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## PROCEEDINGS

(Seated Members: Hugh Russe11, H. Theodore Cohen, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, Steven Winter.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And Liza is going to direct us to the first part of our agenda.

LIZA PADEN: So the first item on the agenda is a review of the BZA cases. And the case that I wanted to bring to your attention is the Lesley University signage on Mass Ave. And George is here from Lesley University to talk about the signage application and how the proposal fits with the overall scheme at Lesley University.

GEORGE SMITH: Thank you. My name is George Smith. I'm Director of Operations and Campus Planning with Lesley University.

We have applied for a Variance for the addition of a sign to the front facing the Mass Ave. the front facing facade of 1663 Mass. Avenue which is our new dorm that was built in 2009. This particular sign is in keeping with the overall sign package that we had submitted. It's been about two or three years ago and it was approved for, for the way -- it's in keeping with the sign initiative that we put up. We have another building that's on the corner of 0xford Street and Everett Street which is our White Hal1, and I've included a picture in the package of that particular sign which is letters that are installed on the side of the building. And these letters are very similar to the letters that we're requesting to install in the front of the Mass. Avenue facing front of the new dorm that's at 1663

Mass. Avenue.
So it's actually used as a gateway
marker. It's not meant to be a sign to show the direct entrance to the dorm which is actually, it's on the Wendell Street side of the building. So we're requesting that we be allowed to add that sign to the side of the building and request your approval.

HUGH RUSSELL: As I recollect as last we saw this from last week, I guess it was. You're just proposing Lesley University without the Doble Campus?

GEORGE SMITH: Yes. And the reason for that is this particular sign that's on White Hall is right on the corner and it's right -- that building is facing -- faces directly on to the quad. And all of the buildings that are right there in the immediate area of that building are the Doble

Campus. We felt that the Lesley University on the front of the new dorm facing Mass. Avenue, since the buildings that are right directly behind that are not Lesley buildings, it made more sense to do it this way.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a question.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So is my understanding correct that the ZBA turned down your prior request for a Variance to put up a banner that said Lesley University.

GEORGE SMITH: They did, yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And do you know, what was the rationale?

GEORGE SMITH: Well, at the time when we -- there was, there were several Variances that were required to construct the
dorm the way it was, and at the time the BZA wanted us to have that, the request for that banner in the package with the rest of the Variances that we had. And for one reason or another it was missed. And so we went back later after we had put the banner brackets on the side of the building and requested the banner, and we were turned down at the time because they thought it was inappropriate. It's a large banner. It's the same size as the banners that are on the front of the University Hal1. And it said Lesley University, and they requested we take it down and denied the application.

These letters we feel that they're more conservative. They're not extremely large, and, you know, they look nice on the side of the building, and we think it's an appropriate way to announce that that's

Lesley University building.
HUGH RUSSELL: Do you have the BZA application here still?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, for this case.
Yes, I do.
(Ahmed Nur Seated.)
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, either I missed it or I was not aware of the fact that the banners had been banned. Was that part of our discussion? Do you recall that?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, this was a -- I don't remember when -- if they -- I don't remember any discussion of this building when they came for relief. I think the relief was very minor.

So, I don't have any recollection of weighing in on the banner or not or whether we were asked about it. You know, a week ago we questioned whether we did the banner and

| 1 | now we heard the answer. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN WINTER: I think George just |
| 3 | explained to us that the banner was |
| 4 | inadvertently left out, but the posts were |
| 5 | placed -- |
| 6 | GEORGE SMITH: They were. |
| 7 | STEVEN WINTER: -- in preparation |
| 8 | for the banner, and the BZA said no banner |
| 9 | leaving the posts only and no name. |
| 10 | GEORGE SMITH: That's correct. |
| 11 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I assume the posts |
| 12 | are down now? |
| 13 | GEORGE SMITH: No. They're still |
| 14 | there. |
| 15 | STEVEN WINTER: They're built right |
| 16 | in. |
| 17 | GEORGE SMITH: They're tied into the |
| 18 | structural field. |
| 19 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Just like the |

columns on the Sackler Museum which never went across the street.

PAMELA WINTERS: Did they give a reason why they didn't like the banner?

GEORGE SMITH: I think it was too many. It was too high. It was too large. It's, you know, those banners are -- they're 15 feet tall, about two and a half feet wide.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
GEORGE SMITH: And, you know, while it would have been nice to have that banner on the front of the building, they thought it was inappropriate. And it was -- so they didn't give us the authorization to put it up.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Hugh, the issue here is the height, is that what it is?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's the only part
that requires relief is the height.
GEORGE SMITH: In terms of size and the additional signs, the Bank of America and the High Rise Bakery that we have on the building, as you can see from the application, there's plenty of linear feet of sign. And the sign is a little over two feet tall and about five feet long. So it's a conservative-sized sign.

STEVEN WINTER: And, George, when we say sign, we're talking about the letters on the brick.

GEORGE SMITH: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Not a shingle.
GEORGE SMITH: We're talking about letters mounted directly to the brick.

STEVEN WINTER: And, Mr. Chair, if I may continue just a moment. Also, so I think that one of the things that puzzled us was
that the -- or me, that the sign is not a wayfinding sign, and it's not an address sign. So my question was what does it do? GEORGE SMITH: Well, it's a -- it's kind of gateway. It has a function as a gateway to the campus. And as I mentioned, you know, the buildings that are directly behind the dorm are not Lesley University buildings. So, therefore, we didn't feel it was appropriate to put Doble Campus on there as it is on the side of White Hall. But as far as --

HUGH RUSSELL: You have to update half of the frontage on Wendell Street is Lesley so that you can, you know, they don't have the old motel that Harvard Law School owns. But if you look at this map, most of that block is Lesley. Most of the frontage is Lesley.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm not sure where you're going with that.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I think it's logical to say if you're trying to mark like the corners of this part of this campus, I don't -- I forget the terminology. Are there three campuses; is that the way it works?

GEORGE SMITH: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: If you're sort of trying to mark the corners of the Doble, then this is sort of the logical place to do it.

I guess I can see the understanding. I can see that it's part of an overall plan. It's actually relatively innocuous. And so although I was initially, I'm somewhat asking these questions like why? I think there are some answers.

STEVEN WINTER: I have to say I'm much more sympathetic with the historical
perspective that the BZA denied the banner. I think banners actually can add to vibrant colors and feelings and flavors on an urban landscape. So that doesn't make sense to me. Knowing that, I'm much more sympathetic to the branding as it were.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. I can see how sort of the banner's out of scale with this particular building because the banner's trying to relate to a larger area. And also is trying to match up with the banners which are quite modest to the scale of the University Hall. There's a science of signs and then there's an art. So that's how, this is an artistic endeavor if you will. The great sign would be the art institute.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think the word branding is a little strong for what I see as a relatively modest, as you called it,
conservative effort that's on1y halfway up the building. When I think of branding, I think of what Microsoft did or what some of the other buildings have done in East Cambridge, and this is not that. I think this is befitting of a university that wants to keep its dignity, and I think it achieves that very well. So perhaps it's branding but of a humble and kind that suits both this building, and I think the purpose. So I like to see us support this. STEVEN WINTER: I concur, and perhaps we can move forward.

AHMED NUR: Yes, I do too support.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I'm fine with it now. Although I would prefer the banner.

PAMELA WINTERS: I would prefer the banner, too.

| 1 | LIZA PADEN: I don't think that's -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I |
| 3 | understand. |
| 4 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that's |
| 5 | just rubbing it in. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I think, you |
| 7 | know, our colleagues on the Zoning Board have |
| 8 | considered this -- |
| 9 | PAMELA WINTERS: Right. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: -- and they made a |
| 11 | decision with more facts at their disposal, |
| 12 | so be it. So should we take a vote to |
| 13 | support it then? |
| 14 | A11 those in favor of voting. |
| 15 | (Raising hands). |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: You're voting against |
| 17 | it? |
| 18 | AHMED NUR: I'm supporting. |
| 19 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, good. |

(Unanimous Vote in Favor.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Al1 right, thank you for coming down to explain it to us.

Now we can move to the extension request. No point in having you sit here for an hour.

GEORGE SMITH: Okay, so on April
13th of 2011, we were issued the Special
Permit for the artist to the Boston -- our new construction for the art center building. And since that time up until February 25th, we had some ongoing litigation with regard to the building. And as of February 25th, which was the final date for any kind of appeal that went by, and there were no appeals, and so from this, as on February 25th all of the litigation that's associated with the project is finished. And so as of that date, we started moving forward with permitting

| 1 | process. And it looks like we may be able to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | have it permitted with the City before the |
| 3 | 13th of April this year, but we're not |
| 4 | necessarily -- we're not certain that we can |
| 5 | and so, therefore, we'd like to get the |
| 6 | Special Permit extended just to allow us a |
| 7 | little extra time to work on the permit and |
| 8 | get it in to the city. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: What's the length of |
| 10 | the extension that you'd like? |
| 11 | GEORGE SMITH: Six months. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Sure. |
| 13 | THOMAS ANNINGER: So moved. |
| 14 | PAMELA WINTERS: Seconded. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 those in favor? |
| 16 | (Raising hands). |
| 17 | GEORGE SMITH: Thank you very much. |
| 18 | (Unanimous Vote in Favor.) |
| 19 | STEVEN WINTER: George, while you're |

here can I ask you to talk to the Board about -- there's a wonderful way you're decommissioning the church or it's a ceremony. Could you tell us a little bit about it? I think it's terrific by the way. GEORGE SMITH: Decommissioning? HUGH RUSSELL: Deconsecrating? STEVEN WINTER: Wel1, no. There's some public gathering with Lesley folks and the community to acknowledge the fact that we're going to move the church, and I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about that. I think it's great.

GEORGE SMITH: Well, I think we're going to have an activity like that. I don't know exactly what is specifically set up at the moment. But it's a great occasion. That that church has been on the site where it's at since 1867. And we, you know, this is
really nice that we've had the opportunity to repurpose it and bring it back to some of its future glory, and put a new steeple on the top of it. It was the one that was on it for most of its life. So at any rate, the -we're kind of thinking the groundbreaking is going to be sometime in the April time frame. The actual church itself is going to be moving in, and if we stay on the schedule that we've got established, it's going to be moving in August. And so at that point in time we're moving it from one side of the site to the other. So, I think that's sort of an opportunity to gather and, you know, in that capacity.

STEVEN WINTER: If you could keep us informed, we would appreciate it.

GEORGE SMITH: I will, absolutely.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next item
on our agenda is Planning Board case 280, a public hearing. 19-21 Wendell Street.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Brian Murphy maybe?

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, Brian.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And the transcripts.

PAMELA WINTERS: And the transcripts.

BRIAN MURPHY: I will be brief with the update and Liza can say there aren't any transcripts.

The next hearing will be next week, the 19th. A public hearing on the Bike Parking Zoning Petition. Again, this is the Board's petition that was forwarded to the City Council and just procedurally has to come back again, as wel1 as a K2-C2 update.

And, Liza, am I correct that April 2nd
will be K2-C2?
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
BRIAN MURPHY: And then April 9th
will be 30 Cottage Park Avenue and 130
CambridgePark Drive.
April 16th will be at the Central
Square Senior Center, and that will be MLK
School Special Permit a well as Town Gown comments. And, again, expect to be back in the beginning of May for more K2-C2.

And then just to give you a little bit of an update in terms of the Council process with the MIT petition. The Council kept the -- the Ordinance Committee kept the subject matter in committee but forwarded the Petition to the full City Council where it will be on the Council agenda for the 18th. They're having a series of smaller meetings coming up, and they're going to have a round

| 1 | table ordinance hearing on the 22nd of March |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | where there will be sort of a more, more of a |
| 3 | working session and formal discussion. There |
| 4 | may be some additional sessions after that |
| 5 | But at this point they're still continuing to |
| 6 | move forward with the petition. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. |
| 8 | And do you have transcripts? |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: We have the transcript |
| 10 | for February 5th, and it's been certified |
| 11 | complete. It looks good to me. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, motion to |
| 13 | accept that transcript. |
| 14 | STEVEN WINTER: So moved. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: Discussion? |
| 16 | A11 those in favor? |
| 17 | (Raising hands). |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in |
| 19 | favor. |

Okay, so now we will go to the public hearing on 19-21 Wendell Street. And I would like to ask the Petitioner a question which is you have the right to be heard by a seven-member Board and there are six of us here tonight, and one of our members is actually retiring at the end of tonight's meeting so there might only be five if the discussion gets carried to a later date. Are you willing to proceed?
MATTHEW ZUKER: We'd like to proceed.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
MATTHEW ZUKER: And Tom at his last meeting. It would be a good case for him to hear on the last day.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
MATTHEW ZUKER: Mat thew Zuker, Z-u-k-e-r. Chestnut Hill Realty.

It's been a little while since I've been here. It's good to see everybody again. I'll give you a quick little review. After a very collaborative effort between Chestnut Hill Realty, the Cambridge City Council, the Law Department, the CDD staff, and the Engineering Department, the City Council approved the Basement Apartment Overlay District in December 2011. I have a copy of it somewhere here.

As you know the idea came from the existence of large areas of underutilized spaces in older buildings that had high ceilings and larger windows. Today we're here before you for four proposed units at 19-21 Wende11 Street under this Basement Apartment Overlay District. The by-law allows these units by Special Permit upon meeting certain criteria and conditions. In
deference to, and with the help of the Engineering Department, the overlay district was created in an area with the risk of overlying flooding was minimal.

The by-law states, quote: The application for a Special Permit shal1 include a report on historical occurrences, and the future likelihood of basement flooding in the area of the proposed conversion with a functional scope determined by the City Engineer to be appropriate to the location of the project, and the report shall assess the likelihood of flooding in the basement units by way of sewer system backups or overlaying flooding, and identify proposed mitigations to prevent any such flooding.

The applicant shall obtain approval of the report and proposed mitigation from the City Engineer prior to submitting a Special

## Permit app1ication.

We've spent extensive time working with
Owen O'Riordan and the engineering staff to determine the functional scope of the report and in identifying proposed mitigation measures. We had four meetings and a site visit with Owen to develop a report and determine mitigations.

The report itself went through three major changes to incorporate recommendations from Owen and his staff. The report indicates 19-21 Wendell Street is located in an area with a low risk of overlay and flooding. In fact, the building has no history of flooding or sewer backups.

Proposed mitigation measures wil1 ensure these basement units will provide quality habitable living.

Furthermore, our engineer has certified
that by incorporating proposed mitigation measures, the likelihood of any sewer backups and/or overlaying flooding in the basement units is minimal to the point of insignificant.

The final report was submitted to the Engineering Department on January 7th of this year and was approved by Owen on January 15th.

The by-law states, also, quote: The Planning Board may reduce or waive the number of accessory off-street motored vehicle spaces upon making a finding that such reduction will not result in substantial adverse impact to on-street parking based on information provided by the Applicant regarding the availability of alternate transportation options or other factors that would result in a reduced demand for parking.

We met with CDD staff and the Transportation, Parking, and Traffic Department to review on-street parking demands and factors that would reduce such demands.

We conducted a survey of our Cambridge residents regarding transportation. The result of the survey is that less than 50 percent of our residents own a car, and those that do, many do not rely on them as a primary means of transportation. In fact, two out of three of our residents use other means of transportation rather than cars.

Separately, at the request of TPT, we surveyed the residents of the existing nine basement apartments at our properties, and the results were that none of these residents -- basement residents owned a car.

Also at the request of TPT, we
conducted on-street parking study on a weekday night on Wende11 Street between Oxford Street and Mass. Ave, which indicated availability of spaces that could be used in unlikely event that these residents of the new units rely on cars.

In addition, we're providing four new bicycle spaces that meet TPT guidelines and upgrading the existing bicycle spaces based on TPT recommendations.

Other factors that reduce the demand for parking is that CHR has a Cambridge transportation advisor, and that we currently lease two parking spaces to Zip Car and our centrally located Langdon Street parking lot on the corner of Mass. Ave. which is one block away. These factors further mitigate the need for owning a car.

All of the above items are mentioned in
more detail in CHR's traffic and transportation report that was submitted to TPT and was -- received approval from TPT recently.

We received an abutter list from CDD, and on February 15th we sent out notices for a meeting that we had on February -- an abutter meeting that we held on February 28th in the basement of Wendell Street. No abutters showed up at this meeting.

We spent a lot of time and thought into the design of these units to be as nice, habitable, and safe as possible which includes lots of natural light and direct access to an exterior patio truly making these garden style units.

Safety features include safety glass and special locks on non-egress windows and doors.

Furthermore, we've added a fitness center for all the residents.

CHR meets all the conditions and criteria required for a Special Permit to be issued. The City Engineer has approved the report.

Each new unit will comply with all building health and accessibility codes.

The building will be upgraded to provide for code compliant full separation between storm water and sanitary sewer lines.

Backflow prevention devices are proposed that comply with all Building Code and other requirements.

One unit or 25 percent of the four proposed units will be an inclusionary affordable unit versus the 10 percent requirement for new buildings not withstanding there's also a ten-unit
threshold.
Four new code compliant bicycle spaces were added. We received support from TPT that a reduction in the number of parking spaces will not have a substantial adverse impact.

And for now that is my presentation. I'11 open it up to questions and comments and thank you for your time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you very much, Matthew and Liza. I think you're committed and more follow through than anyone who appears before us. And appears that you have done a lot of homework.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I'd like to echo that. I'd like to say that the memo from Sue Clippinger indicates that her department supports the application. The memo from Owen indicates that the applicant

| 1 | has agreed to, but has not actually completed |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the work that is required, and that all of |
| 3 | the, all of the sewer overflow, backflow has |
| 4 | been mitigated. So it looks to me like all |
| 5 | of these conditions have been mitigated that |
| 6 | we're standing in the way and I'm ready to go |
| 7 | ahead. |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: Tom. |
| 9 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we have a |
| 10 | public hearing. |
| 11 | STEVEN WINTER: Oh, I'm sorry. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: So are there any |
| 13 | questions for Mr. Zuker about the proposal |
| 14 | that time? |
| 15 | PAMELA WINTERS: I have one |
| 16 | question. Ahmed? |
| 17 | AHMED NUR: Go ahead. |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: Pam. |
| 19 | PAMELA WINTERS: When you initially |


| 1 | came before us, you had more basement |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | apartments that you wanted to have special; |
| 3 | is that true? Am I remembering that |
| 4 | correctly? |
| 5 | MATTHEW ZUKER: This is one of three |
| 6 | buildings that we have. |
| 7 | PAMELA WINTERS: That's correct. |
| 8 | MATTHEW ZUKER: Since this is the |
| 9 | first time through and working with Owen, I |
| 10 | mean we spent a lot of time working with Owen |
| 11 | on this specific building -- |
| 12 | PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. |
| 13 | MATTHEW ZUKER: -- so to do them all |
| 14 | at the same time would have been a much |
| 15 | larger amount of work on his end. |
| 16 | PAMELA WINTERS: Right, okay. |
| 17 | MATTHEW ZUKER: So we figured we'd |
| 18 | go through, one get a process down. |
| 19 | PAMELA WINTERS: Right. |


| 1 | MATTHEW ZUKER: Go through the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | report and go with TPT. And each one is kind |
| 3 | of unique so you can't really do them |
| 4 | altogether. |
| 5 | PAMELA WINTER: Okay. |
| 6 | MATTHEW ZUKER: But we started with |
| 7 | this one. |
| 8 | PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, I thought you |
| 9 | had. Thank you, sir. |
| 10 | MATTHEW ZUKER: Thank you. |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed. |
| 12 | AHMED NUR: I might have missed it, |
| 13 | and you might have mentioned it. Was there |
| 14 | air quality measures, and tests such as |
| 15 | moisture content in the air of the basement. |
| 16 | MATTHEW ZUKER: No, I don't believe |
| 17 | we've done a test. But speaking from |
| 18 | experience of going in lots of basements in |
| 19 | my life, the way these basements are set up |

is actually -- they're not fully below grade. That's why we have the high ceilings and the large windows. So we've never had a problem there. In fact, when we're down there, we have existing units there, there never have been any smell or anything that would suggest that you are in the basement.

HUGH RUSSELL: Al1 right. And then let's proceed on to the public hearing.

So if you would sit down. The only name on the sign-up sheet is Heather Hoffman.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: My name is Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street. I was originally going to speak in opposition and now I'm going to speak in ambiguity. And at the very bottom I think that this is, this idea is still a pretty bad idea. However, I was pleasantly surprised to hear that there would actually be an inclusionary unit. When
this was proposed as a Zoning Amendment, I advocated, along with others, that since these units were not going to be cheap and they were pretty much going to be gifts to the owners of the buildings, that we should use this opportunity to catch up on the Inclusionary Zoning that would have been required had these buildings been built after the inclusionary housing provisions were added to the Zoning Ordinance. So I'm happy to hear that. And the only other thing I would note is that as far as use or not use of cars is concerned, many or most of you may have seen a story in The Globe recently they did a study in Portland, Oregon, and discovered that people who live in buildings where they're forbidden to park have just as many cars as the others. So, thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Adam, we have your report and it seems to speak for itself.

AHMED NUR: I have another comment. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

AHMED NUR: I'm curious on -- Adam, if this is an average for three days after it snowed at eleven o'clock that there were 19 additional spaces that were not -- snow was not removed. I live on Turcotte Street and that's usually the parking spaces are available that the city comes and plows, is that a normal thing that happens in that area?

ADAM SHULMAN: I mean, I don't have any other data than what they did here. I mean, anecdotally we see probably whatever you see after it snows. Sometimes cars get
snowed in and they don't move for weeks which questions how much people are even using their cars. In terms of if all of the spaces are not shoveled out, you know, where the cars, you know, we don't -- all we know for this one particular area is this -- it's unfortunate that it snowed a couple of days before the study, but you know, we thought it was important to see if we could get some information in a timely manner. And I think just the fact that there were so many spaces that were not shoveled out, sort of indicates that if there -- even three days after the storm there were people really, looking for the parking space, they could have shoveled out, there could have been more spaces shoveled out.

AHMED NUR: There's a demand for it.
ADAM SHULMAN: I don't have enough
data to say it's typical for that street or that area.

AHMED NUR: I think you answered my question. That's fine. That's exactly what I was saying. Even if the city doesn't shovel and the snow is as high as three feet deep and people park their cars, if there was a demand for parking spaces. So 19 spaces tells me it's not a very residential off the street parking.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would say of the total supply about 30 percent weren't shoveled out, I can tell you on Antrim Street that ratio would not apply because of the demand parking on Antrim Street. So I think we can actually count that as a piece of evidence.

AHMED NUR: That's where I'm going with it.

HUGH RUSSELL: And that the storm
was the 23 -inch snowfall I think?
ADAM SHULMAN: No, I actually think it was a week after that. I think it was another snow about a week after the big storm.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
I mean, isn't it striking that one week ago we had 10 inches of snow. It's all gone. Except for the pieces that were left over.

I think the Ordinance that the Council enacted, you know, addressed the important issues. They ended up as criteria. And, you know, the potential for flooding, a report that was clearly treated very seriously by the City Engineer. The potential impact on residential parking which, you know, resulted in the report and a review by the Traffic Department -- Transportation Department.

Other issues such as providing for bicycles has been addressed.

So if you go into the application, each of the criteria that apply under the particular Special Permit being requested seems to have been addressed, and it seems to me in a case like that, the way the law works, says that if they meet the criteria, we should grant the permit.
h. THEODORE COHEN: I concur. I've been in favor of the basement units I think since this proposal was -- came around the second time. And I think, you know, that Chestnut Hill Realty and the proponent all along have, you know, followed the procedure. You know, dotted all the I's, crossed all the T's, and have done -- gone every step of the way. And I think with the report from DPW and from Traffic and Parking, it seems
they've complied with the Ordinance and which does have an affordability component written into it, and they've complied with that, and I can't see any reason for not granting the Special Permit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Other comments?
PAMELA WINTERS: I guess I have one, just one. I sort of disagree with you, Ted. I'm generally not in favor of basement apartments, but this particular one I think that I do agree with what you had just said and what Hugh said, and I would be willing to vote for it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Anyone else wish to comment or should we proceed to vote?

THOMAS ANNINGER: Is this one of the ones that we visited.

MARK LEVIN: Mark Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty. I was on that tour. I believe

| 1 | it was the first tour that we started. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | AHMED NUR: Come up to the mic and |
| 3 | make sure the green light is on so everyone |
| 4 | can hear you. |
| 5 | MARK LEVIN: Hello? On that tour we |
| 6 | started at Wende11 Street and then we moved |
| 7 | down to Chauncy. |
| 8 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I remember it |
| 9 | we11. It was an awful lot of space |
| 10 | downstairs. |
| 11 | MARK LEVIN: It was very dry. Just, |
| 12 | it was a very dry basement. |
| 13 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Right. |
| 14 | Seems perfectly appropriate to me. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: Then let's go into |
| 16 | the finding. I am -- let's make sure we make |
| 17 | the proper findings. |
| 18 | So I think to the floor area ratio the |
| 19 | space that's being converted has already been |

counted because of its height and it wasn't being used as mechanical space. So no new first floor areas being created by this. While clearly the setbacks of this building don't conform to the history of setbacks, there's no above grade extension of the building. And I don't think we -there's no floor area that's going out.

Then there are Items $C$ and $D$ which were sort of descriptive about reports which would be part of our reports. So we would be voting to reduce -- well, actually to waive the number of motor vehicle parking spaces based on the finding that there is not significant adverse impact as a result of the study on the report on traffic, parking, and transportation.

They're creating the proper number of basic number of parking spaces, and
apparently in addition creating the other parking spaces in the building to meet the city's standards. We're not aware of any -in any way in which they will not be reading the building accessibility codes. In fact, that's a condition of getting the Building Permit. So we don't have to make a finding on that ourselves.

They are doing the sewer separation, backflow prevention, storm water retention, a11 in accordance with the -- all those pieces are -- have been reviewed by the Public Works Department and they approved them.

They're providing one inclusionary housing unit in accordance with the Ordinance.

In terms of the general criteria, the use is now an allowed change use and so uses
wil1 not be affected by this use.
We do not find the nuisance or hazard.
The traffic question has been -- there won't be additional traffic in a significant amount. Largely because there will not be any additiona1 parking.

And we do not think this impairs the integrity of the district because the City Council has recently examined this question and has said this is something that is permitted in the district.

So those are the findings. Is there a motion?

THOMAS ANNINGER: And the others that are reflected in here because they're really quite good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. I mean, decisions are not never made in transcripts of our finding. We sort of provide the
bullet points and they get addressed in full detail in the decision.

So does someone want to make a motion to grant this? I think it should be you, Tom.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Your last one.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't see that there's much to be said here other than I think we're all in agreement that this satisfies the new Ordinance that I think we've worked on now for the first time. But we worked through it enough, and the proponent was kind enough to not remind us that we did not help you with this, did we, when it came before us the first time?

MATTHEW ZUKER: Yes, the feedback was useful. It was a collaborative effort. THOMAS ANNINGER: I thought you handled that very well in the way you didn't

| 1 | refer to that. But I'm willing to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | acknowledge that. But nevertheless I think |
| 3 | we're all ready to support a Special Permit |
| 4 | for what you've requested and what's |
| 5 | reflected in this document that you gave us. |
| 6 | And, therefore, I move that we grant the |
| 7 | Special Permit requested. |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Is there a |
| 9 | second? |
| 10 | PAMELA WINTERS: Second. |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Pam. |
| 12 | Discuss on the motion? |
| 13 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Only discussion |
| 14 | to make clear that it's the granting of the |
| 15 | Special Permit and the waiver of the parking |
| 16 | requirements. |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 18 | Okay, al1 those in favor of the motion? |
| 19 | (Raising hands). |

HUGH RUSSELL: Six members voting in favor.
(Russel1, Cohen, Anninger, Winters, Winter.)
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: So, Jeff, are you the person or Iram?

IRAM FAROOQ: Al1 right. Good evening. Iram Farooq, Community Development. So, over the last few months we've done several updates with you on the Central Square and Kendall Square processes, but today we're essentially making the transition from the planning piece to really start to sink our teeth into the Zoning recommendations. So as we've done with previous studies, I think several of you remember the Concord Alewife and Eastern Cambridge Planning Studies. So as we've done
with those studies, we are now here with the Zoning principles that the committees recommended and we'11 be working with the Planning Board over the next several months to actually write the Zoning language that starts to make those recommendations real and then create a Zoning Petition that will have the same lifecycle as a typical Zoning Petition; it will go to the City Council, come back to you, and there will be public hearings and you'11 hear from the public. I did want to point out that several members of our committee are here. So if committee members could please wave, that would be great. Thank you. So if the Board wants to hear more from committee members.

So this is really a critical implementation, step, in all the work from the committee, and the Zoning changes that
you'11 have, that be we'11 be discussing today as well as the design guidelines, are a key tool to bring the vision that the Committee's formulated to fruition and to make sure that we set the stage properly to ensure that future development happens in a manner that's consistent with the vision and the plan.

So, you've seen these plans, the recommendations for both Kendal 1 and Central, and the good news is that we are a bit of the way through already, so you've -- you saw the design guidelines and you gave your general blessing to those. So we have to define those maybe a few tweaks, but mostly you felt good about those.

Two of the Zoning pieces have already advanced so -- the Forest City Zoning was approved just last month. The MIT Zoning,
which is currently under discussion at
Ordinance Committee, you have made your recommendation so it's moved through the Planning Board already. And the good news there, also, is that many -- you'11 see when Jeff talks about the Kendall Square recommendations, you'11 see that there are many familiar elements, because a lot of what you've discussed during MIT's Zoning Petition is consistent with the Kendall Square recommendations so it's not going to be all new.

So last week we sent you a memo that laid out the process. We're hoping to have one meeting a month that's dedicated to K2-C2 Zoning, and then as needed we'11-- and as time is available on your agenda, we'11 schedule smaller discussions as well. It would be great if we could file the petition
in time for the City Council's summer meeting, but we don't want to rush you. And it's a lot of complex stuff, and we just want to make sure that the Board is comfortable and you have time to process -- as much time as we need to process as we move through this.

So just a couple of things I wanted to point out is that -- this is the last thing I wanted to point out, is that in both Kendall Square and Central Square, the property owners and developers and the key property owners were on the committee. So the recommendations that you see and the Zoning that Jeff will -- the principles that Jeff will discuss are all stemming from consolidated work of both the neighborhood and the developers and property owners. The exception really is the side in Central

Square which was purchased by Twining
Properties in association with Normandy Real
Estate just in January after the conclusion of the work of the Central Square Committee, and that's a significant piece in Central Square. But we're optimistic because Twining Properties has been one of the key developers in Kendall Square and they've done the significant housing elements there. They've been great stewards of the open space and have helped to create some of the most creative retail in that area, so we feel good. We've begun conversations with them. Bob Flack from Twining is going to be here. He is on the Kendall Square Committee. And we know that they have hired -- they've got CBT on board recently to start working with them on the planning, and they've agreed to kind of be our test balloon and test some of
the Zoning principles on their site. So we think that's great because when we do Zoning based on the planning study, it's really rare for us to have that opportunity to do that realtime testing. And we've been able to do that with Kendal1, with MIT, and then we'11 have a chance to test things with the biggest parcels in Central Square.

And so with that, I am going to turn it over to Jeff who will walk us through the Zoning principles. The one change is that even though your manual starts out with Kendall Square, today we'd like to start with Central Square and then we'11 come back to Kendall a little bit once we are done with Central.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Before we go there, I actually would like to discuss the process because I think -- the question is do
we buy into this timeline? Is this the proper way to do this? And what are the priorities between the different portions at work?

And the Board has actually had some considerable discussion about the process in Kendall Square and which has not been reflected in the schedule. And I think we -so where I see this being now is that we should be moving forward at the -- very expeditiously in Central Square, taking the time in the deliberation process to coordinate with Twining and have them give us their insight because they now have a -- are now more involved.

I think the Board was very impressed by the -- both the substance of the Kendall

Square report, the recommendations, and the public response to that. I think we're
anxious to proceed forward. At least I'm anxious to proceed forward and get that enacted so that we can move forward.

In Kendall Square, we felt last fall that there were too many questions about some of the sectors to move forward with them, and specifically, the specific thing that's happened is that the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority has changed from being a boardless entity with an Executive Director who was really clearly, you know, sort of at the end of his tenure. Now there's a Board. The Board consists of people who are highly respected in the community. I think two of them were actually on the K2 Committee. I know Barry Zevin.

IRAM FAROOQ: One. Barry was on ECaPs Committee.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So, and it seems to me that we need to not go forward until this sister board is ready and able to go with us. And my recommendation would be to -- before we go much farther in Kendall Square we have a joint meeting with the redevelopment board, that we actually tonight vote to ask them to have a joint meeting, and I believe that they would be receptive to having a meeting with us in April. I think I would put an invitation out, not a specific date or time, I think, you know, our people and their people can figure out what the best way to do it is. I think it's just simply too many unknowns, and this is a Board that's trying to get their hands around it and determine what their role is. And we should grant them the same deference that we grant to every other board and commission in the city which

PAMELA WINTERS: And this is for Kenda11 Square; right?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I don't think we can get there by June in Kendall Square. Maybe there are parts of it that we can get to, but I'd really like to have this important Board working with us.

I've been on this Board for 25 years, and for 24 of those 25 years I've hoped that it would be possible for the Redevelopment Authority and the Planning Board to work together. And I think that, Steve, you told me that it is the rule rather than the exception that Planning Boards and Redevelopment Boards find it difficult to work together.

| 1 | STEVEN WINTER: Unfortunately. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: And I think now we |
| 3 | have an opportunity to change that in |
| 4 | Cambridge. And I feel that they may have |
| 5 | some legal tools that may be helpful for us |
| 6 | in certain parts of the Kendall Square |
| 7 | District that will help us to accomplish what |
| 8 | we want. |
| 9 | STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chairman, I ask |
| 10 | for two things: |
| 11 | First I'd like for you to tell me what |
| 12 | is your -- what would your intended outcome |
| 13 | be? Best intended outcome of such a meeting |
| 14 | between these Boards? |
| 15 | And then I would ask Brian if he could |
| 16 | respond and say, tell what you think about |
| 17 | that and how that fits into what we're doing? |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: I think the purpose |
| 19 | of the meeting would be to come up with a |

timeline in the schedule for getting the Zoning recommendations out. One that would work for us and work for them working together. But that's, I think that's the goal.

And probably a secondary goal of just people, you know, putting out on the table, introducing themselves, but I don't think they have much to fear from us, and I don't think we have much to fear from them. The meetings can be calm in that situation. BRIAN MURPHY: Mr. Chair, I think I would certainly agree with you that there is no fear factor with either of the two Boards involved here. And I think that there's actually a -- there is a certain amount of continuity and overlap. And just to let folks know you do have Conrad Crawford, for example, who was part of the K2 Committee.

You've got Barry Zevin who was part of ECaPs as Iram mentioned. Kathleen Born who was a City Councillor who was involved with many of the major re-Zonings in the city, and there's a great context in that way. And Margaret Drury, City Clerk is also fairly well versed in the goings on around the city. And then Chris Babcor is perhaps a little bit less of a, you know, involved in the details of planning but more, you know, bring it to different perspective and experience to the Board with his background as a long-term Cambridge resident -- lifelong Cambridge resident actually and Assistant U.S. attorney.

I think a meeting in April would be a terrific idea to try to bring people together. And I think that, you know, coming up with a schedule would be fine. I think
that we're trying to make sure that we continue setting the stage for the work, and I think our view would be this is important planning work and needs to take as much time as the Board or Boards fee1 that it needs to take. What I think we would want to caution, because I think we'd like to get started, because we think it is probably going to be a fair amount of work for the Board. But clearly if it's, you know, if it gets to a point where it feels like it's too far ahead, I would fully expect that the Board would sort of put on the brakes a little bit and have us slow down and really to have us emphasize certain issues. I do think the time of the start just because of some of the pieces that are out there, for example, Boston Properties is anxious and is working with the city to try to see whether they can
purchase a piece of Ames Street to do the housing that they have been negotiated with the City Council around the Broad Building expansion. So I think making sure that we -that the Board has a chance to sort of be thoughtful and put in place and set up expectations and ground rules would be helpful, if that can happen. If not, that would probably move forward with the rules as they are now and status quo.

So I think -- I don't want to predetermine how much time it takes. If it's too soon, you know, June, July, August,

September or whatever, I would just say that it makes sense to start the journey knowing that we don't know how long the journey is going to be. And I would fully expect it will have many twists and turns along the way.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Editorial remarks?

THOMAS ANNINGER: The on7y comment I would make is that I know that we never take political considerations into account, but this is an election year, and that ought to be borne in mind as we figure out the timing because renewing these petitions has its own problems. So I think we want to keep at least some peripheral vision on that. I think that is a reason to move ahead rather than not. We have the benefit of one councillor who won't be with us at the end of the year and there may be reasons for moving ahead. Maybe good reasons.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Right, I think the

Council loves to enact legislation that everybody's behind, and since that seems to be pretty much the case in Central Square, that's why I would put a priority on that to
make sure that moves forward as quickly as possible. If we -- if and when we find that's true of the other sectors in Kenda11 Square, then we should be prepared to move forward.

THOMAS ANNINGER: It makes a lot of sense.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
Okay, shall we move on then to -STEVEN WINTER: I'd like to ask, Mr. Chair, do you feel that the Board made the resolve that we need to to address issues that are concerning some of us before we move forward?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I guess we should actually formally vote to invite the CRA Board to meet with us in a round table kind of format. So we'11 put that forward as a motion.

## Is there a second?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: On the motion.
(Raising hands).
HUGH RUSSELL: So we're -- take the motion in for form of asking staff to issue invitation in our name.

I think I've said what I wanted to say, which is that, I mean, I think that's the most -- that invitation in that discretion to me is the crucial piece. So I'm prepared to go forward and I guess Jeff is going to talk to us about Central Square.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm not sure this is the right time to raise it, but we're setting out a fairly, you know, adventurous schedule, and I know there have been some pushback of the fact that we've been meeting three times a month --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- rather than
what had been more standard of two times a month. And I'm just wondering whether we, staff envision that the three times a month is going to become the rule rather than the exception and whether everybody is prepared for that or whether there is some way of organizing the workload on this and our other projects submitted is not a three time a month situation.

PAMELA WINTERS: I think I asked that question at the last meeting, too. And I think, Brian, that you said that this was going to continue through perhaps May or June and then we'd get a summer break or is that not true?

BRIAN MURPHY: I would think that's likely. I think there is certainly a lot of
activity going on in the city, and I think part of the reason that we tried to go to three was sort of a desire to keep from having the marathon sessions that go to the wee small hours of the morning. But I would expect that it would probably slow down in the summer. But, again, it's really -- a lot of it we would want to make sure that we work with the Board for a schedule that makes sense, that was comfortable, sort of balancing the work that needs to be done with the schedule that people have and recognizing that this is a significant sacrifice of people's free time and very much appreciated. And if we get to the point where we're taking too much advantage of that, let us know. PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: In reading the people's comments on this subject, I think it
would be best if we didn't meet three times every single month and that we not -- we try not to schedule permit discussions for the additional meeting. So we try to keep the permit discussions on the first and the third. I know there's at least one member, possibly two, who find the schedules make it very difficult for them to make the second Tuesday of the month. And part of our doing our business effectively would be of course greatly enhanced by having a full quorum which actually allows in the way of structure for a person to drop out in the course of a discussion. We haven't had that luxury for a year or more, and we've wasted some meetings, parts of meetings as a result of that, which is that's a good thing.

The flip side is if you want to discuss Kendal1 and Central and those members who, on
the off meetings, those members who can't come to those meetings, one of them in particular is very strong -- meaning Bill, very strong member in terms of the Zoning. We don't want to schedule meetings in such a way that he no longer has an input on the support and (inaudible) the Board. So it's not a simple matter.

I guess I would say see if you cannot not schedule a meeting for May. Give us May off, and then I'm sure overt he summer the attendance will drop. We don't usually have enough business to have two meetings a month in the summer, although it could well be that the Zoning discussions will pick up our time if we do not complete them in the way you hope that we can complete them. But I'm, I'm really hoping we can get Central Square to the Council well before June.

Are people generally agreeing with that analysis?

PAMELA WINTERS: I do.
HUGH RUSSELL: Are you willing to say meet an extra meeting every other month?

STEVEN WINTER: I concur with what you're putting forward and with the intent of it. And I would like to remind people that there are some Planning Boards that meet weekly. The Ipswich Planning Board, for instance, which is all electronic by the way, sir, meets weekly. So there are a lot of different models for this work.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's the electronics that slows them down?

PAMELA WINTERS: How long do they meet for, though, in Ipswich?

STEVEN WINTER: Just an evening meeting. I don't know.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
STEVEN WINTER: There's a lot going
on.
HUGH RUSSELL: Jeff.
JEFF ROBERTS: Okay. Jeff Roberts,
CDD. And this is an effort that as Iram mentioned, starts with the Kendall

Square/Central Square Committee recommendations. And what I've been sort of tasked to do working with Iram and the rest of the folks in the office is to help translate those recommendations into a Zoning framework. So what this represents really isn't anything conceptually new from the recommendations that we received. It's really more of a translation and looking at how those recommendations fit in with what we, with what we currently have in our Zoning Ordinance.

So I'm just going to walk quickly through the whole picture which is shown on the map up to my left and in the materials that you should have. And then as mentioned, I'11 focus, I'11 focus in a little more detail on Central Square. But just to look briefly at Kendall Square, the concept there in the recommendations was to institute a set of special requirements, and these were demonstrated in the MIT Zoning Proposal that you saw, including requirements for active ground floors, a substantial component of housing with middle in -- with a provision for middle income housing requirements for parking, sustainable design, and so forth. And that those requirements would apply generally across the entire area, but that strategically we would look at the Zoning as being made up of four separate PUD districts.

And the -- one of them was addressed through MIT Zoning. The other three are each identified for having particular patterns of land ownership for existing development that requires a slightly different strategic approach to how to implement and achieve those goals.

So that's just briefly Kendall Square. And then focusing on Central Square. In that district we have a -- currently in our Zoning we have a Central Square Overlay District which encompasses an area which is about what you see on the map. The recommendations for the Central Square Overlay District include some modifications to it. The most significant modification is to extend the boundaries of the Overlay District to include a portion of the industrial zoned area that's south of Main

Street. It's the area that's typically known as the Osborne Triangle. And then by -after making that change, you could think of the Central Square Overlay District as having three distinct parts with distinct strategies for each part. And the main part, what we typically think of as Central Square, has been called the heart of Central Square, which is I think actually terminology that's carried over from the existing Central Square design guidelines. The portions south of Lafayette Square, which is kind of in an orange hatch on the map, would have a new designation of the Osborne Triangle Subdistrict which would have some similarities, but would have some -- but also some differences in what would be allowed there. And then to designate the areas that are further off from Mass. Ave., they're more
than a block off of Mass. Ave. as the neighborhood edge subdistricts, and it was particularly important in those areas through the work of the Central Square Committee to have a specific set of requirements in place that would help to protect the neighborhoods and provide transition in the scale and type of development as you -- as it ventures off of Mass. Ave.

I just would, I thought I would point out, I didn't point this out in the memo, but I was looking at -- as I was looking at the existing Central Square Overlay District requirements, it really, it covers a -- the purpose of the existing Overlay District is to cover a set of issues, in particular urban design, and that's covered through a set of design guidelines and some requirements for Planning Board review and approval as well as
a separate advisory committee in Central
Square that has review, has advisory review authority for new projects in that area. It also talks about ground floor uses and ground floor design. It talks about historic preservation. And it has some particular relief that it provides on parking requirements.

So, the recommended modifications through the Central Square process, in many ways, are reinforcements or in some cases slight modifications of those, of those requirements that are in place. And there's -- and with one really major addition, which I think came out during the discussions that you heard from the committee, which is to encourage the creation of additional housing, including affordable housing and middle and housing for -- middle income housing. this portion starts on page 6, I already briefly covered the Zoning Map change and the establishment of subdistricts. And then there are a few -- I won't go through each of these line items, but there's a few sort of major concepts to sort of take in from all of this.

One, as I mentioned in terms of the height and the FAR, the intent is to provide incentives for the creation of new housing in areas where there is sort of capability for that, that type of development. It increases the allowed height for residential uses while still maintaining bulk height and bulk controls where development abuts the residential neighborhoods on either side. In the Osborne Triangle Subdistrict the change is really to, is essentially sort of a
bumping up since that's an area that's primarily industrial and commercial in character. There's additional incentives put in place to encourage more housing.

One particular thing to note in terms of the FAR requirements, is that one of the recommendations is a shift that may seem a bit subtle but is important to think about. Our current Zoning has a sort of -- it has a differentiated approach to FAR. You're allowed a certain FAR for commercial uses and a certain FAR for residential uses, and it's sort of an either/or proposition. So if you have a mixed use development, you -- the total amount that you're allowed falls somewhere in between what's allowed for a commercial and residential. And the recommended approach here is to allow the -to take the maximum residential FAR as a
maximum total FAR, and -- but to continue to cap the non-residential FAR where it is now. So what that means is currently if you have a lot that's built to an FAR of 2.75, you have maximized your development on a lot and you can't do any more whether it's commercial or residential or whatever. You can't do any more on top of that. What this is saying is if you have development and FAR of 2.75, the total allowed FAR is still 4.0. So it essentially gives some residual development potential for those lots that are, that might still, that might still have some existing commercial development on them. And there are different ways to treat that. And as we get towards the end of this list, there are some different approaches for how to, how to manage that.

The middle income housing provision is
very similar to what was discussed in Kendal1 Square where any development above and beyond the current limitations in the district would require a portion of that to be, to reserve for households of middle income, 80 to -typically, 80 to 120 percent area-wide medium income. And in this case there would be a particular focus on providing family size units or two- or three-bedroom units of an enough of a size that they would -- could accommodate families with children. Just kind of skipping down a little bit. I mentioned that currently there are ground floor provisions in Central Square Overlay District. This would be somewhat of a just a modification of those to more specifically require retail uses along Mass. Ave., and to require basically that new development on Mass. Ave. and on Main Street
is designed in such a way that it could continue to accommodate retail in the future. So even if it's not, even if a retail use couldn't necessarily be supported there now, over time as development evolves, those are spaces that could potentially be filled in with more ground floor retail uses.

And then there are incentives exempting ground floor uses, ground floor or retail basement uses if they meet particular sets of requirements. And the recommendations go into a little bit more detail about what that exactly means. It means that a certain amount of your retail has to be small scale, small sized retail, you know, a certain amount can be a little bit, could be a little bit bigger, but it's meant to encourage a diversity and a mix of different retail spaces on the ground floors.

Day care, cultural uses, non-profit types of uses were a particular concern and so they're included in those incentivized uses.

There was discussion of public room style spaces. The idea of sort of taking open space and bringing it into the interior buildings and finding ways to make that work is something else that's included. And residential, and then residential balconies, and again, it's to support the residential use.

There's a -- there was some discussion, there's -- one of the interesting things in the current Central Square Overlay is the fast order food cap which has been the subject of much discussion. It basically says that if you have a fast order food use, it's -- you can only have 14 of them in the
district, and it makes it -- limits
establishing new ones. One of the issues with that is that a fast order food establishment as defined in the Ordinance could be anything from, you know, the way I like to describe it is, you know, picture a nice sandwich shop where you can, you know, get something to eat and a cup of coffee, well, isn't that great? Well, that's a McDonald's. So as far as Zoning goes, it's very hard to differentiate what might be considered what people might envision as a fast food use from something that's actually a fast food use that we might actually want to see. So, the idea behind that is to, is to not -- is not to look at it from that point of view, but to look at implementing some formula business regulations. And this would be the first instance of having such
regulations in our Zoning Ordinance, but it is something that we've talked about and we've looked at several times in the past. And what that means is that there would be regulations that apply to establishments that are uses that have a uniform trademark design signage menu or merchandise portfolio or array that's identical across a large number of such establishments across the country. It's not specifically saying that a chain is an issue because Zoning doesn't regulate based on ownership. It's really looking at it more from a design perspective and saying that we're -- if you want to do something that's a sort of a cookie cutter design from something that we see everywhere else, then you really have to demonstrate that you're doing it in a way that's sensitive to the -sensitive to the area and to the unique
qualities of Central Square.
So that's something that I'm sure we'11 continue to discuss.

HUGH RUSSELL: So this is looked at definitely as the design review constraint rather than a use Special Permit?

JEFF ROBERTS: It would be -- it could be, it could be a use -- it could be a use Special Permit, but it would likely -other than being -- aside from being a -- or instead of being a BZA Special Permit, which is the use -- conditional uses typically are, would be treated more as a design -- in sort of in keeping with what's typically the case in Central Square. It would be a design look on the part of the Planning Board to approve such uses.

So there's still -- I think there's still a lot of detail to be worked out there.

It's sort of an unfamiliar concept, so it's something that I'm sure we'11 have much more discussion on. But just to get through the end of this and then we can go back.

And so going on to page 7, and I don't know why the numbering goes from 8 to 18 , but I'm just noticing it now. The parking and loading requirements would actually -- we would take a similar approach to -- or the recommendation was to take a similar approach to what's being done in Kendall Square which is to impose some maximum parking limitations and then allow flexibility to go below the minimum to our Planning Board approved to the minimum. It's actually the case now for the Planning Board for existing buildings the Planning Board can approve lower parking as a part of the existing Central Square Overlay requirements.

Sustainability requirements, again, would be similar to what's in Central

Square -- in Kendall Square specifically for the Osborne Triangle. We would look at LEED Gold as a new level of standard for commercial buildings. That area would be required to look at the feasibility of the connecting of the district's steam system, which we talked about last time.

And the last two items which are numbered 19 and 20 , are some sort of interesting new concepts for dealing with multisite development or development on, development that kind of cuts across different subdistricts within the Central Square Overlay. And I'11 explain a little about of what it's intended to do.

## Transfer of development rights is

something that exists elsewhere in the Zoning

Ordinance. It means that if you have one lot with a certain development potential and another lot that's not connected to it with the certain development potential, you can take the development potential from one and add it to the other and build a -- and build basically a larger development on that. The purpose -- and it can be -- it's a tool that can be used for many different purposes. In this case the purpose would be largely to, again, to support the development of housing. And as I mentioned before, there would be, as a result of these recommendations, sites with some additional residual housing potential that could -- that might want to then transfer that to another site that could actually build the housing.

It would be to help protect the neighborhood edges. So the regulations that

93
have been proposed would allow development to be transferred out of the neighborhood edge districts into the core districts, but not the other way around. And so providing an incentive -- so someone with ownership, maybe ownership of multiple sites where some of them are in the neighborhood edge some are in the core, they could shift the development into the core and then the neighborhood edge space could then be dedicated towards uses that are publicly desired, such as open space or affordable housing or, you know, potential middle income housing.

And then, and one of the other goals is to support preservation of historic buildings. So in Central Square there are a number of buildings, and they were identified in the Central Square study that are, that may be preferably preserved. If the

Historical Commission were to take a close look at them, they might decide -- if there were development proposals, the Historical Commission might look at them and decide that they were preferably preserved, and therefore we would want to provide an option for utilizing the development potential that's on those sites rather than make significant modifications to that existing building could develop somewhere else.

The transfer development rights could be used in a couple of ways. It could be used for one owner to shift their development rights, to sell their development rights to another owner, but could also be used if an owner owned multiple sites to do a multisite phased development project that would -- that may have come to the Planning Board and may be looked at similarly to how you look at a

PUD where you would say, you know, we have these sites, this is how we've arranged our allowed FAR, this is how we're arranging our heights and then the Planning Board can make an approval based on, you know, doing a residential building here, commercial use here, open space here.

So that basically covers the Central
Square piece. And I can go back over any of the details or end up having you talk about Kendal1 Square, too.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, why don't we -if there are any questions about what Jeff just talked about in the Central Square any clarifications? This is a bullet list of trying to, it's a description of translating a report into sort of an action plan of what they're going to be going after in different categories. weren't clear to me on sustainability. It only applied to the Osborne Triangle subdistrict or were there just parts?

JEFF ROBERTS: I may have sort of stuttered my speech on that a little bit.

The LEED standards, the requirement to -- well, the LEED -- the green buildings standards apply citywide. But in the entire Central Square Overlay District for commercial buildings, the standard would be increased to the gold standard, but not for residential buildings. And in the Osborne Triangle Subdistrict they would need to study the feasibility of the district steam.

I think the expectation would be that the bulk of any new commercial development, you know, there would hopefully still be a mix of uses. It's anticipated there would be
a mix of uses in either area, but the larger scale commercial development would likely be south of the Lafayette Square in the Osborne Triangle Subdistrict.

HUGH RUSSELL: I must have been wool gathering when you discussed unit density, item 4. And I guess I want to -- we want to be sure that that if there is no minimum lot area per dwelling unit. What that means is there's no minimum size per dwelling unit. That's the lot area of the dwelling unit combined with the FAR ratio results -- you can calculate what the minimum average size of a dwelling unit is. And so by getting rid of the lot area per dwelling unit, you're then are getting rid of that provision. And if that happens and the Board has to grant Special Permits, then we need some standards to apply if somebody comes to us with what to
us seems to be, you know, too micro a proposal, for example, or a too unbalanced proposal. So, I think -- it's a good idea to have a great deal more flexibility, but when you do that, you have to have more standards.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. That's
something -- that certainly was a point of discussion. I could say -- so that's correct. So lot area per dwelling unit basically controls the number of units you can have on a lot. So when you put that together with the floor area you're allowed to build, you get a sense of what the average unit size would be for a project. In the, in most parts of the Overlay District currently, the lot area per dwelling unit is very low. I think it's 300 maybe square feet. So if you're thinking about a large residential building, you know, the lot area per dwelling
unit becomes so small that it's not even really very relevant. And the fact, I believe, in the Industry B District, we had a project that was permitted there. I don't think there's any minimum lot area per dwe11ing unit there anyway. So I think the idea is that if you, if you started to transfer development from one district to another, it might -- that's sort of where the lot area per dwelling unit is different in one versus another, you might start to get a little bit of confusion as to how you do the math, add all that up. But it could -- but I think you're right, and we certainly have talked about how to think about standards for unit size, unit configuration, unite type, particularly with regard to the middle income units that will be intended for families.
H. THEODORE COHEN: If I follow up
on that question. Does the State Building Code or Board of Health regulations mandate any minimum size for a dwelling unit?

HUGH RUSSELL: Indirectly because there are requirements for dwelling unit in terms of fixtures in bathrooms, kitchen appliances. There's a minimum room size, which I believe is 70 square feet. So it's, it's, you know, not quite on the common standards, but you can, you can -- I mean, I've done microunits and they -- the state standards don't get triggered by every 100 square foot unit. That's a big unit compared to state standards.

IRAM FAROOQ: Can I just -- the one thing I wanted to add is that in Central Square there was a lot of emphasis not on microunits but on trying to figure out ways to get actually family-sized units. So we
will -- as this gets written, I think the balancing act will be to allow the flexibility that Jeff talked about in the instances of transfer and development without actually creating a playing field which incentivizes people to do microunits.

Because Central Square is thought of as a much more appropriate place for family units, whereas Kendal1 it may be more appropriate and makes sense to do micros.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Jeff, I have a
question about transfer of development rights, which it's -- conceptually I like what it does and I like the flexibility that it brings. My question is: Are the development rights transferred from in perpetuity, can they ever return?

JEFF ROBERTS: Well, no -- I mean,
they -- it would work the same way as a, say a Special Permit. It's a Special Permit provision. So if you're doing a building and you get a Special Permit to do it, then the conditions of that Special Permit apply for as long as the -- for as long as you have the use that is, that is there. So you would need -- so if you -- if you had -- if you transferred development rights, it's all within the bounds of a Special Permit. And if you wanted to change, if any of the provisions or conditions of that Special Permit over time, you would need to amend the Special Permit and you, you know, you may need to then get a Variance or something else if by, if by changing the Special Permit you're then creating a new Zoning violation. So that's probably too complicated an answer. But it would -- it doesn't -- it's not
something where there's sort of a sunset clause that automatically resets everything. When a Special Permit takes effect, it's in effect for the duration of what was permitted.

STEVEN WINTER: Un1ess modified by the governing body.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. Unless it gets modified.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: It's interesting but when thinking about closing attorneys and the what the scrutiny they put on projects. So because it might be useful -- there might be a place, for example, where the development partner like Twining can weigh in on would there -- is it -- does it need to be written to say well, you've done this transfer, now this piece of land now has this presumption
that this is a permanent feature of this piece of land and, you know, that might be more comforting to a closing attorney. But on the other hand, all governed by Special Permit, so....

I see Bob grinning in the back. It's one of those hard problems to answer.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can debate it for a long time I'm sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: Let's not try to -we're under some obligation to move forward.

Are there other questions or comments on this piece?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. It's
really just informational because, you know, I don't want to go into the whole height issue. If somebody can just give me some examples of, you know, I was just curious in the heart of Central Square Subdistrict what
-- does anybody know what is the tallest building that's there now and how tall it might be?

HUGH RUSSELL: It's the elderly housing in the heart district or is it in the peripheral district?

ROGER BOOTHE: I think it's 180 feet for the Central Square building, the corner of Prospect and Mass. Ave.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. The elderly housing is like 20 stories, right?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Between Green and
Franklin, but it's probably not in the district.

CHARLES TEAGUE: It's 25.
JEFF ROBERTS: Right. It would be sort of be in the -- it's a little bit of a funny thing, but it is in a sort of
neighborhood edge subdistrict. Because even though it is a larger scale than anything next to it, it does abut that neighborhood so it's still treated in that same way.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's going to be the only one under these rules.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So under these rules in the heart, nothing could go that high again unless they got a Variance. But we won't go there.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right.
So in the heart of Central Square the maximum for residential would be 140 feet which could be, and I may not have pointed that out, it could increase, if there is a transfer of development rights, the Planning Board, in approving that, can approve an increase in height to accommodate the transfer of development of up to 20

| 1 | additional feet. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | H. THEODORE COHEN: So we're talking |
| 3 | 160 would be the max? |
| 4 | JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. |
| 5 | H. THEODORE COHEN: And can that |
| 6 | occur also for residential in the Osborne |
| 7 | Triangle? |
| 8 | JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. It could be one |
| 9 | -- in the Osborne Triangle it could be 160, |
| 10 | and then an additional 20-foot increase if |
| 11 | there's a transfer of development rights to |
| 12 | 180. |
| 13 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, moving on. |
| 15 | JEFF ROBERTS: Are we going to look |
| 16 | at Central Square now? |
| 17 | IRAM FAROOQ: May I pose some policy |
| 18 | questions for the Board that we wanted you to |
| 19 | think about? |

## HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

IRAM FAROOQ: So in the Overlay
District one of the questions that we've been thinking about as we've expanded the scope of the district to cover the Osborne Triangle, we have now captured the Novartis parce1, which was just rezoned, and we wanted to talk to the Board about getting your thoughts about the wisdom of doing that or whether we should try to carve out Novartis just as we recently rezoned. We don't have to decide that now, but just throwing that out as a question.

The second question has to do with the intercontinental parking lots which are the two parking lots straddling Prospect Street. And those are actually in the neighborhood edge districts, and we have not proposed changes to the heights and densities in the
neighborhood edge districts as a way to protect the neighborhood, but there is a strong desire to see those parking lots transform. And so that was kind of a level of detail that I think it's worth talking about at the Board, if there's a way to craft something that may create that incentive without impacting the full district. And similarly for also the Vail Court parcel. We did try to carve a little bit right at the corner of Prospect on the intercontinental parking lots to be in the core districts so you could have maybe a taller building right at the corner of Prospect and Bishop Allen and then the rest would be lower. But I think it would be helpful if we could get the Board's input on those issues.

And then the final release, a very detailed thing has to do with formula
businesses whether we should -- we've gone back as staff, back and forth a lot about whether this should only pertain to food service type uses or whether it should be formula businesses in a bigger spectrum like Staples store or --

HUGH RUSSELL: A bank.
IRAM FAROOQ: -- or a bank, exactly.
So right now we only regulate food service. We don't do that for other businesses, but, you know, again policy question we're thinking about.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, wel1 I'd be happy to give you my instant opinion on all three subjects which is I think it's good policy to cut Novartis out because we don't expect that site to be redeveloped in the next 20 years. And we, you know, 20 to 40 years is probably a time frame for Zoning.

Have there been studies made, higher density on the intercontinental parking lots that we could look at to see in the course of a study process, did anybody look at that issue?

IRAM FAROOQ: Not in great detail, but we'll pull out what we have and bring those to the Board.

HUGH RUSSELL: Because I would agree that as a policy matter, it would be nice to have buildings there rather than parking lots, and that particularly at the intersection of Bishop Alan and Prospect if there's not too much impact on the neighborhoods that were on Essex Street say. I mean, there are some houses that are literally abut those lots.

ROGER BOOTHE: That was something I was going to mention, Hugh, is that we have done a little looking at that. If you
remember back in the library process we looked at that site. HUGH RUSSELL: I remember that, yes. ROGER BOOTHE: And it's important to remember that there are residences pretty close all around there. And I think sort of the direction we were going is right at the corner the Bishop Allen and Prospect you could do something, but you have to be careful as you get closer to the other neighborhood edges.

Could I also pick up on your desire to kind of focus on Central Square? I think we can hold off on having any more discussion on Kenda11 if you think that's a good idea, and maybe we could hear from the Board, you know, your reaction to kind of process going forward now. You've heard Iram's kind of overview and Jeff's laying out Central Square
strategy, and maybe what do you think about that? Maybe it's better to do that rather than getting it clouded up with more Kendall since we maybe have Kendall fatigue from having just done MIT rezoning?

BRIAN MURPHY: And picking up on that, maybe it would also be helpful to get a sense of the particular policy areas the Board would like to delve into and are there particular materials that would be helpful for the Board in that consideration? So, for example, as you mentioned, the intercontinental studies to really get a better sense of it, to get a little bit more deeper into the details. You know, as one thinks of the particular conditions of that site whether it's the impact on St. Paul or versus the relationship between Bishop Allen. ROGER BOOTHE: And the other thing
is if you were to want to stay with Central Square, we do have a number of the committee members here. And I know it's not a hearing, but since they're here and our attempt as Jeff said to translate what their vision was, maybe we could see if they have concerns there. Just a thought, Hugh, trying to pick up on what you were saying.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. I think we're all sort of nodding our heads thinking it's a good idea let's roll up our sleeves and get down to work. We usually -- we sort when we make notes, we make questions and then we like to hear from other people and then we like to consider those comments.

Is that a good procedure now?
STEVEN WINTER: It's okay here.
AHMED NUR: Hugh, I may want to add to that. Since this is Kendall Square
included. If there's anyone from Kendall Square, I would like to hear from them as well. Not that we want to talk about it, but if they're here to do some specific thing, just comments on Kendall Square. Would you be open to that?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I would
actually not be very interested in hearing comments about details that we haven't had presented to us --

AHMED NUR: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- in Kendal1 Square.
If there's a procedural question or suggestion, I think that would be very welcome.

AHMED NUR: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, are there people who would like to speak to us and give us your feelings on how we're headed
particularly in Central Square?
PATRICK BARRETT: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Would you come
forward, please?
PATRICK BARRETT: Just on what we've heard so far? Hello, my name is Patrick

Barrett. I live down the street at 234
Broadway. Possibly soon to be 41 Pleasant Street should I ever be able to close on that property.

Okay. I was on the C2 Board. I'm also a property owner at 897-907 Main Street where Toscanini's, Cinderella's, and Pu Pu Hot Pot for the next four months will be. We've spent a lot of time primarily wrestling with the idea that we need more housing in Central Square and how we can accommodate that. Relative to the suggestions that -- the outline that was given, you know, we were
trying to be as sensitive as we could to height, but there are some limitations to what's been done in Central Square and it has primarily to do with the height restrictions being at 80 feet. You know, as a property owner, for at least a limited time, I could tell you that the size of my mortgage prevents me from doing great development there, but also for people who have owned for multiple generations, there's really no incentive to do anything there because once you reach that 80 -foot 1 imit, you become under an auspices of many more Zoning regulations that makes the actual build so expensive you would never do it. And in keeping with that mind, I think that's kind of where we were headed relative to our height designs. The minimum lot per dwelling unit, you know, I think that a lot of these
larger projects have to go under some pretty strict scrutiny relative to site design and what's appropriate. And I'm not so sure that -- I think in our recommendations hit everything exactly perfectly, but I think they lay the ground work for what ought to be considered for an area that I think has been allowed to somewhat language for in an inordinate amount of time.

My property in particular does not benefit greatly from the recommendations that have been made. I've got a 9800 square foot plot. Even if everything that we had suggested were to be done, it doesn't necessarily -- I can't put a tower there. I'm not going to a hundred and, you know, 60 feet or anything like that. But it gives the opportunity for the larger parcel owners to develop their properties in a meaningful way.

Which, you know, all sort of above the 80 -foot mark. We gave incentive for housing. You talked a little bit earlier about the incentivizing a specific, incentivizing microunits or incentivizing family housing. Well, there's a 25 percent requirement for housing above a certain height level to be middle income housing exclusively. And I don't believe in our interpretation middle income housing meant 250 square foot micro-condo. I've been down to see them and, you know, they're, you know, I think they're practical in a sense, but, you know, we had a fellow by the name of Barry Bluestone come in and give us -- this is still -- give us a little bit of a presentation. In his mind the idea was to extract people who are living -- students -- I own 60 units in the area, and I can tell you that they, you know, they
can afford to pay a lot more, and that's where the economics is. But to extract them from the cheapest family housing available in Cambridge, which is what already currently exists, you know, you couldn't build that for what it was built for today. Which I think that idea has some merit. Do we build all microunits? I really sincerely hope not. But the practicality of building family units I think, you know, that's where we get the give and take. We allow for the bigger heights for the family housing. One thing that wasn't really mentioned so far was our concern for open spaces and preserving what was already existing and maybe looking for opportunities to add more. But Central Square is, you know, it's a tight spot. There's not too many opportunities to build anywhere but up. And I'm not sure if you
guys have any specific questions relative to what -- where we came from, but I think in the essence we're trying to create more housing with this proposal.

That's about it.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
ESTHER HANIG: My name is Esther
Hanig and I was a member of the Central
Square Advisory Committee and I live at 136 Pine in Area 4.

So the thing that I cared most about was middle income family housing and Patrick and I kind of thrown to the spectrum. So I loved that. I think a lot -- that most of what we have talked about was captured in this. I guess I just had a few comments. One, about Patrick's thing. Like we had talked a little bit more about green space and apartments, and I think we just
want to make sure that some of that exists within what comes out of it.

I'm sort of inclined towards less
parking rather than more parking. I think one of the things that we were trying to achieve is making it harder to own a car and to drive cars in Central Square. So I would just say that really needs to be a goal that we're looking at. And anything that we can do for car sharing or bicycle lanes or anything else that leads to fewer cars I think is important.

And then I just wanted to say one thing about the formula businesses, because we were envisioning, you know, smart growth where people work, live, shop in the same area, I just -- and because I've heard this from some of my neighbors, you know, they want someplace where they can go, that they can
afford, where they can buy, I don't know, diapers and things like that, that might exclude something like a Target which might kind of meet some of those needs. So I just think that when we look at those -- I mean, I personally, you know, if McDonald's were to leave tomorrow, I would give shouts of joy. And I hate the banks, but I do think that we do just need to be careful when we look at that.

## SAUL TANNENBAUM: I'm Saul

Tannenbaum, 16 Cottage Street. I too was a member of the Central Square Advisory

Committee. Just a couple of quick things. You know, first housing, housing, housing. I mean that was really the focus of what we were trying to do, because I mean the economic vitality of Central Square and just needs more people.

Second, I mean one of the most
important things we were considering is not something that's actually before you, but that's sort of leveraging the city's parking lots as, you know, areas -- as pieces of land the city owns that's, you know, where the city has the most leverage to determine the outcome. And we've told the City Council this, and in a formal meeting, we would like to see you be bold about that and use, you know, for land that it owns to see the outcome that we all seem to want there.

And I mean lastly, I'11 echo Esther about parking. I think the summary memo doesn't capture the strong feeling that many of us had on the committee that, you know, we should be working actively to eliminate, you know, parking minimums and the Zoning Codes, but specifically close to the T station and
that -- but I mean this was controversial but I mean there were, you know, certainly a large number of people on the committee who felt we should be working as hard as possible to eliminate parking not just for the end of the car aspect, but also to minimize the cost of development. And even after varied parking that costs a lot, and one of the ways to keep Central Square more affordable is by not requiring people to build as much or any parking.

THOMAS ANNINGER: May I ask you just a question if you've finished your thought. What did you have in mind for the use of those city parking lots? Can you give me an example or two?

SAUL TANNENBAUM: There were a wide variety -- I mean, there wasn't consensus. I mean, personally I would, I would, you know,
plant, you know, as much housing as possible. You know, other people wanted, you know, public meeting rooms. There was, you know, talk of sort of, you know, a marketplace sort of, you know, sort of facility. I mean, what we were all agreed on was that surface parking, it was the worst possible use of that space. And if we could do something else with it, the city should. I mean we, you know, we heard discussion that there are, you know, infrastructure constraints. There was, you know, talk of plans of storm water management facilities under one of those lots. But, you know, I mean if you're looking at places, you know, where the city could leverage whatever outcome, if it owns the land already, you know, clearly that's that. It was also outside of our purview but we also agreed that the Central Square branch

| 1 | of the library, the parking there, you know, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | if the city could just sort of nuke that and |
| 3 | start over, that would be the wonderful |
| 4 | thing. Because those are dead lots the way |
| 5 | they are. |
| 6 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you. |
| 7 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Am I correct |
| 8 | that the lots you're talking about are in the |
| 9 | heart of Central Square Subdistrict? |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 11 | SAUL TANNENBAUM: Yes. |
| 12 | H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. This side |
| 13 | of Bishop Allen, right? |
| 14 | AHMED NUR: (Inaudible) |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: They're also, I think |
| 16 | I counted six parking lots and Bishop Allen |
| 17 | Drive. I walked down there the other night, |
| 18 | and there may be more. Some of them are |
| 19 | private ownership, two of the larger ones are |

under city ownership. Mark.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Thanks. Mark
Boyes-Watson, also a member of the C2
Advisory Committee.
While I think first that the Zoning, the wonderfully succinct Zoning that Jeff presented, if only we could have done everything in half an hour like that, that would be just fine. And I think that it's a really an accurate distillation of lots of the goals without so much of the flavor. But I wanted to make -- and I think there are three points that I wanted to just focus in on. And I'11 end with the most -- the one closest to my heart.

But the first one is on the housing. I think that just going back to, Hugh, your comment that, you know, Zoning is for 20 or

40 years and the changes that are being made, it seems that not being overly prescriptive about that what housing becomes, I think is really important right now. As I said, I work in that industry and it's not clear what the needs are. And it's also, I think, unclear, you know, what you'd say, where does a current 70-year-old resident of Central, where did they go; right? So -- and what do they need? They're not these middle income family housing, but they're definitely

Cambridge families. You know? So I think they're not being overly descriptive as we go forward with that stuff, and I think that's partly the recommendation to drop requirements and allow review so that the wisdom of things could be reviewed. I think it's a great idea. And I think it's great to allow this type of development so that all of
those sort of accessibility issues, etcetera, are captured by this kind of building. And I think that the committee was very clear that they want to find ways of not impacting the current neighborhoods, what we think about of those rustic style, low density neighborhoods. But we introduced this mix that allows people of all types to be here to make the retail vibrant and make the whole place work without, you know, huge impacts. And that's also why we -- I think we should reduce the parking so that we don't have congested streets and we continue to press that trend of the city's car ownership declining and walking and bicycle use. And flexibility on the housing on the front seems to me very wise. And the flexibility to go high is just an absolute requirement of getting there. And that's where they
transfer development rights.
As you look at Central and you look at the ownership parcels and the historic buildings, it's not like that every lot is going to be able to do any of this stuff. A very few lots can. And I think as property owners look at that, giving them the flexibility, and I think it's all flexibility type tools. And I just personally, as a long time resident, you know, we've seen so little happen in Centra1. You have to ask yourself wel1, what's going on there? It's not that it's not always been a fabulous place to live because it has; right? And it's right next to Kendall and it's right next to Harvard and it's always been there. So anyway, I think the changes to the Zoning, it's not -- the status quo isn't so great, and I think the change, time for the change.

So the last one was just to amplify a little bit on these parking lots. When I came to these parking lots, I think that -and it relates to the transferability rights. And it really relates to progress, because one of the things that I've been advocating is that we don't be slow introducing what the city's going to do. And I think if the Planning Board can help with this, I think it's wise, is to -- especially about the Quest Properties which abuts one of the parking lots in Central, one of the key central parking lots, the one behind McDonald's. And another big ownership, consulted ownership parcel is the Essex Street lot. And if things are going to happen, you know, it's no good to say well, we'11 figure out what we're going to do with those sometime later. When actually we need
to know now so those people who might be able to take advantage of all of this can actually see what it is and people can make proposals. If the Planning Board can urge the city to think about that disposition process, it can start to coincide with all of this rather than thinking it's something in the future. I think that works better with the whole C2 recommendations and the whole endeavor. So anyway -- and the parking lot, it seems to me having the opportunity for all sorts of things. But one of the things that I've always, I have always speculated on is that they are significant parcels, the city controls, and can dictate lots of things about what happens to them. And everything from going to sort of healthy eating and all of this, the farmer's market thing, to frame that in a proper public market that gets us
back to a better way of being relative to food, etcetera, etcetera, and small business and local agriculture and all those things. I mean those kinds of things that are political statements that we have the ability to leverage these publicly-owned things to the publicly-owned goods -- the public goods that we might need.

And my last of those is that if that's associated with a piece of public open space, then it is a secular space in the old fashioned way where secular things like political rallies and good public sort of congregation can occur. We don't have that. We have a lawn in front of City Hall which is not a public gathering place, but it's sort of an urban space.

So, it seems to me it's a wonderful opportunity that, you know, I think we could
do well to grab. So those are my thoughts.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak?

Charles.
CHARLES TEAGUE: Thank you. I'm a little surprised that the public speaking is tonight. I just wanted to remind the Board, except for can't remind Tom, he wasn't there at the Town and Gown that MIT put up their map and the Osborne Triangle was called the North Campus. And actually I wish people would call it the North Campus because they showed the property ownership map, and as near as I can tell, they own everything except the Miracle of Science and U-Haul. So I would like the Board to keep that in mind when you're looking at the rest of the MIT developments in the rest of Kendall Square and is, you know, MIT does just -- I've just
been looking at the graphs. And MIT is growing rapidly. And so you have to envision what the university and the industrial, and its industrial component are, and to keep that all in mind when you're looking at this. And then what we didn't see on the grand vision of things would be something -- it was -- when they talked about the parking lots, what I would really -- I always was waiting for someone to say well, we'11 build on the parking lots but we'11 put a big chunk of open space right in the middle of Central Square. A really big chunk, a really big public space, that would be lined with, you know, various public things. And that's -and there was one point some talk of a bus terminal. I thought that was very important. But anyways, thank you.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Wait, can you
--you know, where would that big chunk go? Where would it be?

CHARLES TEAGUE: You know, I --
HUGH RUSSELL: Parking lot, right?
H. THEODORE COHEN: You're talking about building on the parking lot.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Building on the parking lot and then just replace some large low rise section with open space and --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Something that's on Mass. Ave. now?

CHARLES TEAGUE: Something that's on Mass. Ave., that's -- because having open space off Mass. Ave., I'm just going, like, where is it? It's the problem of Kendall Square. It's like where is Kendall Square? You come out the subway, and it's just all built up. It's just like, I don't -- you know, sometimes I think you should take out
the first two floors of the Marriott and just have a giant arcade, because then you would have -- then you would know where Kenda11 Square was. You know? And the Marriott lobby could be up on the third floor. It wouldn't matter. It's just a lobby. But, you know, like the question is we do have Central Square except that, you know, in front of the police station -- and which will be a public building. And we can have this group of public buildings. But that's, that's sort of a horrible, nasty traffic place. And so if there was a natural, you know, square in Central Square.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So in its
fantasies did the committee consider that at a11?

CHARLES TEAGUE: I didn't go to al1 the meetings and so you can ask them. But
there was talk -- there were talk of public rooms and but it was more like building on the parking lots and places more off the square. There was talk, as he said, blowing up the garage. Which, you know, if the garage became a bus terminal, that would be -- but I don't know how you fit it in on the streets. But I think it -- there was talk of being bold, and I'm, like, you gotta be bold, you know.

What I would love to see is a, is a public building with great public meeting rooms so that everybody in the room can see and hear the presentation which is so -which is, you never get at the BZA. This is so much better than the BZA. But this could be better. You know, everything should be screaming wireless. We should just have these general purpose conference rooms and
they should be accessible. They should be where the Red Line is. And they should be where City Hall is. Anyway, that's -- those are my dreams. So thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Someone else wish to speak?
AHMED NUR: I would. I was on the
Central Square Advisory Committee as well. And, you know, most of us agreed on open space was one of the big things where we took the parking lot and, you know, build up things and left the bottom. You know, like for example, brought the parking lots together and build a structure, and then have the other areas, open spaces to a green areas. Or one was how do we make it along the avenue safe for children and, you know, try to get a control on profanity and the drunk in the streets and what not. How do we
bring business and pedestrians in to come in and buying from our stores and shopping? How do we make Central Square safe? How do we get rid of all these banks, phone shops, gyms and all that stuff that close early? And try to control the amount of liquor stores, you know, that are across from one another. And the whole perfect storm of the subway being there and the homeless, from all walks of life just come down and hang out.

In addition to that we talked about how do we bring residential into Central Square as, you know, low rise along the avenue, having the high rise in the middle, and then also another low rise towards, for example, Bishop Allen? And so, you know, the advisory committee worked hard, and there was a lot of ideas brought and obviously it was in front of you and we had brought it to you. And so
if there's any specific questions in addition to that, I would be more than happy to answer.

PAMELA WINTERS: Ahmed, I have a question. Did any of the people who owned the retail operations, the restaurants and stores, did they have any comments about doing away with the parking lots? Because, you know, a lot of friends of mine come in from the suburbs, they like to eat at Central Kitchen and, you know, just different places. Do they --

AHMED NUR: We were divided on the parking lots. I mean, there were some of us who thought and environmentally speaking and traffic and engineering, however you want to look at it, whenever you want to get rid of traffic, you want to get rid of parking lots. People will find a way to get there. For
instance, let's build parking lots and make it easy for us. So I can't speak -- there are a few store owners here that were (inaudible), that yes, there are a lot of comments and they did defer one person to another.

SAUL TANNENBAUM: Can I respond to the parking lots?

I, I don't -- what we felt we should do was build a central parking facility and sync it. I mean, we recognize that retail businesses still need parking. I mean, the, you know, parking minimums were for residential buildings that might be constructed in the square. But, you know, the need for parking, you know, in Central Square, you know, we all acknowledge we think it can be provided, you know, better than it currently is and certainly it shouldn't be,
you know, surface parking if at all possible. So, and I mean the other thing I wanted to say, I mean these are consensus recommendations. Me, I would have gone, you know, denser and not really worried all that much about open space because I'm a city guy and, you know, that's, that's my druthers but other people on the committee, you know, felt the need for open space. So I mean this is -- we've already tried to find the middle path between the two extremes. I know I would, you know, if I weren't a dictator of Cambridge, I would be planting, you know, tall buildings there because I believe in density. I mean that isn't going to happen in this city so, you know, let's find something that reasonably could happen. PATRICK BARRETT: Patrick Barrett. I just had one comment. So part of -- we had
a fellow who was a store owner at 1369
Coffee, he was there as well. He shared some concern about the parking issue. But I think as part of our consensus with overarching goals was to increase the housing stocks. As a commercial property owner, one of the problems that my tenants face is that there's simply not enough people in the area to attend their stores. And that part of our presentation's dealt with the fact that as far as a micro-economy that about 30 percent of the total people who live in the area shop at the stores. And without that population of people there, it's sort one thing -- so it's one of those things that you have to do it all in order to get it.

Thank you.
IRAM FAROOQ: So one other thing,
Pam, to respond to your question is that we
actually -- Sue and Adam actually did an analysis of the usage of the parking lots.

Because when we started out, we thought Central Square has more parking in terms of the amount of business than even Harvard Square. Of course we should be able to get rid some of it. But when they did the utilization analysis, they found that while during the day there is a lot of capacity. At night all those parking spaces are full. And they're not full of residents because they actually also cross-referenced license plates with Cambridge address -registrations in Cambridge. And so there is a need for that parking right now. And we're not proposing, the committee is not proposing eliminating the parking. It's just reconfiguring it so that all the land gets released for great things and it gets moved.
Well it did -- I know you are still
talking but I did want to make sure that the question that Brian asked that you have a chance to tell us what you might want to see from us to help advance the discussion further next time in terms of work items.
HUGH RUSSELL: So what was
interesting discussion that when the question was asked which happened to the parking lots, there wasn't a straight forward answer. And that seems to tell me that that's a place where there could be some more work. If the goals are clear, then you can write it. The Zoning can reflect those goals. Now this is going to be a -- presumably a disposition process which is very cumbersome. And it seems to me that there's some potential for, you know, public, private so an owner of an adjacent parcel might say wel1, look, I can
accomplish this goal on this spot and I can make it work if you'll let me extend my housing say over the top of what's going on. So I think that's an area to try to get more clarity, and even though the committee process didn't maybe reach the goal you might want to have because it's a very complicated question and they're conflicting goals.

ROGER BOOTHE: There are many of
these questions that have been raised tonight that really the plan, the vision -- I think what Jeff was laying out was the Zoning piece of that and obviously we want there to be a strong a connection as possible. This is going to be something that takes years to make happen as with any one of our plans. So I think the new thing that's pretty exciting and very positive about what's come out of this committee process is a desire for the
housing, for really trying to I think Mark said, you know, it's time to get off the status quo, and we heard that pretty loud and clear. So I think what we're going to be getting from the Zoning isn't going to solve all these problems. And things like the land disposition and what to do with the parking lot is clearly going to be a process in and of itself. I'm feeling like what Jeff presented is a pretty good translation. I didn't hear anything from the folks that were here tonight admittedly, it was just those who were able to come. I didn't hear anything that was terribly contradictory. I think there was Saul in particular was saying we weren't hard enough on the parking issue. And some of that is something the Board wanted to do anyway is cut back on parking. So I think I'm feeling like we're in pretty
good position to move forward. But as you think about it, any other thoughts you have or things that seem need any clarity, we'd be happy to work with you on.

JEFF ROBERTS: If I could add just a piece to that, too. Sorry. But I just wanted to in terms of just a reaction to that point. There would be a -- it is worth some thought as to how the Zoning would apply in such a scenario with looking at the parking lot, disposition of parking lots or development on the partnership to develop the parking lots. There would be really a limit to how sort of how far Zoning could go in directing what actually happened because it would be, it would -- in a certain point it would fall outside of the purview of Zoning and into the sort of the private agreement between the city as a land owner and, you
know, a potential buyer or a developer as a land owner. So that's just something to be cognizant of as we move forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think, for example, and one of the ideas that appealed to me a lot was the farmer's market that -- and I was thinking of that block in downtown Baltimore that's got a roof on it and it's public open space and it's full of all kinds of uses. It was at one time a, you know, where farmer's brought their produce. There's some of that left. The idea that there would be a grand hall somewhere in Central Square that would be used as part of the food thing. I think Mark, spoke to that. That's a part where it does intersect with the Zoning. But if that's something you really wanted to have happen, you could create Zoning in Central Square for it to happen.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean you have similar markets all over Europe. And, you know, Seattle, the Pike's Market is right downtown.

What I would like to hear -- whenever we've met with the committee, I think there's been a drive on the committee to give us their recommendations. And the fact that they've reached some sort of consensus on it, I find it really interesting the extremes that were discussed and, you know, like you're saying, you know, I built high, I cover everything, you know, with tall buildings and just get a lot of housing. Wel1, you know, obviously we're not going to re-debate all of that. But it seems like we're getting some sort of consensus compromise ideas and maybe that's where we'11 end up, but I'd like to hear some of the
extreme points of view of, you know, well, what does happen on the parking lots? Or, you know, if we were to build 200 feet, you know, everywhere in the heart district, what would that mean? And, you know, obviously these are things that the committee went over a long time, but I'd like to just hear when we're talking about particular issues, you know, what some of the extreme points of view were and, you know, how the committee ended up where it did end up.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm taking the silence to mean two things:

One is that it's 20 minutes of 10 .
And secondly that it's really an
endorsement of what we've heard tonight and that the direction that is being taken and that the, again, the committee process was very convincing to us. And what we've
learned of it is also very (inaudible). You know, my things I brought up I really almost took little footnotes.

So should we continue with this? STEVEN WINTER: I have a question. And the question is, pardon me if I'm being a little thick, but from this point on the Central Square things, what does moving forward look like? What does it -- what are we, what are we going to do next?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's going to go from checklist to language.

STEVEN WINTER: Is that about right? IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. STEVEN WINTER: Okay. HUGH RUSSELL: Are the guidelines in Central Square going to be revised also? IRAM FAROOQ: I think on the Central
small word change, but we didn't have a lot of comments on Central Square. We had a few comments on Kendal1 so I don't anticipate a big change in Central.

Is that right, Roger.
ROGER BOOTHE: No, there was a general sense in the guidelines that you wanted to make them not too constrictive and we changed some of the language and focused both sets of guidelines and they are guidelines and not trying to be too rigid.

HUGH RUSSELL: What's the process for adopting those?

IRAM FAROOQ: We usually -- once the Board has agreed, has sort of endorsed and blessed those, we attach them with the Zoning Petition because they get referenced in the Zoning. And so that way the City Council knows what we're talking about when they see

| 1 | that reference. That's been the way we've |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | done it in the past. |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: So that means there |
| 4 | would be some pressure to get the Kendal1 |
| 5 | Square guidelines in that final form so that |
| 6 | it can be connected to the MIT petition? |
| 7 | IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: So this is the last |
| 9 | meeting to be attended by Tom Anninger. |
| 10 | H. THEODORE COHEN: We have rules to |
| 11 | do. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, we have the |
| 13 | rules? Before we do that, I would like to |
| 14 | make sure that our minutes of this meeting |
| 15 | contain a vote of thanks to Tom for his years |
| 16 | of good service and wise counsel and |
| 17 | friendship. We could not ask for a better |
| 18 | member and we let him go with regret. |
| 19 | PAMELA WINTERS: You will be missed. |

H. THEODORE COHEN: Here, here.

ROGER BOOTHE: Could we add the staff's comments to that message? We've worked with you for so long and it's a real pleasure.

BRIAN MURPHY: And I think it's true for members of the Planning Board, but particularly for somebody like Tom who has been doing this for as long as he has, I think his legacy is really seen on a daily basis throughout the City of Cambridge with the built form that is so much better for his thoughtfulness, his deliberation, his vision, his work, his leadership and the legacy lives on in the entire community. And service on the Planning Board is extremely important to the community. It's not always easy. I think that you are loved by people when it's convenient and hated by people when it's
convenient as the case may be. It's many hours, not just here at the public meetings but also in terms of the preparation work, and your skill and commitment, diligence is really, as I say, is reflected in the community around us. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: And we have one more thing to use Tom's skill in front of us. We had an informal subcommittee of the Board, which consisted of Ted and Tom and I. I guess I was sort of not really part of the subcommittee, but I was basically, didn't have the training. So we -- they've come up with some revisions to our rules which have been circulated to the Board with highlights in yellow and where the major changes are. I don't know if anybody wants to put into the record what those changes are. And I would love it if we could vote to enact these rules
tonight, but that would depend on whether the rest of you think that we're ready. I think also there's -- perhaps it would be useful if we ask the staff if they have any comments on the draft, too.

ROGER BOOTHE: Liza.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I think you should do it, Ted.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Al1 right. Just very briefly we tried to propose rules that would reflect pretty much the policy that we've been following for maybe the past six or nine months of -- the rules are based upon rules that have been in effect for many, many years. They've been amended. Just some definitions, talk about what constitutes the Board and the Applicant and Members, and what the Constitution of the Board is. Probably the heart of the rules, the changes of the
rules are to clarify the requirements of quorum and the requirements of voting. And for all matters other than Special Permit matters, four members would constitute a quorum. And then if a quorum is present, a majority vote of the members and associate members voting would be an affirmative vote, which is pretty much the standards throughout all public bodies.

However, for any Special Permit matters, both the General Laws Chapter 40A of the General Laws and the Zoning Ordinance require that there be a -- for a Board of five or more members, that there be a two-thirds vote since we are seven members and two associates. Two-thirds would be 4.6. So for any Special Permit matter there has to be five members voting for them to approve something. And similarly there has to be a
quorum of five to work on the Special Permit, a revision of a Special Permit, or a modification.

The other principle change relates to procedure that the Board will follow, and those are in Sections 5.8 through 5.11. That, you know, how we will hold public hearings and how they will be held, and basically what we've been doing for the past several years. The Petitioner or their representative will make a presentation that presumably will be approximately 30 minutes, and then other people can speak, and in general would be three minutes, and the Chair obviously will control the hearing and can make modifications as necessary.

The change that we've been following in the past several months is that the Board would not close a public hearing until it
felt that it had received everything it needed to have its final discussion and take a vote. And, but if hearings went over several sessions, and especially if there had been requests for new information, the hearings would generally -- subsequent sessions of hearings would generally be limited to changes that had been made or new information.

There's also a provision for obviously receiving written testimony, and that the Board can establish with staff if there's any deadline for getting written testimony before a particular vote is taken.

That was really the heart of the rules and regulations. Otherwise it's, you know, reliance upon the Open Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and only with regard to Special Permit only someone who has
been to all meetings can vote on the Special Permit matter except as otherwise provided by law which leaves open the possibility that the City might adopt the state law which would allow a member who has missed a meeting to read the transcript or listen to the transcript, and then they would be eligible to vote. So if the City does adopt that, then under the rules we could follow that process.

There is one typographical change that Tom corrected, pointed out. In the definition of Board, the draft you al1 received says seven members and two associate members constitutes a full board. It should be singular, constitute a full board.

Tom suggests we delete one comma. I can discuss that with Liza if we approve these in substantially the form that they've
been granted to the Board.
I know Bill did have one question about the quorum and how voting would occur, and I discussed that briefly with him that at the end of one of the previous meetings and he seemed, he then understood it. He seemed comfortable with it. I have not heard any further questions from him about it.

So if anybody else has any questions?
PAMELA WINTERS: I want to thank you guys for taking the time to do that.

Thank you.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I want to move that we adopt the rules as presented to us with such minor changes as might be necessary and that we go forward with them. We've already been following them for sometime and I think there are, they're a major improvement over what we've been doing, and I

| 1 | think it responds to what we've heard from a |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | number of people to keep the public hearings |
| 3 | open. That's the key to it. And I think |
| 4 | that's the right thing to do. And |
| 5 | therefore -- |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second to |
| 7 | that motion? |
| 8 | AHMED NUR: So moved. |
| 9 | STEVEN WINTER: Discussion? |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I would -- I |
| 11 | said I was going to ask the staff if they had |
| 12 | any comments. |
| 13 | JEFF ROBERTS: I mean, I can jump in |
| 14 | since I have the microphone but others could |
| 15 | follow up. I know this is something that |
| 16 | we've been discussing a little bit in our |
| 17 | internal meetings. And particularly, and |
| 18 | this isn't necessarily an issue with the |
| 19 | rules themselves, but just with the sort of |

application, something to consider in the application over time, is that as business comes before the Board that requires a public hearing, there are requirements for advertising of those and so by keeping those hearings open, there requires a slightly more vigilance I guess on the part of I guess the Board and on us as staff to make sure that we're being clear when discussion is continued to a future date that there's a sort of a little sort of checklist we would go through wrapping up to say when is the next discussion going to take place? Making sure that the members who were available will continue to be available, and that there's appropriate time allowed for any additional advertisement that may need to occur in those situations.

So does anyone want to add to that? I
think that was the main issue that we had discussed.

LIZA PADEN: Right. If the hearing is kept open and continued, the next date has to be announced at that meeting or else we go into a process where I have to advertise it again. And if I have to advertise it again, it will probably put us in with the deadlines for newspaper, a hearing matter can't come back for a month.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I
understand that and obviously you've been handling it very well up until now. If, you know, perhaps when you schedule hearings, you can anticipate that there will be at least be one further session and have already a date that the Chair will know that if we do continue it, he can announce, he or she can announce --

LIZA PADEN: Right. If it's
announced at the meeting, I don't think that's a problem.
H. THEODORE COHEN: It will be continued to a certain date and obviously that can then go up on the website and, you know, and if we are looking at a third, you know, a third date, you know, at the time of the second session, hopefully we can have a third date and we can just, you know, keep rolling right along with announcements so you don't have to go through the trouble and expense of advertising again.

LIZA PADEN: The biggest
complication is the time lag, is you have a month between meetings when you're discussing an item.

HUGH RUSSELL: But if you -- I believe when you schedule things and say
well, I could have another discussion following the meeting if necessary or maybe not. You know, I mean you would say to me, well, the agenda for the next meeting is full so it would be the --

## LIZA PADEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's important to do.
It's an important concept for these rules, but I think the reasons we are keeping hearings open is because of a meeting, the Open Meeting Law in trying to -- which is to -- as changes are made in a proposal, to be able to receive public comment and for the public to have the expectation that they would be able to comment as things change.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. I think the law requires it and I also think that, you know, it gives more process and more input from the public so that, you know, that
nothing -- they're not foreclosed at al1
until we're really ready to vote and I think that's the way it should be.

ROGER BOOTHE: Iram and I were just
discussing that it probably would be important as you continue a hearing, to make it clear every time to the people who may come back that you're only wanting to have new information. And maybe this is something we should be helping do a little more clearly. So partly the staff should make sure that we'11 remind you of that.

HUGH RUSSELL: The deep history of
Planning Board there was a sheet that was up that talked about process. LIZA PADEN: I have it. ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, we could dig that out.

HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe it's just

| 1 | something that gets posted on the door rather |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | than handed out or something. Or put on the |
| 3 | website. |
| 4 | Okay, so there's a motion. Is there |
| 5 | further discussion on the motion? |
| 6 | And then on the motion. |
| 7 | (Raising hands) |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in |
| 9 | favor. |
| 10 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Before we break I |
| 11 | just wanted to acknowledge those nice words |
| 12 | and to say that my time has come and I'11 be |
| 13 | glad to share with any of you what I'm |
| 14 | thinking of doing to replace my Tuesdays, but |
| 15 | I will miss this. This has been a good |
| 16 | experience in my life. It's been an |
| 17 | important part of it, and I want to thank all |
| 18 | of you. |
| 19 | Pam, Bill, I wish he were here. |


| 1 | Hugh, who has become a very close |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | friend. |
| 3 | Ted and Steve and Ahmed. And the |
| 4 | staff, Brian, Iram, Roger, Stuart, others who |
| 5 | are not here. Liza of course. I'm missing |
| 6 | some people. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Jeff. |
| 8 | THOMAS ANNINGER: Jeff. |
| 9 | Cathy who has been an extraordinarily |
| 10 | patient. Whom have I missed here? Susan |
| 11 | Clippinger. |
| 12 | PAMELA WINTERS: Stuart? |
| 13 | THOMAS ANNINGER: What is his name? |
| 14 | Adam. Adam of course. And who else? Susan |
| 15 | and Charles Teague. And all those people who |
| 16 | have come here regularly. |
| 17 | What's quite remarkable is how |
| 18 | collegial it is. After all is said and done, |
| 19 | we have found I think a balance that is quite |


| 1 | remarkable. On the one hand we set a very |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | high standard, at least that's how I see it, |
| 3 | and yet I think we've proven that you can get |
| 4 | something done in Cambridge, that is |
| 5 | complicated and beautiful. You can't say |
| 6 | that about just any city. So I think this is |
| 7 | a place that works and works well and I'm -- |
| 8 | I've been very happy to be a part of it for |
| 9 | several years. And I'11 miss you all and I'd |
| 10 | like to find some way to stay in touch. |
| 11 | Thank you. |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: You're welcome to |
| 13 | come any Tuesday. |
| 14 | We are adjourned. |
| 15 | (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the |
| 16 | Planning Board Adjourned.) |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |


| 1 | ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The original of the Errata Sheet has |
| 3 | been delivered to Community Development |
| 4 | Department. |
| 5 | When the Errata Sheet has been |
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| 8 | ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development |
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| 15 |  |
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