with -- even if you did the pitched roof.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Three stories. WILLIAM TIBBS: Three stories. So I
can't imagine it's going to be anywhere close, but that's for you to show it in some convincing way. The problem with this one for me is that the site is very narrow. It's a very odd site. It's very narrow in the front and it has that little jog in the back. And unless you can show me some context of how this looks in the neighborhood, which is one of the criteria that we have to use to select it, I can't -- I just can't deal with it. So, I think it's good that you did those studies in the back, but at least in a block kind of way you need to show those in three dimensions, show the garages next-door, show the property next-door so that we can see this in context. Even though they're different properties, the Bingham house and the house on this lot almost look like they could be one, because if you don't see the property line, you're not -- you know, you're not aware of the jog. So in my mind, I'm
open to the idea of looking at this and determining what might be a reasonable approach if you're going to have something up front. But the two back options are reasonable, too. But I just can't assess them at all without you actually giving me some context in three dimension or some three-dimensional views to begin to see where the open space is, where the drive is.

PAMELA WINTERS: And the surrounding --

WILLIAM TIBBS: The idea about the parking in the front, even if you -- if it's screened and if you have landscaping and stuff like that, I, I just -- you don't have enough information for me to be able to make a determination on this at all from my perspective. I don't know how the other board members fee1. And you need to come back and just show us some -- show us what you looked at, and then what the pros and
cons are. And then we can sort of try to help you if we can and sort of say which one makes sense to us. But this particular one, if I had to vote on it tonight, I would be voting no big time because -- from my interpretation, having gone there and looked at it, I just don't, I don't get it. STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair. HUGH RUSSELL: Steve. STEVEN WINTER: Yes, Bi11, I concur with you. And I would be a little more blunt. I would say that I don't have a clue what is going on with these buildings so the relationship to them or the relationship to the driveway or in between, whether it's too close to the existing house. I just, I don't have a clue what's going on from the information.

HUGH RUSSELL: Tom.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I agree that the information is not adequate, but I do think
we can take this a step further if we start to roll up our sleeves and really think about it. At least I have my view on the changes I would make to this. I'm with you, that I don't think that this proposal that you have is a good one, but I think with a few changes and they are substantial -- maybe we can take this thing down so I could sort of see you guys?

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: It might help if you guys would sit over in the middle.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's great.
Thank you. And maybe you can sit over there. Thank you, we're fine.

Here are some of the things that I think we ought to talk about:

Clearly the option of putting a building in back and having nothing in front, I couldn't agree with you more. It's not a good one and it's not desirable and we
wouldn't want you to do it and I don't think you want to do it.

HUGH RUSSELL: And we've gotten letters from two abutter that don't want that either.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Right.
This building, I was there today, I think there are -- the first question is where is it located? How far back are you setting it? And what is the angle at which you are setting it? To me it should be a little bit further back than where it is now. Not a whole lot, but its relationship to Mr. Bingham's, is that it, Bingham? Mr. Bingham's building I think is not good the way it is. I think it is a little too far forward. And if you try to recreate his angle and his setback, I would push it back further. That would -- that seems logical to me, and I think that would give you actually a little bit more breathing space, but I'm

| 1 | not sure of that. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: So you're saying you |
| 3 | want him to match the Bingham's setback? |
| 4 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes. That's No. |
| 5 | 1. |
| 6 | No. 2, I think you would vastly improve |
| 7 | this building if you chopped off a story. I |
| 8 | think it should be two stories, not three. |
| 9 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. |
| 10 | PAMELA WINTERS: I agree. |
| 11 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Then I think it |
| 12 | will be -- it will look quite logical in the |
| 13 | scheme of things. You're cramming in a top |
| 14 | floor on a very narrow building and that's |
| 15 | what makes it look so weird. |
| 16 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, it does. |
| 17 | THOMAS ANNINGER: So I would take |
| 18 | off a floor. I know you want -- you don't |
| 19 | want to hear that, but that's what I would |
| 20 | suggest you do. |
| 21 | And the third thing I don't like about |

this project, and I think we have to figure out something to deal with this, is these five parking spaces. Where does that come from? I know, I know what you're going to say about the 1970 Variance. I guess my first question is are any of the people on Norris Street using this anymore?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Never did.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Never did. So it's kind of a bogus solution that I would suggest to you with time has lost whatever strength it may have had as a solution to a problem from 30 or 40 years ago. So I think it's meaningless now today. I don't believe that that Variance gave you the right to have more parking than is appropriate for the site the way it stands. So I guess I would like to analyze this as how many spaces does this site get for the housing that you propose to use for it? Forget about Norris Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Two.

## THOMAS ANNINGER: Two?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Very simple.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I might think three might be okay, but certainly not five. So in sum, I would push this back so that it lines up pretty much so it has the same setback as the Bingham building. I think it would look better that way, and give everybody a little breathing room in front. I think it would relate better to the street. Two stories --

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: -- two maximum, three spaces.

HUGH RUSSELL: Other comments?
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, Tom pretty much covered everything I had to say which I think his comments were excellent and, you know, really encapsulate. I agree, the building if it's going to exist, has to be in the front. And I think it's always been the
oddest looking building at three stories and, you know, it really has to be less tall. If indeed people are not using those three parking spots, then I think we ought not have to do deal with that. Although I think reading the variance it may be necessary for you to go back to the BZA and get the Variance modified. But I think if we can get down to two or three parking spots at the most and they're -- I think in the middle, as you've been showing it, that would be appropriate for the structures that are there and would leave a nice large yard in the back which would be good for you and for all your abutters would have open space. And I think then that become an acceptable configuration. HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: I would just like to have better visuals. I'm a real visual person, and I just -- I would like to see how this relates to the abutters and just more
clear pictures of where what you propose probably going to propose something different after tonight, but how it's going to fit in with the abutters and how it's going to -how the whole thing is going to look and have a really good picture of it so that that would be my request.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, can I, I just want a second what she just said for two reasons: One, without really seeing the house that's there, if I just looked at your assessment that you did looking at the site whatever, actually I would have been tending to put the building in the back, but then when you realize there's already a building in the front that's not on this property, but for all the visuals intents then you're talking about three buildings all lined up there in the front. And that's why the one in the back doesn't make a lot of sense to me. And so I think it's important to show a
site plan and to really show those buildings so that we can see. And then when you put in the parking and where you're going to have grass and where you're going to have paving, and we can assess all that stuff and go from there.

The parking, the five parking spaces are just in your way. It's just causing you more problems than they're worth in terms of trying to solve this problem.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Could I briefly address --

HUGH RUSSELL: No, I'd like to speak.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Excuse me.
HUGH RUSSELL: I'm also from the, you know, the lack of information led me to go to Google maps to try to understand what was happening in the backyard. It appears to me that there are some trees there that are of significant size, and that would be -- I
would like to know where those trees are vis-à-vis any parking plan that you come up with. And that I would not want to see, you know, significant loss. I think there's one tree that's on the footprint of the house that to me would be an exception that, you losing that tree is different in my mind. And if you look at Google maps' sort of view, when you zoom in, they start giving you an oblique view which gives you more of a characterization of what the structures are like. And there are some buildings that are taller than, you know, one and a half or two stories, but there aren't too many. There is, of course, the building we know and love on Norris Street, but it's not on Cedar Street. There is a -- looks like a three-family, a three decker on the corner of Norris and Cedar on the north side. So I'd go back and forth in thinking, well, you know, there are three-story houses scattered
around North Cambridge. And another three-story house isn't wildly out of character. There's some pretty unusual houses.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It's not the height. It's the narrowness of their particular plan that --

HUGH RUSSELL: I'd like to complete my remarks, please. The -- so it's unusual -- there are other very unusual houses. This would be a very unusual house in terms of its height. And so I agree with my colleagues that it's just out of whack.

I look at the floor plan and I wonder why you need four bedrooms and a study and three bathrooms? Is this going to be for a whole bunch of students? Is that why you need all the parking places? Is that what we want in this neighborhood? And so I'm wondering if you could actually just take off the first 20 feet or so of the third floor
which has a bedroom and a bathroom in it, and then there's a stair next to that that actually is -- there is another four feet where the roof can be lower. I mean, I don't know what that would look like. You know, it might be pretty -- it might be equally bizarre, but it might be a way to treat it so that, you know, is it far enough back from the reasonable points of view or is it -this building is quite exposed partly because of the way the buildings are, the lots are set at an angle to the street, so, you know, at the corner of the Bingham lot that is, there's a lot of distance to the street that exposes side enough that the building aligns with that. I don't know.

In the big picture here, they don't want to cut off the corner of the house but they may decide that's what they have to do to maximize their financial return, and in which case that -- this case goes away and
this building gets built. So we can't just -- we have to have a negotiation -- we have to discuss.

WILLIAM TIBBS: With all due respect, we are not here to design the properties for these projects for the proponents. We can give you our thoughts and our ideas on how to improve and what makes it reasonable, but we don't -- I mean and negotiation is all right, but we're not -you know, we can give you some thoughts and ideas, but I don't want us -- we shouldn't start designing things for people. That's their job. They come to us with a project and we react to it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, and I think there's been a very clear reaction from the Board, and I only muddied it slightly.

So now, Mr. Hope, what did you have to say?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Thank you, and

I'11 be brief. Just for the record, I do understand from the Planning Board that the other perspectives and visuals would make what we're proposing a lot more easy to understand in the context. I did think this perspective was helpful, but without the perspective looking down the driveway and to the rear I think you made the point clear. It's very difficult to know how this is going to feel in relation to Mr. Bingham. And I think that exercise would be something that would be worth doing for the Planning Board, for the neighborhood, and for the project in general.

Specifically toward the parking, I did go meet with Inspectional Services. And you have the Variance in front of you. The affect of the Variance, and let me be clear to the site, it doesn't burden 54R Cedar, but the compliance the Certificate of Occupancy for that third floor unit is contingent on
three parking spaces being located at 54R Cedar. That was the --

THOMAS ANNINGER: You mean the one on Norris Street?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Excuse me. The Norris Street's Variance that allowed for a third unit is conditioned on three parking spaces being allowed on 54R Cedar. So that if the owner decided to eliminate those spaces on his own or if we were conditioned a Special Permit that eliminated those three spaces, designated for 55-57 Cedar, then that third floor unit would no longer be valid and you have to get a Variance to be able to modify that Variance or a brand new Variance. That's in totality what that effect is. The idea of who's using those, as you've heard from the neighbors, saying that, but you do need to provide three parking spaces. The flexibility is where those parking spaces can be located. The owner has no intention of
wanting to give up that third floor occupancy. That is a fully tenanted building. So there are people living in that, and it would be a severe hardship for the occupants of that building as well as for the owners to give up that parking space. So as much as the board has expressed the desire not to have five parking spaces on that lot, it has been a decision of ISD, regardless how long ago it was and how ineffective it is today, it is a requirement of that Variance to have that third floor unit Certificate of Occupancy.

Go ahead.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Go ahead. I mean, I'm not going to believe that a Variance of that age which no longer has any meaning in terms of the parking, nobody's using it, it has lost its meaning, somebody has to be smart enough to say time has lapsed and it no longer makes sense so we have to bring it up
to date. And I can't imagine that the Zoning Board isn't -- or the Inspectional Services isn't flexible enough to say let it be without the parking.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And I think to your point, I think the proper procedure would be to go to the Zoning Board and get a Variance. And I think that would be -- but that's not in the decision that the owner is necessarily going to making and I don't know if this Board can make that but I --

THOMAS ANNINGER: We can certainly --

HUGH RUSSELL: Is that house owned by the same people that own 54 ?

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. So I mean, but that's the reality of the parking on the lot.

The other thing I would say is in terms of the comments about knocking off a floor. In discussions with the owner, that is not
something that he is prepared to do. The Zoning and the density allows for a certain height and a certain mass on the lot. I think the comparison from his point of view is the burden and the cost and expense of chopping off the corner of the house versus the burden of losing a floor. So for him it really is a calculation in terms of what he would rather do. So I do think that perspectives of the house is something -- is a good exercise that we could do, but just in terms of being respectful of the Board's time, the owner does not want to take a floor down and he also does not want to participate in removing one of the five parking spaces on the lot.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
THOMAS ANNINGER: This is a gentleman who comes to us frequently and has asked us for a number of times to help him with his proposals.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Understood.
THOMAS ANNINGER: It is hard for me to believe that he is not doing anything more than just playing hard ball with us, but it makes no sense for him to chop off that corner and do something attached to that corner the way you showed us. Or to do a building like this with a chopped off corner. Would he really shoot himself in the foot like that?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we're going to find out. Given what I'm hearing here is we're asking for changes, you're saying your client will not authorize such changes, so then I think we're in a position to move to a vote and vote to deny. We'11 find out.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, yes.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Wouldn't it be better to postpone and let you come up with some thoughts --
would.
THOMAS ANNINGER: -- I think that makes more sense than to have us turn you down and two years start to run from the time we turn you down.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And just for procedurally in terms of postponing, what would that mean? Because I know that there's not another Planning Board hearing between now and when the petition expires. I haven't been authorized to grant an extension after tonight.

HUGH RUSSELL: He has not -- would someone like to make a motion.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I have not been authorized to grant an extension passed the January 31st date.

STEVEN WINTER: To deny?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: So moved. So moved.

THOMAS ANNINGER: No. Wait, wait. STEVEN WINTER: Let's discuss it.
H. THEODORE COHEN: One second. Liza, did you say that it expired the 31st? LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And we have a meeting the 22nd.

LIZA PADEN: The 22nd. Which has two public hearings; one of which is the Forest City petition as continued, and under General Business you asked for a discussion of the bicycle parking zoning. I would suspect it's a full agenda.

HUGH RUSSELL: The only thing that's going to convince this Board is a proposal that has a less than five parking places and does not have a third story.

STEVEN WINTER: We've just been told by the proponent's representative that that's not going to happen.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Wel1, he didn't
say that. He said --
ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Just to
clarify, I said I haven't been authorized to extend the hearing passed January 31st. I wasn't aware that there was a hearing on January 22nd that could potentially -- but I'm relaying what I've been told in terms of what I think what the option is to do.

WILLIAM TIBBS: But you did just say that you did not want to take off the third floor. I mean, you just said what you -- you just said what you can't do.

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: I expressed the wishes of the owner in terms of the modifications that he would make and I think the analysis --

HUGH RUSSELL: So we have a choice of either postponing it and letting you come back in a week and telling us, yes, we'11
make the changes you want or, no, you won't. And if it's no, then I think we have no
option but to vote. I believe what you're telling me that the owner's not going to do that.

PAMELA WINTERS: Are you sure the owner is not going to do that? Or would not consider?

STEVEN WINTER: We can't guess.
JAI SINGH KHALSA: I would like to have one last crack at it.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we should have -- I see no reason not to see if we can help this along. The alternative of doing this a week from now will take five to ten minutes. We'11 either hear something or we won't.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: So I see no reason why we should do something that I see as premature.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It's not premature.
HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, what we're
saying is I think you're going to say, yeah, we'11 take another extension for another month or two and come up with a new design within those parameters. That's really --

ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Just, I would appreciate without extending passed January 31st, if the Board would allow us just based on comments by Mr. Khalsa that he feels that there would be an opportunity to be able to persuade them. We've kind of heard what the Board would like to see. I think there's an opportunity to do that. I can't say what owner would do, but we would be brief if the Planning Board would allow us to take this time to not extend but to have the 22nd, we'd take that opportunity if you would allow us to do so.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, it doesn't take long to write up a decision to deny.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I was going to say you should make sure the owner knows that

| 1 | we're proposed -- as it is the Board was |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | disposed to deny it. |
| 3 | ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: That's very |
| 4 | clear. |
| 5 | PAMELA WINTERS: Is the owner here |
| 6 | tonight? |
| 7 | ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: No, he's not. |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Liza. |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: Can I ask for |
| 10 | clarification? So what will happen is this |
| 11 | will be put on the agenda for the 22nd as a |
| 12 | continued hearing, and at that time if the |
| 13 | proponent has decided he doesn't want to do |
| 14 | any of the changes that the Planning Board |
| 15 | suggested, the Board will move to a vote. |
| 16 | And if the proponent has decided he will |
| 17 | investigate further, at that time an |
| 18 | extension will be requested and granted by |
| 19 | the Planning Board? |
| 20 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Exactly. |
| 21 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, exactly. |
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