# PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE GENERAL HEARING 

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

> 7:05 p.m.
in
Second Floor Meeting Room, 344 Broadway City Hall Annex -- McCusker Building Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair

Pamela Winters, Member
Steven Winter, Member
Tom Sieniewicz, Member
Steven Cohen, Member
Catherine Preston Connolly, Associate Member
Susan Glazer, Acting Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Community Development Staff:
Liza Paden
Roger Boothe

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

## I N D E X

CASE

## PAGE

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases
2. Update, Susan Glazer, Acting Assistant City Manager for Community Development 27
3. Adoption of Meeting Transcript (s) 33

## PUBLIC HEARING

Planning Board to amend the Zoning Ordinance
of the City of Cambridge to create a new
Section 6.100 Bicycle Parking, modify the definitions of parking, Gross Floor Area, and private Open Space as they relate to bicycle parking and create a new definition for Bicycle Parking in Article 2.000, modify the Yard Standards in Article 5.000 as they relate to bicycle parking, and modify various sections of Article 6.000 to remove references to bicycle parking where they are not consistent with the proposed Section 6.100 and add new references where they are necessary.

KeyWord Index

## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board and I would like to start out by welcoming three new members to the Board. I thought it might be a good idea if we just went around and each of us introduced ourselves to each other because, although the four of us know each other quite well, you probably don't know us and although I know Catherine from years ago, and I've known Steve for sometime. But anyway, I will start as a model.

I'm Hugh Russel1, and I work as an architect doing mostly multi-family housing for a big developers.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
I'm Pam Winters and I, I've been on the Board for 13 years and was part of a rezoning effort that took place before that, and I --
prior to that I was a special ed. teacher and also was involved and am still involved with the Cambridge Arts Association and I'm a painter.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm Steve Cohen. I'm an attorney by training. Years ago I represented construction 1enders, some universities, and a number of real estate developers and architects in Boston. In 1982 I left the practice and then went into real estate development which I've been doing since then. I sat on the Mid-Cambridge Neighborhood Conservation District Commission for about 15 years or so and chaired the Commission for the last four or five years or so.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'm
Catherine Preston Connolly. And as Hugh
alluded to, I was formerly a city staff
person working for Community Development as a parking and transportation demand management planning officer. So I am recovering parking geek. I left City employment to go to law school and I'm now a real estate attorney and I am in-house counse1 to American Tower Corporations. So now I get to get to be a telecommunications geek.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm Tom Sieniewicz.
I am an architect and city planner. I am also a hockey coach in Cambridge Youth Hockey for the last 16 years. I have three children in public schools here. I had a tenure on the Zoning Board for 10 years from ' 97 to 2007, the last seven of which I was the Chairman. And I am an architect during the day, part of a large international firm. I run the Boston office of MPBJ, and I too am a painter. I paint everyday.

PAMELA WINTERS: We'11 have to talk. STEVEN WINTER: My name is Steve Winter and I'm -- my profession is regional planning, which really is linking municipalities to work together collaboratively, cooperatively across boundaries to make sure that the Metropolitan Boston never looks like Fairfax, Virginia, ever. And I also have a great affection and fondness for urban landscapes and urban places and people who live there, how they change us and shape us and make us what we do.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm Ted Cohen.

I have recently retired after 40 years of practicing law. I was a municipal attorney for about 30 years, and then for about 10 years I used to sort of do land use development permitting in real estate
practice. Long-time resident of North
Cambridge. I don't paint. I can't paint.
But I do have a son who is an urban planner for the New York Transit Authority whose goal in life has been to save the life through mass transit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Missing tonight are Bill Tibbs who is an architect and a planner. At the moment is planning at Boston College. And Ahmed Nur who works at a large contracting company and learned to swim in the Nile River.

So the official item on our agenda is the review of the Zoning Board cases.

LIZA PADEN: Right, so the Board of Zoning Appeal cases. The first one I wanted to draw your attention to is the one for 120 Vassar Street. And the plans are in front of Hugh. To replace -- it's another case where
they're replacing the existing antennas with upgraded antennas. These are going to go on to the gymnasium that's on Vassar Street at MIT. There's photo sims that are probably more useful, Hugh. The plans are not so useful. The photo sims here are probably what you want to pass around.

I will say that most of the antennas, the antennas are all finished in the same color as the brick that they're mounted to on the facade, and they are facing the open space at MIT. So they're facing the tennis courts and the track and field. You can see one of the installations from Vassar Street itself.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we didn't have our favorite telecom attorney.

LIZA PADEN: This is not Mr. Sousa's case, no. This is Sprint. And he's not
representing them I guess.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I
suggest that we provide maybe five minutes of background to the newer members of the Board, or less, sort of illustrates our -- the way we've embraced the telecoms, the replacement of these things, and the successes that we've had?

HUGH RUSSELL: So, our role in telecom is an extension of our general role to advise the Zoning Board. Tom could probably tell us what the Zoning Board probably wants, it may be helpful to us. So, this is a case where they grant permits and we advise. And unlike most of the Zoning Board recommendations we take a very active role in the visual impact of these installations. Ordinarily we leave much what's happening at the Zoning Board to the

Zoning Board because they are the ones who are hearing the cases and hear all the facts. We try to bring planning considerations to the -- sort of general planning considerations to the Zoning Board. What's happening now is everybody's changing from a dumb phone to a Smartphone. Everybody else at this table probably has a Smartphone. And a11 the carriers are having to upgrade their bandwidth capability for the Smartphones.

And what's happening is they're just swapping out antennas, by in large, and the antennas are pretty much the same size, and we can
tell them to make them whatever color we think is good or we can recommend that to our colleagues at the Zoning Board. And sometimes we don't like the installations and so we enter into dialogue with the providers.

And once when there was a telecom case on a
building that we had given a Special Permit for, we were the permitting granting authority and we actually denied a permit, went to court and we won. That's on the old part of the Sonesta Hotel. And it was an antenna, a new antenna mounted in the middle of a huge brick wall that was a real architectural feature. And so that's, I think, sort of help validated what we're doing. It's always a tug between pictures -have they made their way around? I'm sort of filling time.

STEVEN COHEN: Do you want them? HUGH RUSSELL: No.

So sort of a tug between the duty to provide this public amenity and trying to do it in a way that isn't too ugly.

So in my view of this particular case is they've succeeded in not making it any
uglier than it is now. And it's really invisible now from the public way. I don't know what other people think about this particular case.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I have a question and, Liza, I don't know if you'11 know the answer. In the proposed condition they show in one location going from like four antennas to one, but they still have the other three --

LIZA PADEN: Mounting brackets?
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- mounting brackets.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Are they
removing the mounting brackets or are they leaving them?

LIZA PADEN: I think they're proposing to leave the brackets there. So if
you want to make the recommendation like you've done in other sites that they remove the brackets that aren't being used --

PAMELA WINTERS: Definitely. STEVEN WINTER: Definitely. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I mean unless they're planning something in three weeks to have a second proposal.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, other than that, it seemed that it was an improvement over what's there.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Anymore
comments?
PAMELA WINTERS: I have a question about case No. 10412.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Liza, did you see
any issues with that?

## LIZA PADEN: I haven't seen any

issues with that particular one. It's going to be on the north side of Monsignor 0'Brien Highway. I do have the drawings here. There is some discussion that they want to -they're seeking relief on the entrance of the hotel.

PAMELA WINTERS: There's something about a Special Permit to construct a building for hotel use. Is that --

LIZA PADEN: The hotel use is a Special District 1 in the Special Permit from the Board of Zoning Appeal. So that's the Special Permit they're asking for to have the use. Another thing that they're asking for is a -- the waiver, the Special Permit to waive the amount of parking. So they want to reduce the amount of parking. They are required to have 62 spaces, and they're
proposing 55. And you might want to remember that they are going to be next-door to the Green Line. So Lechmere Station.

They're also looking to waive the requirement for the principal entrance to be on Monsignor O'Brien itself. And if you look at the plans, what will happen is that they want to have a drop-off spot, and the only way that you can have a drop-off spot is to have it inside the driveway and not on Monsignor 0'Brien Highway. So they want to have the vehicle drop off and the main entrance to be one entrance, and that's why they're asking for it to be on the driveway and not on the highway itself.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, I -- so this is
-- what's it replacing?

## LIZA PADEN: It's replacing the

Genoa Salami brick building.

HUGH RUSSELL: There is already a hotel on the corner of Water Street. There's another one across the street.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Or are there two?
LIZA PADEN: Across the street there's one. The Holiday Inn Express. It seems to be a hot hotel location.

HUGH RUSSELL: Somewhere I got the idea that a lot of those hotels were used for tour groups.

LIZA PADEN: I don't know.
HUGH RUSSELL: The bus tours that
come around. I don't see the north side of O'Brien Highway becoming a huge pedestrian street because of what's out beyond the hote1 which is, you know, half a mile of highway interchange and ramps and crossing the railroad.

## LIZA PADEN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think not having the entrance facing the street isn't terribly important.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, this project would come to us in any event.

LIZA PADEN: No.
STEVEN WINTER: No?
LIZA PADEN: The Special Permit is from the Board of Zoning Appeal. It's a BZA Special Permit, not a Planning Board Special Permit.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. So there's no design review at all?

HUGH RUSSELL: Apparently it's not
large enough to trigger the urban design review.

## LIZA PADEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: So --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you know how the entrance will interact with the rest of North Point and the development of that?

LIZA PADEN: We11, there's a --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there a system?

LIZA PADEN: There's a site plan on the first page which they'11-- you know what else they have here is -- not great photographs, but what happens is there' 11 be a driveway off of Monsignor 0 'Brien Highway. When you drive into the -- when you go into the driveway, you' 11 circle around to the entrance, but it's removed from the entrance to the North Point area or East Street or Water Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And what you would see ahead of you probably is the embankment that the trains are running on?
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So it doesn't connect to North Point except for walking down
Monsignor O'Brien Highway to First Street.
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I guess you can go on Water Street, too.
LIZA PADEN: You have to go down the highway and then down to Water Street.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And when the T is extended --
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- it will be
running behind the hotel?
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And there will be
quite a ways above grade stil1 I think.
LIZA PADEN: It will be up at the
second floor -- it might even be above the second floor windows. They do have some parking in this hotel that's going to be inside the building underneath the first -underneath one of the floors at the grade -ground floor.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, what's the -- and how is that shielded from O'Brien Highway?

LIZA PADEN: By the hotel itself. So....

HUGH RUSSELL: So if you're on
O'Brien Highway, you see the rooms, public rooms of the hotel?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: One of the weaknesses of reviewing the Board of Zoning Appeal cases is that we only get one.

LIZA PADEN: One set of plans.
HUGH RUSSELL: One set of plans and
we don't get them in advance.
What do you think, Tom?
TOM SIENIEWICZ: We11, I think it would be helpful to go on record saying that we don't have a concern about the front door necessarily being put on Monsignor O'Brien Highway. And I would also say that, you know, the Zoning Board will in its wisdom add some conditions as it invariably does when it's granting relief, but I for one would like to see a condition that the building essentially be realized the way it is which shows activity on that street there, public spaces and windows that, you know, suggest activities on the wall. I'm a little worried about the other end of the building where there are rooms right on the ground floor there which wi11 -- drapes will necessarily be drawn on. Okay, if we can get half the
building with a sense of public presence, that would be good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any other comments?
STEVEN COHEN: I would offer just
one comment if I might. I certainly agree. I don't have a problem with the entrance on the side. It's actually reminiscent of the Inn at Harvard and it does make sense to get the drop offs and the hotel-related traffic off the main road. I'm really struck, however, that a project of this nature would not be subject to any design review of any sort. And I guess -- I'm sure this has been discussed many times by this body, but I guess I would chime in my own view or thought or suggestion that some thought be given to get revising either code to require a design review at least of non-residential projects of this nature, of this size. Because while
the Zoning Board I'm sure does a good job dealing with the technical requirements of the code, as you say the visual, the aesthetic elements of this project are very visible and very important, and do not appear to be subject to any review at all.

LIZA PADEN: I will say that the
Applicant came in to Community Development and Roger Boothe and I both looked at the design and they've taken some of the suggestions that we've made very seriously and incorporated some of those changes. And we did look at the materials and had strong suggestions about it. I don't know whether or not the BZA would require those changes, but for the most part, the materials are reflected on what we talked about with them. So there was some -- there was some design review, but the building's less than 50,000
square feet so it's not going to be a project review Special Permit.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have in some cases asked the Zoning Board to not make a decision and ask the proponents to come before us for the purpose of discussion and review even though it's not required. And sometimes, I mean, we usually I would say when a non-profit housing groups are going before the Zoning Board, they're apt to come and present their projects to us.

STEVEN WINTER: They always stop here.

LIZA PADEN: For a comprehensive permit.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But that's mandated.

LIZA PADEN: That's required. I think that's how we get to them.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I ask Roger if -- do you feel that more scrutiny is needed on this project? Or do you feel that they have enough direction?

ROGER BOOTHE: As Liza said, we did meet with them sometime ago, and it's definitely sort of a strip suburban kind of model for a hotel. It's not going to win any design awards. But I think as some of the board members discussed having the entryway around the side seemed to make sense to us. And they were using better materials than some of these kinds of facilities use. And they were -- are trying to have landscaping along the edges and do the screen the best they can. I think it's probably not going to change that much. And it's better than the one across the street I would say. I think. So it's hard to get very excited about it,
but I don't think it's a disaster.
HUGH RUSSELL: So it's important that what's shown on the plans now be a minimum.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yeah. That might be a good thing in the comments to the BZA to say what we see, we want to at least have that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there anything
that you recommended to them that you didn't see that you wish you had?

ROGER BOOTHE: I don't think so.
LIZA PADEN: No.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
PAMELA WINTERS: Good.
LIZA PADEN: Are there any other
cases that anybody wants to see? No?
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
So, Susan.

SUSAN GLAZER: We11, tonight is actually the third meeting we've had in March.

In Apri1, again, there will be three meetings. On April 2nd when there will be a joint meeting of the Planning Board with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority.

On April 9th there are two public hearings; one for 33 Cottage Park Ave. and a second for 130 CambridgePark Drive. Both of those are housing proposals.

On April 16th, there will be a public hearing for the Martin Luther King School's Special Permit project.

And then under General Business there will be a Town Gown comments. Discussion of Town Gown comments.

Following our meeting last week when we discussed schedule, there will be only two
meetings in May. May 7th, when we will
discuss the Kendal1/Central study again. And on May 21st.

And on the 21st if we have to hold over the two residential public hearings, we will discuss them at that time.

And I would just add one other thing, that this is my last meeting with the Planning Board because I will be retiring at the end of this month and I want to wish you all well. And I'm sorry I haven't had a chance to work with the new members longer. HUGH RUSSELL: We've certainly
appreciated your advice and your calm presence and your thoughts and we'11 miss you.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I have two questions for Liza if I could.

The first is the CRA and Planning Board
meeting here in this room?
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: I just want to put maybe this on the table that to figure out the best way to configure chairs and --

LIZA PADEN: I am open to
suggestions.
STEVEN WINTER: Yes, I know that you are, but maybe we can just start thinking about that so that we have the best sort of facilitative environment. I don't know what it would be, but I mean I'd be happy to put my head --

LIZA PADEN: Send us suggestions. ROGER BOOTHE: Do you remember when we had the Central Square Committee here? We had more of like a circle.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, I liked that.
ROGER BOOTHE: I thought that worked
well. If you would be amenable to that. We could do that.

STEVEN WINTER: I would, certainly.
PAMELA WINTERS: Also, didn't Brian
say at one point we were going to have a meeting at the Senior Center at Central Square?

LIZA PADEN: That's the Apri1 16th meeting.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Okay, got it.

STEVEN WINTER: And the -- I'm sorry to ask questions like this. But the Town Gown again is on the Town Gown comments?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Is on what day?
LIZA PADEN: April 16th.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: That will be after the

## King School Special Permit.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
Should we send you our comments in
advance and be able to say them as well? How would you like us to do that?

LIZA PADEN: If you send the
comments in advance, I can distribute them to people, and I find it's a good way to start the conversation especially where there will be a discussion after the public hearing.

STEVEN WINTER: So maybe we send them prior to the 10th?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, please.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I don't suppose
it's possible to furnish our new members with copies of their reports?

LIZA PADEN: It is possible.
HUGH RUSSELL: It is. You have

## enough?

LIZA PADEN: We11, one of our members prefers electronics, electronic
files. And we have enough copies to give printed copies to the other members. So we -- it's fine.

ROGER BOOTHE: They are on-1ine I believe, Liza.

LIZA PADEN: And they are on-line and we have copies for people. We have those.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. We're a mixed mode Board now.

STEVEN WINTER: Some of us are much more technology sophisticated than the rest of us.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: Transcripts.
HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a

## transcript?

LIZA PADEN: February 12th
transcript came in and was certified.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So
explanation: We -- transcripts are made of the meetings and somebody told us we had to approve them. And I can tell you that none of us read them. But --
H. THEODORE COHEN: They are
on-1ine.
HUGH RUSSELL: We were here. Like, we know what happened. And part of the professionalism of people who prepare such transcripts is that they certify that what they've done is accurate. So we rely upon the certification by the person who's preparing the transcript, that it is an accurate representation of what happened at the meeting. And so ordinarily after Liza
tells us there's a transcript, somebody makes a motion to accept or approve the transcript based on the fact that it's been certified as being accurate.

Is there such a motion?
STEVEN WINTER: I move that we
certify this transcript as accurate based on the professional reporting that Liza received.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Is there a second?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Discussion?
A11 those in favor?
(Raising hands).
HUGH RUSSELL: You're not voting,
Tom?
TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm going to
abstain. I wasn't at the hearing and I have
no way of knowing whether it's an accurate transcript.

HUGH RUSSELL: Very good.
(Voting in Favor: Russe11, Cohen, Winters, Winter, Connolly, Cohen.)

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the next hearing is the Bicycle Zoning hearing, but I don't have the agenda sheet.

PAMELA WINTERS: It's only thing on there tonight.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, it is. That I
saw. So we are going to hear a proposal to amend the Zoning Ordinance in Cambridge to create a new section called Bicycle Parking. And this is a proposal that was prepared by staff, reviewed with us and the Bicycle Committee, sent to Council who has now sent us back for a public hearing.

So who is going to present this?

## ROGER BOOTHE: Jeff, you might

introduce the staff who are here for the new members who are just getting to know people. JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, thank you. Just to do some introductions, you accurately represented where we are in the process at this point. I'm Jeff Roberts. I'm the Land Use and Zoning Planner in the Community Development Department. And seated in the front row starting next to Roger is Cara Seiderman. She's in the Environmental and Transportation Planning Division. She oversees the bicycling programs in the city. Stephanie Groll is the Parking and Transportation Demand Management Officer. She occupies the position that was originated, I be1ieve, with Catherine Preston Connolly.

And Adam Shulman is the Transportation

Planner with the Traffic and Parking --
Traffic Parking and Transportation Department and does much of the -- actually, both he and Stephanie do a lot of the review of projects that are -- that come before the Board and that -- to look at their, how they're providing for parking, for bicycle parking, and how they're dealing with their transportation.

This group that -- we've been the staff team working on this for about a year, together on it for about a year. And this is of course an issue that's been of concern to the city for a very long time. They bring the expertise in bicycling and bicycle parking. It's something that I really didn't know much of anything about when I started this. And I think I've learned quite a lot. I'm going to try to impart some of that to
you during the presentation as I go through briefly what is being -- what's being proposed. They will help and fill in, answer questions as needed.

As you mentioned, Mr. Chair, the members of the Bicycle Committee are present and they have had input into this during the process. The Planning Board has had much input during the process, and ultimately voted to send to the Council as a petition and now it's back for the Planning Board to consider.

HUGH RUSSELL: And just let me say that our role here is to make a recommendation to the Council as to whether it should be adopted or perhaps amended.

It's likely that we will recommend this favorably since it's -- we submitted it, but it often happens that people come to
hearings, raise issues, and then we consider those issues as part of our recommendation. JEFF ROBERTS: Right.

So being in little bit of a sort of in between position, I don't want to bore members of the board who have been through this whole process of developing the petition, but for the benefit of new members and for the public, I'm just going to try to briefly go through some of the background and elements of the petition and then leave time for questions that we can take either prior to and/or subsequent to the public hearing.

So, bicycling, to start off, with fits in, it's a part of many of the different urban planning goals that we have for the city; getting cars off the street and helping to protect the environment, reduce the impact of climate change and greenhouse emissions.

There are health elements to it in terms of promoting active living. And there are also economic development aspects not only as we found -- not on1y does bicycling get people to work, it also has been found to increase patronage of local businesses in areas where you have more people bicycling.

There are many -- there's been much
planning work done already in the city with regard to bicycling. If you go even back to the growth policy of 1993, it notes, as you can read there on the bottom, that one of the areas that Cambridge continues to strugg1e with, while we have done a lot to increase bicycling and support bicycling, is providing an adequate amount of storage for the bicycles. And of course it's all part of a system. If you want more people to bicycle, they do need to have a place to put their
bicycles before and after their trips.
So bicycle parking is something that we have had in the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance since 1981. So it's worth thinking, thinking back on that as we've been doing as to why change it? What needs to be changed? And certainly we've learned a lot between 1981 and the present about bicycling and about bicycle parking and what the needs are.

One is that we've established clearer goals with regard to the amount of bicycling that we should expect to be seeing in the city and that we want to see in the city. That goal has been established as 10 percent of all trips made by bicycle. That's been, that's been sort of the working standard, and I'11 talk a little bit about that. There are issues with regard to how bicycle parking is designed, and we have been looking very
closely not only at our own experiences in Cambridge, but at the standards that are employed by different cities around the country that are seeing comparable increases in bicycling as a viable mode of transportation.

And then a third element is really just as we've learned over time how the particular regulations we have have been implemented. And first we have found that there are some areas where there could be improvements in the application of those requirements.

So looking at the question of quantity, this is a, this is a chart that we've shown a lot and I just wanted to -- we like to show it, and I really want to make sure that this sinks in. This is a ten-year trend, and we've seen from direct observed counts, a tripling in the amount of bicycles travelling
on Cambridge streets. That's pretty serious. And I was just -- as I was putting this together, actually, just thinking about how you rarely see anything in urban planning, it's extremely rare to see a trend where something has changed so dramatically in such a relatively short period of time. So this is really, this is really something that's happening and it's a result of a kind of dovetailing different kinds of things:

One being the long history of bicycle planning that's been done in support for bicycling through creating new facilities on the street for cycling, for supporting employers, and providing bicycle parking where we've been able to do so. And also just the general trends in the way people want to live, the way people want to want to travel, you know, wanting to spend more time
outside of their cars and travelling in a way that's more active and more environmentally sustainable.

So here's just some more background related to that. As I mentioned, the city goal has been through its vehicle trip production and other environmental goals has been to encourage 10 percent of all trips made by bicycle.

If you look at the chart on the right, that's from the U.S. Census. Again, just a kind of remarkable trend. Cambridge, I think, is of all the major cities that you might put on a list, Cambridge has, I think, the lowest percentage of people who drive alone to -- as a means of commuting. And bicycling, as you see from that, from that survey is already fully seven percent and has been increasing dramatically. So who --
that's an average from 2006 to 2010. So it's really anyone's guess how much it's increased now and what we'11 see in the future. But we do actually have an intercept survey that was done in 2012, and I wanted to include that because I mentioned the impact on economic development and supporting local businesses. And in Porter Square when they surveyed people, they found a full half of the people who were patronizing businesses there, were walking there, a full 10 percent were getting there by bicycle. So, again, really interesting trends, and the data really backs up the direction that the city is heading.

Bicycle ownership is a similar, a similar trend. We see that the majority of households in Cambridge own bicycles, and of the ones that own bicycles, a majority of those have more than one. So we're seeing
trends of more than one bicycle owned per household and increasing at some rate.

Meanwhile we're seeing automobile ownership trends at less than one automobile per household and falling. The -- we had a just I guess informally there's a project that the Planning Board saw, a residential project that just got its occupancy a little while back and informally reported that it's a product that has one auto parking space per unit and one bicycle parking space per unit. The bicycle parking is full and demand is still there. The auto parking is not full. So definitely a shift, a noticeable shift in the way people are travelling.

And then shifting to design. There, you know, bicycle parking is just by saying is a little bit of an abstract concept.

People might visualize different things, but
over time as more people bicycle and more people start to use it, we start to learn more about what some of the important features of bicycle parking are. The important performance standards, such as being able to conveniently get a bike in and out of it. That's sometimes not the case when you see a bicycle parking facility.

Making sure the bicycles are protected. Making sure they're accessible to all users. So just not the sort of ath1etic types who can, you know, pick up a bike and kind of throw it around however they want, but people of all ages and all different levels of ability. And accommodating a range of bicycle types. I think Steven Winter pointed out and has pointed out several times that there are lots of different types of bicycles you see on the roads, some of them
with different pertinences, and so having bicycle parking that can accommodate maybe not every type of bicycle you might imagine, but at least a wide range of the types of bicycles you might see is extremely important.

And just as a general rule, having
something that can -- that when someone installs it, you know is going to last over time. And with these considerations in mind we do have resources that have been developed and compiled by cities from around the country, including Cambridge as well as Seattle, Portland, Oakland, Philadelphia; cities that have seen lots more cycling and have actually taken action in the past maybe five or six years to update their own Zoning requirements for bicycle parking.

And here's the, just the examples of
how -- not all bicycle parking is created equal. Just because it's called, just because someone calls it bicycle parking doesn't mean it's working. And of course the types of issues that you might have are really not having as many spaces as you think you might have, and, you know, the bikes in the bushes and everything else which becomes a problem, not just for the cyclist but for everyone who using that space.

So now just shifting into the petition itself, and I'm going to try to walk through the parts of this quickly. This looks a little bit like an eye exam, but I wanted to highlight because it is I believe a 38-page document that was ultimately sent to the City Council, that it is really one key part of this, and that's the creation of a new section that encompasses really all of the
pertinent regulations that have to do with bicycle parking. And then beyond that there's a few change -- significant but small changes that have to do with the way different sections of the Ordinance treat bicycle parking. And then, you know, there's a few changes that are really very minor and just kind of cross-referencing and clearing up any inconsistencies between what we're proposing here in the new Section 16.100 and other parts of the Ordinance.

So the main part, this new section has eight different parts to it. I'm just going to touch on each one of them. The purpose is something you can read. It's not something that we -- it is in the general purpose of the Ordinance to promote bicycling and to promote non-automobile travel. This is just
a little more specific statement about why we
have bicycle parking requirements.
There are some general terms and
standards. Probably the most important is the distinction between long-term bicycle parking which is meant to be day long or overnight or multiple days versus short-term parking, which is meant for trips of a few minutes or a few hours. And this is a standard, again, that's used in other cities as well, comes from the best practices and from acknowledging that both of those types of bicycle parking are important and have varying levels of importance depending on the type of use that you're establishing.

Applicability really has to do more toward with just general Zoning principles then with bicycle parking in particular.

Zoning kicks in when you have new
construction or when you're making a
significant alteration to something that's there. The rule for automobile parking is that any time you increase the intensity of use by 15 percent or more, which essentially means if you're doing something that would increase the number of parking spaces, you would need to have, then -- by that amount, then you would need to, then you would need to follow the requirements. And there are a couple, there are a couple of key differences.

One is that, this was following
discussion with the Planning Board, and some of the issues that came up that we make an exception for bicycle parking for lots with three or fewer units. The discussion being that on smaller properties, you may tend to have more owner occupancy and more, you could provide -- allow more flexibility in the way
that they can deal with their bicycle parking. One of the -- another difference is that when bicycle parking requirements are triggered, instead of simply providing the increase, providing bicycle parking for increase in intensity, you are required to provide bicycle parking for the entire use. And this is to make sure that the demand is really fully being satisfied in those cases where there's a significant change on a property. It's a little complicated. I can go back into that if there are questions.

The location breaks down fairly simply. When you're doing long-term parking, it's expected to be within the same building that the use its serving or within a separate structure that can be located within 200 feet walking distance. The goal with long-term parking is that it's secure and enclosed and
limited for access only by the people who are authorized to be there.

Short-term parking, the options are to provide it within 50 feet of the entrance, like the bike parking we have out in front here is actually much less than 50 feet, but 50 feet's a pretty reasonable distance. And then the option is to, if that can't be met, is to contribute to a fund which could be used to install public bicycle parking on the sidewalk. It could be used more flexibly to install things like seasonal bicycling corrals which can provide, which during warmer months when there's less demand for on-street parking can really help to satisfy the increase in bicycle parking demand when it's warm.

The design and layout standards are again fairly simple. The -- and the point of
this is really to have a set of requirements that are easy to follow, easy to install, easy to maintain. If you look at it in comparison to all auto parking, we tend not to worry too much about, you know, what makes an auto parking space an auto parking space. It's in the Zoning. It says your auto parking space has to be these dimensions, has to be accessed in this way. And so we have a similar approach here where there's a set of standards that if you just follow the standards, than you meet it.

Access is something that is important. Again, for auto parking, again, for bicycle parking, the primary access uses a set of rules that are very similar. If you're familiar with them, with ADA requirements, Americans with Disabilities Act requirements which actually do apply to bicycle parking as
well as just uses in general.
Secondary access there's provision for providing -- for allowing secondarily bicycle parking to be accessed through steeper ramps, through stairway channels which means being able to move it up and down a set of stairs.

The no obstructions rule, we needed to be -- we felt that we needed to be more forceful about it even though it's, it's stated in the current Ordinance that there shouldn't be obstructions, we still tend to see things like this which is obviously an issue.

And in terms of the quantity of parking required, again, this is based on the studies that we've done and the city goal of accommodating 10 percent of expected trips. That does increase to a standard of 20 percent when we're talking about college and
university uses, and we were able to draw on data for a variety of sources to come up with a set of requirements that make sense. We have some flexibility allowed within this structure, particularly to allow long-term spaces to be shifted to short-term spaces. That can be, that can serve a number of different purposes.

One is if you have a small retail-type of use, instead of having to provide one indoor bike parking space, which might be a difficult thing to do and may not really serve the goals very well, you can provide all of your parking as short-term parking where it's really needed the most.

Similarly I think from some discussion
with the Bicycle Committee brought up the idea that in certain circumstances people might want to use the outdoor racks more than
using indoor bike parking, and so there's some flexibility to allow that to happen. Not to completely get rid of the long-term requirement, but to shift in a limited way. And then the final section of this or final part of this section is to deal with modifications. There's currently no provision for making any modifications for bicycle parking requirements except going to a BZA for a Variance. The rationale for having -- well, allowing the Planning Board to make modifications is really two-fold: One, if there's new, you know, we -bicycle parking continues to evolve and bicycle parking continues to evolve and we certainly don't want to be in the way of what might be the, you know, the future of providing bicycle parking, but we do know that these types of, if there's new
technologies in place, they require testing, they require monitoring. The last thing we want to do is have something installed that seems like it works great today but fails tomorrow and end up with a lot of headaches. So making sure that those, that those are allowed but that they get careful review and are permitted with conditions, is important.

And then similarly you might have situations if you have a, for instance, a campus-style development whether on a university or a private campus where it might make sense to have your bicycle parking provided in a slightly different way. Maybe is it pooled parking that serves multiple buildings, multiple uses. That's something that we'd like to be able to permit, again, by submitting a plan to the Planning Board.

You say to the Planning Board, here's our
plan for bicycle parking, here's how it meets the intent of the requirements, and then you can proceed according to your plan.

So that's the, that's the main piece of it. Just to touch on the additional pieces, the definitional piece, bicycle parking is -bicycles are actually included within the general concept of parking which sometimes creates confusion. It's more sensible and a little bit more intuitive to have a separate definition for bicycle parking that's not the same thing as for automobile parking. And making sure that parking, where it's referred to in the Ordinance, refers to automobile parking as it's usually conventionally meant to apply.

The three pieces having to do with gross floor area, private open space, and yards are really meant to resolve any
impediments in the current Zoning Ordinance to providing that bicycle parking. And that would apply whether the parking -- as long as the bicycle parking is designed according to the standards, it would apply whether or not that bicycle parking is required. So even if you're not required to provide the bicycle parking, you can get these, you're entitled to these exemptions. These are exemptions that really exist within our current Ordinance, but in terms of the application enforcement we found over time that they needed some clarification. So that's why those changes are included in the petition.

And then the final piece of it is modification throughout Article 6 that are meant to provide cross-references where they're needed, to eliminate some of the conflicting language that is currently in the

Ordinance with what's being proposed, and the one kind of substantive piece has to do with the plans submission requirements. So when someone's proposing a project with parking and with bicycle parking, they will submit a plan of it. Often it goes to Traffic and Parking, Adam will look at it, and we'11 see something like this, and wonder, you know, where's the bike parking and how do I have any idea whether it conforms to the requirements that are in the Zoning. So just making it clear within the plan requirements that you have to show your bike parking at a closer in scale so that we can actually tell whether or not it conforms before it gets approved.

So that is the overview of the petition and hopefully we can answer again any questions either before or after public
comment.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, it's been our principle to go straight to public comment so that we've got everything on the table.

So, when people are recognized, if they would come forward, you should give your name and address, speak at the microphone, and speak in accordance with our three-minute time limit rule. And the timekeeper is Pam and she will let you know.

So the first name on the list is Debbie Galiffe (phonetic).

## DEBBIE GALIFFE: My name is Debbie

Galiffe. I live at 93 Hammond Street. I'm a member of the Cambridge Pedestrian Committee. I believe that our Chair Helen Rowe submitted a letter to you. I'm seconding the letter. We're in favor of the petition in part because we wanted to encourage sustainable
means of transportation; walking and bicycling. And also in part because mandated bike parking gets rid of some of the clutter on the sidewalks. There -- I'm also a cyclist and I often find it's difficult to park my bike because there's no place to park it. People park it on all different places, trees, everywhere. We fee1, I fee1, at least, that if it's organized and if there's adequate amount and adequate amount, would be a lot better for pedestrians on sidewalks. And I guess that's really all I wanted to say. So we're very much in favor of the petition and we hope you approve it. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much. DEBBIE GALIFFE: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Katherine Hornby. KATHERINE HORNBY: My name is

Katherine Hornby. I live at Gurney Street in

West Cambridge. I'm the Vice Chair of the Bicycle Committee and I'm here to speak in favor of this petition as well.

I've submitted a letter in an earlier
stage of the process which I think still
holds true, but I just wanted to say today that first that biking is good. I think it's good environmentally. Although days like this make me support global warming. But generally I think it's good from an environmental perspective. It's good from a public health perspective and a social perspective, people being out and about and visible on the street and communicating in a way that's just not possible if you're in a car.

I think that if we are, if we as a city are to support biking, we need to support bike facilities, we need to support bike
lanes, and we need to support bike storage.
And that brings me to the more specific points of the Zoning Regulations. I think these, these updates to the Zoning

Regulations will make it clearer what we expect in terms of, you know, sufficiency of bike parking spaces in terms of adequacy of bike parking spaces from a design standpoint, and I think they improve the transparencies, transparency of the process. I think right now there's a lot of -- the city has a set of expectations which are not clearly communicated to developer and so developers don't really understand what's expected and there's a lot of ad hoc negotiation. I think that this will help cut through that and help everybody as to what's wanted and what's needed. That's what I have to say.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

## Taylor Walker.

TAYLOR WALKER: Hi, my name is
Taylor Walker. I live at 71 Port Street in East Cambridge. I'm also a member of the Bicycle Committee and an architect by trade. And I just wanted to also support -- I agree completely with what Katherine said and I support the petition. I think it's really important to make clear standards so that everyone knows what they are especially when you're doing design work. It can be confusing if you're trying to meet parking standards, are mixed up with the bike standards.

Another point that I just want to support is that I think that having the Zoning apply to three-family houses would be a really good addition to the petition just because I think that a lot of times renters
and tenants that live in three-family houses also might want bike parking and owneroccupied buildings are, you know, single-family but a lot of the three-family condos should also have those sort of facilities provided for them.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak? JOHN HAWKINSON: Oh, sure, I'11 speak, Hugh.

## HUGH RUSSELL: A rare --

 JOHN HAWKINSON: John Hawkinson, H-a-w-k-i-n-s-o-n, 84 Massachusetts Avenue.Generally I appear before you hiding in the back as a news reporter, but as a cyclist

I'11 just point out to second the comment about three-family housing. I know you very carefully removed the requirement for three-family housing that is both
three-family and new construction from the, you know, I don't mean to be form shopping, but I think it's worth another look at that question. Requiring it for three-unit housing that's new I think is not too much of a stretch. Asking retrofitting is a big stretch and maybe two, two units is a big stretch. But there are a lot of people who rent bikes who are stuck with really horrible ways to try to squeeze them in and that happens in three-family units.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
ADAM VILLERE: Hi, my name is Adam
Villere, V-i-1-1-e-r-e. I'm at Harding Street.

And I'm actually here tonight on behalf of the Boston Cyclist Union. I want to both
support my support and the cyclist union support for the Zoning Petition. We think this is a fantastic thing to encourage all users to make the transition to replacing trips with bicycles and making this more accessible and the accessibility guidelines we're very supportive. And so I wanted to express that. I also wanted to express my gratitude for mention in the three-unit requirement as the two previous comments mentioned, I think including three units would really help apply to it because so much of the houses in Cambridge is triple deckers, you know, and smaller units, that having that extra accessible is really going to catch more residents and, you know, doing it into new construction wil1 make it easier. So hopefully get more people into bicycles. So that's all I have to add and thank you very
much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
KAELA VRONSKY: My name is Kaela
Vronsky, K-a-e-1-a V-r-o-n-s-k-y. I 1ive at 51 Museum Street. And I use -- I bike as my main mode of transport, and I just wanted to express my excitement for this petition both for myself and also for all of the community benefits that have already been mentioned and I just wanted to second the support that previous speakers also expressed on the three-unit addition for the petition.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one.
So now we will discuss this matter.

I suppose, Ted, you should explain the thinking of the Board on the one-, two- and three-family question.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Surely.

This was a matter that we discussed in really great detail over a series of meetings and Jeff could obviously talk about some of the statistics that he presented to us.

Perhaps I was leading the charge, maybe I was the most vocal in opposition to -- I think the original proponent was for, did not exclude single- and two- and three-families for new construction, but did exclude singleand two-family retrofitting. I believe that given the nature of Cambridge and the fact that so many houses exist on small lots, not just single families but single- and two- and three-family houses exist on very small lots, the requirement of providing -- mandating an
enclosed storage area in many of these lots simply does not make sense. I use myself as a homeowner. The proposed shed would take up probably a third -- well, maybe a fifth of my backyard. There would be no place to put one on a side yard. I do have five bicycles.

They're in my basement. I manage to get them in and out through the bulkhead all the time when I need them. And I think that it should be up to a homeowner and the percentages of homeowners in single and two families is very great, but I think a lot of triple deckers are also owner-occupied and I just don't think that it is appropriate to mandate bicycle parking in single- and two- and three-family houses. We do not mandate storage sheds. We do not mandate baby stroller storage outdoors. There are lots of things that are not required. I understand a
lot of triple deckers have tenants in them.
I think that's an issue that tenants can take up with landlords. Just as not every tenant gets an automobile parking spot when they rent a unit in a triple decker, tenants may or may not get a bicycle parking spot, and I think that's -- if it's an issue for a tenant, that's something that they and the market can control. And I very strongly personally oppose the idea of mandating requirement in single-, two- and three-family houses. Certainly with regard to the other, you know, larger structures, both residential and commercial, everything that's in the by-1aw I strongly support. HUGH RUSSELL: Question for the
staff. We obviously have a lot of three deckers in the city. As if they were falling into the purview of this Ordinance, the
existing ones would not be required to provide new parking. So my question is: Are there many new three-family structures being built?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm trying to think back to the statistics that we showed. I think that certainly the majority of new housing units created in the city are through construction of projects that are 20 units or more. So that's the majority of the new units, but there are, I think, somewhere along the lines of a few --

ADAM SHULMAN: Percent?
JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. It's sort of
one of those things more than one percent but maybe less than three percent fall into that smaller project range. Those are projects that the Planning Board obviously doesn't see as much of, but there are occasionally
projects that are on smaller lot, new
construction on a smaller lot where either an existing structure is torn down and they're building a new three-unit building or just in a vacant lots that's been divided in a certain way that it results in a three-unit buildings being built.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Jeff, condo
conversions would not count?
JEFF ROBERTS: No, no. Again, the
standard is just any, any new construction or any conversion that increases the intensity of the use by more than 15 percent. It could, that could include, and we could think about how we would want to, how we might want to apply it, but it could include, for instance, a two-unit building that were increased to have three units in it, which under our Zoning Requirements would require
to add an auto parking space. And under the proposal and the petition would not be required to provide any bicycle parking.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Cara Seiderman,
Community Development Department. So I just pulled up the information from the last presentation. The statistics that Jeff had pulled up, two pieces of information:

One is that for the three-family units,
I mean three-unit buildings, 71 percent of the units are rental. And that is different from the two-family, that's 54 percent rental. And of course single-family is if they're detached, it's 14 percent rental and attached single families are 32 percent rental. So it goes up and up and up. But there is a marketed difference when you get into that. And it's approximately a dozen new, three, three-family units a year. So
that's 12 times, it's about 50 units, 12
times three would be that a year approximately.

HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.
PAMELA WINTERS: (Inaudible).
HUGH RUSSELL: Under our new rules
we could.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, it's
already discussion mode.
PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: That's the standard.
PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, that's right.
HUGH RUSSELL: And as we keep asking
questions, I think we ought to leave the hearing open.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
I just want to say that I agree with Ted and he more eloquently put his thoughts out there than I could, so I just wanted to
second Ted's thinking on this.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
Catherine.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Can
someone from staff remind me for new construction of one-, two- and three-family houses, are there automobile parking spaces required?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, automobile parking spaces are provided to a general citywide standard that automobile parking be provided a rate of one space per residential unit.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.
JEFF ROBERTS: And that applies to any type of housing.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I
guess, then, just to differentiate from Ted's comments, I think it -- the whole point of
this Ordinance is to say that bicycles are not the same as baby strollers, that they are a form of transportation, and that in a situation where we're requiring the provision of automobile parking, it is appropriate to provide bicycle parking. And, again, we're talking just about new construction. And just as a new construction project could go to the BZA for relief from the requirements for automobile parking if it were appropriate, they could similarly find that relief for bicycle parking. HUGH RUSSELL: Other comments? TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm painfully aware that I might be going over territory that you've spent hours already discussing, but just quick1y anecdotally you referenced the project where the project, the parking spaces were all full and -- sorry, the parking
spaces were not full and the bike parking spaces were already fully committed. Is there a provision in this section that we're looking at that incentivizes bicycle parking over car parking? Is there a trading mechanism here?

JEFF ROBERTS: No, it's not part of this proposal. We had -- as we worked on this, we made a conscious choice to keep bike parking its own separate provision. To keep auto parking separate. There are some, as we looked at some examples, there are cities that have taken that approach of, you know, transferring bike, auto parking to bicycle parking. It's certainly a consideration that has its merits, but in this case we have, we have a provision. We wanted to make sure we got the bicycle parking right and then we do have a provision through Special Permit to
reduce auto parking where there's a case to be made for the reduction in auto parking. HUGH RUSSELL: So in fact a recent
case that actually happened up on
CambridgePark Drive where in the design review process more bicycle parking, bigger bicycle parking showed up, some cars disappeared, and they probably are still way over parked if the experience of the project down the street applies to them which, was it 55 percent?

ADAM SHULMAN: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: On the old one, and it's 85 percent on the one we just approved. So I suppose one would have to come back to somebody to get permission to reduce in the case that Jeff was talking about. To be kosher they'd have to do it. But of course they could just buy bicycle racks and put
them where cars were and probably nobody would file a complaint.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, are we
still talking about just the one to three families or --

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we're -STEVEN COHEN: -- broader? HUGH RUSSELL: -- we're broader.

Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: I just had a question. I'm clear and very happy about the applicability of these bicycle standards to new construction that I would even, you know, be satisfied with imposing this requirement on new construction on one- to three-unit homes. But what I want to ask about is the applicability of the standards to existing structures. Is it my understanding that they are applicable if there's any expansion of 15
percent or more, and that in event of such expansion the standards are applicable not only to the increased square footage, but applicable to the entire building or use which is being expanded? Is that the case? JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, that's the proposal in the petition. And so for a residential project that would mean an increase. An increase in intensity means the increase in the number of units of 15 percent or more. And then in the case of a non-residential use, a commercial use, it could be an expansion in floor area of an office building or a retail use. For instance, it could also be a conversion of something. So for instance, it's a large or maybe a 10,000 square foot office building converts into CVS or retail use. So under the parking requirements this is fairly
consistent for both auto parking and for the proposed bicycle parking, a conversion from office to retail has a larger requirement.

And if that increase is more than 15 percent, than as part of that conversion, the proponent would be required to install bicycle parking that conforms to the standards for the entire, for the entire use. STEVEN COHEN: Just as I look at your standard, I look at some of the numbers, the numbers can be breathtaking for an existing building. If, you know, you look at an office building which could be hundreds of thousands of square feet, and it's an older building and it doesn't have any parking, if they modify their use or expand somewhat, gosh, you could be, you know, suddenly having a requirement for, you know, well over 100, 200 bicycle parking spaces. Or I think of
the old courthouse, for goodness sakes, how big is that? I don't know, 500,000 feet or larger. That would be close to 200 parking spaces long term. I guess I'm just wondering about the feasibility of that in many instances and to what extent does the Planning Board then have discretion to modify or waive the requirement and what are the criteria that the Planning Board must apply in such applications?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. So that, I
guess I'11 try to take your last question first.

The Planning Board under the section that I described previously would have the ability to modify any of the requirements that are in that section regarding bicycle parking. So depending on what the issue is, if the issue were access, that they could
have a parking facility, but that the access had to be done slightly differently, than is mandated in the Zoning. That's something the Planning Board could grant relief for. And the Planning Board would be judging it on is whether it meets the parking demand adequately given the nature of the use. So the, you might -- while you might say that, and kind of going back into the first part of your question, yes, that's true. When you're converting a building from one use to another, if it's a very large building and there aren't that many buildings as large as the courthouse, but if you do have a large building, that can be a pretty significant requirement that you have to meet. You have to meet it for auto parking as well as for, as well as for bicycle parking. And one of the things that we noted as we discussed
before, is that when you compare the auto parking requirements, the bicycle parking requirements, the bicycle parking requirements are just in terms of sheer space are still much, much smaller and can be accommodated in different ways. And while the standards that are being proposed here are fairly strict, they're still not nearly as onerous as the auto parking requirements. So, the Planning Board, looking at a project like that would look at it in the both specifically in terms of whether the bicycle parking is being provided in a way that adequately meets the needs and that's something that the staff would be able to review and weigh in on. But also looking at from the more general point of view of, you know, what is it important from a planning perspective, what's important for the city
and, you know, and then as Hugh was
mentioning before, in some cases that means weighing the need for bicycle parking with the need for auto parking. In some case that means the Planning Board might exercise its ability to reduce some auto parking requirements in exchange for better fulfilling the bicycle parking requirements. So you're correct, there are circumstances where you're converting a large building there may be a requirement and they may have to be met in some creative ways and that's one of the ways why the Planning Board has ways to make modifications.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm curious based on your description of it, the needs of a building being converted clearly are not being met, but the proponent argues that is simply not feasible because of the, you know,
configuration of the building or the lack of space on the lot or, you know, some other grounds, does the Planning Board get -- have the power to modify or waive requirements under those circumstances where there really isn't the argument that the needs are being met? They clearly are not being met.

JEFF ROBERTS: Well, if the Planning
Board can't make that finding, then there's always -- the developer always has the recourse to go to the BZA for a Variance. And that would be I think more fitting with what you're describing. If there were a particular hardship that were, that just were the circumstances of the site that then the proponent could make a case at the BZA that because of that hardship that the requirements, that they could not make economic use of the property while meeting
those requirements.
ADAM SHULMAN: Jeff, is it also the piece about being able to contribute to a fund.

ROGER BOOTHE: Could you speak up, please?

ADAM SHULMAN: I was raising the question if whether or not in the short-term parking situation there's the option to be able to contribute to a fund, right, if you can't meet that condition? Is there, is that another similar solution?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. That's
another, I guess that's another general thing to point out in terms of the proposal is that the intent is to have requirements that can be complied with, not to have requirements that are, that are so inflexible that it, that the default option would be to try not
to be to comply with them. And so, for instance, in short-term parking if you, if you have a lot where you have a building it's built all the way out to the edges of the lot, you couldn't possibly put your required short-term parking anywhere, then you have the option to contributing to a fund where it could be provided on the sidewalk, it could be provided on the site somewhere else in the way that the city has some -- can exercise some discretion in where it's located. And for long-term parking you could have, there could be shared arrangements with abutting uses. There could be a separate -- if the building couldn't accommodate it, but the lot could accommodate it, you could accommodate a second structure. And, again, you could find, if you could accommodate it within the building but had access issues, you could
look to the Planning Board for variations that might allow you some flexibility where it is provided. There is flexibility built into it. And just in terms of the standards that we have, you know, we have seen projects that typically conversions of non-residential structures to residential use which has been a typical type of case that the Planning Board often sees, and we've been able to deal with those cases. In most cases they have been able to provide bicycle parking as needed and according to the standards that we look for.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: I think I have two
comments. One is that we had a case last week which the property owner added four apartments in the basement on Wendell Street.

And before there was a wide open basement and
there was lots of bicycle parking space under the proposal, he found one legitimate parking space for every unit in the building that consumed less than the basement but that was just in one of the constraints that went into the plan. And I sort of wonder in my own practice which is mostly with sort of fairly far out suburban development, and it's like, I tell my clients, you know, I had to have one parking space per unit, which comes to about 15 percent because that's the LEED standard. It's 15 percent of the occupants so it's more than 15 percent per unit, you know, they'd go ballistic. Some day would be wonderful if indeed in that location there would be that much bicycle transit. Although I've only once ridden my bicycle to such a project, I just did it to prove I could do it. It was like 12 miles each way and I only
did it once.
STEVEN WINTER: Did you pay the tol1
on the Mass. Pike?
HUGH RUSSELL: This was actually on a northern project and I was able to go on city streets the whole way. I ended up on Lynnfield. The last little bit on Route 1 was a little challenging but I stayed on the sidewalk. So I think a lot of it is changing people's -- you've got to change people's minds. This is the reality in Cambridge now. This is the kind of uses that we may actually have to rethink it in five years or ten years and we have to say it's not enough anymore. You know.

I'11 tell you one story. I was on the Zoning Board when Au Bon Pain, which was a new company then, came to ask if they could install a facility in Holyoke Center which
had previously been a men's clothing store, and there was a requirement for 10 additional automobile parking spaces just because that's the way the Ordinance worked. And they came to the Board because the Holyoke Center Garage could not readily be expanded. And I thought, you know, it's hard for me to find bicycle parking. So I said, okay, you've got to provide 10 bicycle parking spaces and the university went ballistic. Oh, you know, it's going to block the sidewalk. It's going to create tripping hazards down there. It took them four years to figure it out. But I now park there frequently because Au Bon Pain is the start of my day. But, you know, and they have a bicycle parking arrangement which I think might require -- might or might not require a Variance or a slight thing. It may not quite meet the dimensional requirements.

CARA SEIDERMAN: It's close. A
little bit further away but otherwise you could do it, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And actually it's
very good. And the biggest problem there is bicycles on rusted chains that should be removed.

So, I don't know, I think that we're doing something that we are bringing new territory, and so I don't know. Do we want to circle around to the three-family or just --

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Can I make a few
comments and I would like to circle around.
Your comments were very thoughtful. I just had a few things that I wanted to mention.

The public bicycle parking fund, I don't know
how that's going to be structured or how it's going to be set up, but I do think it needs to have an advisory board or something on it.

It just can't be a city account of some -- I think it has to have business input into how that money is going to be spent throughout the city. We need, we need business people to tell us what they need.

And, Jeff, this is very sma11, but on page 5 of 36 , you mentioned that the wave racks do not meet the standards and they're prohibited. And I guess my question is: Is it really necessary to say that we don't want certain things? If it is, then let's say it. If it doesn't meet our standards, then it doesn't meet our standards. Is it, is it a naughty sort of a bicycle rack all across the country?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, I mean, I would
-- yes, I would certainly defer to the Board's judgment on that one. You can make a recommendation. You could express your views on it. Well, there's a balance, I think, between making the Zoning so tight that you really aren't saying anything that's unnecessary and really providing guidance where you feel that guidance might be needed. And despite, you know, what you see here on the top right, you go anywhere around the country, that style of rack is for some reason the -- tends to be the most popular thing that gets installed whenever someone is installing bicycle parking.

STEVEN WINTER: And is in fact the wave rack?

JEFF ROBERTS: That's the wave rack
and that's the shape. Something about it really looks compelling when you buy it out
of the catalog I guess but it's --
STEVEN WINTER: It's clean.
JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, but it just
doesn't, it doesn't park bikes.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay. We don't need to spend any more time on it. I get it. I really do understand it. And there are just a couple of more.

I wanted to say, you know, when you -actually one of my points was that this -the staff have really done a good job putting flexibility where appropriate, and particularly I'm on page 8 of 36 where I'm looking at 6.106.2 there's flexibility there and it's appropriate. And then when you go down to 6.107 .1 at the very bottom of page 8 of 36 , you're saying that any bicycle parking space that meets the requirements for both long-term parking and short-term parking may
contribute to the minimum requirement for one or the other but not both.

So what you've done is very good.
Things are very tight where they're supposed to be tight and there's flexibility and room for discussion where there's supposed to be. And I think that's consistently the tenor and the tone of this document. So I think we've really done well on that. That's what makes Cambridge Cambridge is our ability to be innovative when we can and when we see those openings.

The, on page 9 of 36 , the long-term bicycle parking requirements, I just wanted to make sure that we -- on our five that we've somehow checked with the hospitality industry to make certain that those numbers are appropriate. I don't know whether they are or not, but I just want to make sure that
we're not doing anything onerous to the hospitality industry because they're important in so many ways. And also somewhere on ours there, there may be room for the community residences of the group homes which are institutional group homes, groups homes, you know, our institution sort of emptied out into the seventies and we've got people living in the community now. And it's great. People from the larger institutions for mental retardation and the larger institutions for mental illness, that's terrific, and that's a good step. I don't know if the requirements would be the same or not, but those group homes are all over the place and we might want to mention them somehow.

A1so on page 10 of 36 , N5 mentions
storage facilities I think, and I wonder if
> we really want to ask storage -- is that correct, Jeff?

JEFF ROBERTS: So I'11 just make a general comment about this that covers the passed couple of comments. We really did our best to make sure that every use that's defined in the Zoning Ordinance has a -- has a really well thought out bicycle parking requirement for it without really going overboard in terms of detail. So storage facilities as a general class of industrial, sort of light industrial use, along with warehouses, you know, small manufacturing facilities.

STEVEN WINTER: Self storage.
JEFF ROBERTS: Right, self storage.
We apply the general rule based on those, what the occupancy of those tends to be. The storage facilities obviously not storing
people, they're not supposed to be, but people, you know, people do visit them to take things in and out of storage so there is a need of bicycle parking. That category of use, in that category of use the requirements are really very minimal. I think, you know, something that's 10,000 square feet might require one bike rack or something along those lines.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
JEFF ROBERTS: It's really a small
requirement, but the requirement is there to make sure that there is bicycle parking for those types of uses.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And they would have employees.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay. No, I get it.
I'm really -- actually most of my points are
really just to make it part of your own thought process. I think that the methodology that you've used, best practice and other numbers, I think these numbers are fine. There are just a few I wanted to push at and make sure they're on the right track with.

And I also thought on page 13 of 36 at the bottom of the page where you mentioned that the campus master plan, you know, in a town with as many universities as we have, that's a terrific piece to be there and I really am glad that that's there. And that may be it. Hang on.

Yes, there's one piece that I didn't understand and I'm on page 15 of $36,5.24 .1$. At the end of that it said the last -- the second to the last sentence, in addition objects or equipment located in a required
yard that are necessary or pertinent to a public bicycle sharing station. I just wasn't sure what that was.

JEFF ROBERTS: That was a Zoning change that we did last year. So if you remember there was the hubway system that was installed, and prior to doing that we were at the Planning Board and the City Council with a Zoning Petition that specifically allowed that use which we defined as a public bicycle sharing station in the Zoning Ordinance. And as part of allowing that use, we also made a provision for allowing it to be located within a required yard which is where you would, you would likely see it and where you do tend to see it in front of buildings which is within a yard space. So that's what that is. That's currently in the Ordinance.

That's not a proposed change. That's what's
there now.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay. I just wanted to make sure I knew what it was.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: And, you know, in a
general sense I, I've crossed a lot of things off my list as we had the discussion that I'm not going to mention because they're no longer issues. But in a general sense I think this text is really tight. It's tight where it's supposed to be tight, and it has flexibility where it's supposed to let us be flexible which is the way we make defensible decisions. So I think that we're really on the right track.

Mr. Chair, if you're ready, I'm wil1ing to revisit the three-family issue. And maybe I can just tell you where I came down on that.

I think that I still believe that the one- and two-family restrictions are a little onerous. But I think that the three-family may not be, particularly if it's for new construction only. And particularly if this owner can go to the BZA to request relief. If in fact it is such a difficult thing to do, I mean we need to tighten it as much as we can without being onerous and that could be a way that we can tighten this.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I'11 tell you
my thought when we had this discussion before was that it might make -- I would prefer if somebody was building a three-family structure that there was bicycle parking. I think that's appropriate. And because of the small size of the lot and the small size of the structure it may be difficult to meet the standards. And that my approach will be to
say yes, you've got to do what you can reasonably do and we can be authorized to cut some more slack than we ordinarily would because of this. That would be my preference. It was not the predominate or successful preference in the previous discussion. I think it's -- we think about you have to write something down on paper. You have to draw lines at certain places and they -- you could argue that they never fit anything perfectly. And so I'd rather have a statement of principle that they should be provided with three-family structures because I think that is the right thing to do when you're building if you can do it. So that's, I mean that's -- I think, and I think that they tend not to be -- I think it's unlikely that such structures are owner occupied in this day and age, but not impossible. I
think most of -- I'm surprised with your statistic because I think certainly on my street I'm not sure any of the three-family structures are in single ownership today. I think they all are condominiums which is a different dynamic.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, what you're saying that new three-family units should have new parking spaces plus three bicycle spaces parking for three bicycles?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, that's what I'm saying. But that we would be happy to build what we need to in that one instance be even more generous than we can be in other cases. But, you know, if they're providing three automobile spaces, they're providing a thousand square feet of automobile parking, and three bicycle spaces are I think something, like, what is it, 100 square feet?

# JEFF ROBERTS: Or 1ess. <br> HUGH RUSSELL: Or less? Yes. 

CARA SEIDERMAN: Less than. It's
like half of the quarter of the car parking space.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So it's like 70 square feet. They ought to be able to make it work.

PAMELA WINTERS: Does it have to be a covered parking space for bicycles?

HUGH RUSSELL: That might be one of the things that we might have to relax is the degree of coverage because that might become a problem in terms of -- Cara.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I was just going to
say that the kinds of coverage that we were showing in some of the examples for small units like that were just under a deck or something that was not fully enclosed one in
the same way that the long term that we showed that had to be fully enclosed and locked and what not. And those kinds of buildings that you might have something that, it does help to be covered but that like under a deck would be different from inside the building necessarily, and that might be one place that there could be flexibility.

HUGH RUSSELL: I sense we don't -we're not going to reach consensus on this subject?
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I'm -- I would say I'm not extremely opposed to requiring parking space for new construction of three-family houses. I think, I still remain opposed to it in existing three-family houses because I think the lots are very sma11. I think the requirement of three parking spaces plus short-term parking spaces
and the requirement of them being enclosed and locked, and in many of the instances there are not decks but things to be covered, I just think giving the existing housing stock we have it's very onerous for owners. If the compromise was at its required for new construction, new triple deckers, three-family units and that there was some greater flexibility for the Planning Board to modify the regulations as appropriate, I could live with that.

I also do want to say that I think we've generally been opposed to sending people to the ZBA to get Variances because it's, it's onerous, it's expensive, and -HUGH RUSSELL: And their agenda is busy.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And their agenda is busy. And I don't think that this is
something that they would normally want to do is hear about bike parking requirements.

But, you know, if there's strong feeling that new three-family construction should include a bike parking requirement, I could live with that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Can you live with that?

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. I do like the idea of having some flexibility where it can be parked underneath a deck or something like that rather than having, you know, a totally enclosed structure that's going to take up yard space. That's my -- I guess that was my, you know, and Ted mentioned that, about the backyard space and having a totally enclosed structure in your backyard, you know, that's something that I would find rather offensive. But I think putting it
under a deck is fine. You know, just having some flexibility like that.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, I also
agree that it might be okay to impose the requirement on new three families, but I, you know, the important prerequisite is the point that you raised of dramatically increasing our flexibility of standards. I think the way that I deal with my bicycles at my house, and they're just in a room and I have hooks on the wall and you hang them on the wall and it's very convenient and accessible. But there's no way that that arrangement would come close to meeting the standards that we had in our proposed new by-law. So if we're going to make, you know, such a home subject to the standards, I -- whether we rewrite the standards, there are separate standards to apply to such a situation, I think that would
be difficult to do. I think the better course would be to maximize the flexibility that this Board would have to modify or to waive the application of those standards in such a small three-family structure. And as you say, obviate the need to go to the ZBA for a Variance. I mean, that would just be unreasonable I think.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Jeff, do you have a comment.

JEFF ROBERTS: I wanted to follow up because Cara had something, and I just wanted to make sure that it was clear to everyone, especially the new Board Members that as the petition evolved we had at one point included a provision that allows for smaller lots such as three-unit lots with only three units, that there would be some flexibility in the long-term bicycle parking requirements so
that they could be provided instead of being in completely enclosed sort of shed type structure, they could be enclosed, you know, in a place where they could be covered, you know, from rain and snow and everything, and would be sort of reasonably protected by being located on the lot in such a way that they weren't just right out, you know, in the middle of the, off of the public way. But that they wouldn't be required to meet the, to meet the full range of standards of being fully enclosed and locked. And we did show some examples of that as Cara mentioned. We could certainly go back and look at reintroducing those standards in the case of a three-family building and in terms of the -- allowing the Planning Board flexibility we could certainly do that, too. We've already, we've already allowed that flexibility. And
really as I mentioned before, the standard is really are you meeting the requirement and are you providing the bicycle parking in an adequate manner. And so the Planning Board does have some discretion even in big cases and in small cases to ask that question and say have you, have you given us a proposal that makes the most sense given what you're proposing to do? And that can be, and so both of those approaches can apply.

## HUGH RUSSELL: So I would propose

 that we forward this proposal to the City Counci1 and recommending they adopt it and recommending that they look thoughtfully at a way of including bicycle parking in new three-family structures considering the potential difficulties of doing that on small sites. That we don't sort of try to sort it out how to do it because they've got to dosomething in the big house, you know.
STEVEN WINTER: The big house.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, if I could have a motion to that effect?

PAMELA WINTERS: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there a second?

STEVEN COHEN: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: Any more discussion on the motion?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Just a little discussion on the motion since I've been silent on the issue. I think it makes sense to break the Zoning Code at the proposed amendment at the three-family level.

Obviously there are other constituencies here tonight within the discussion. There are some saying, you know, we've got to have gardens, we've got to have infiltration, we
have to have usable open space. So there's a lot of pressure on these smaller lots. And so there's a dimensional issue here. The percentage of the lot that's going to be devoted to bicycle parking is much higher and at this smaller construction and so the flexibility has got to be built into the code as compared to the larger project. So I think where the Planning Board has landed tonight is actually wise and the break at three-family makes sense and that we can offer a lot of flexibility because there's a lot of other pressures on this precious property.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, any more discussion?

STEVEN COHEN: I think probably this will only apply to one project every five years or so. And I wouldn't be surprised if
the developers figure out how to take this to their advantage because after all the space devoted to bicycle parking doesn't count for FAR, so we may suddenty have 500 -foot rooms devoted to bicycle parking. But it does seem like a reasonable place to draw the line. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, then on the motion, all those in favor. (Raising hands). HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in favor.

And thank you very much. I believe we have nothing left to do so we are adjourned. (Whereupon, at $8: 55$ p.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)
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