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HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the Cambridge Planning Board.

The first item on our agenda is a review of zoning cases, and Liza is going to walk us through them.
LIZA PADEN: Do you want to start with
the sign, or do you want to start with MIT first? HUGH RUSSELL: Let's start with MIT
first.

LIZA PADEN: So MIT is coming in for a

BZA variance to alter an existing the building.
The building is at 50 Memorial Drive. And \(I\) sent out some of the plans and elevations for the proposal. This building, one of the things is this is the institutional building, which all of the buildings -- I think there is three, possibly four buildings on one parcel. So everything is calculated out of this one parcel. So anything
```

they do is a variance.
So the expansion they are doing, some of
it is to increase the accessibility. Some of it
is to install conference space. For the most
part, it looks like it is all within the existing
building footprint with some additional build-out
at the top floor for a conference center. And I
have some plans here if anybody wants to look at
them.

```
    HUGH RUSSELL: I would like to look at
them because \(I\) have not seen anything on this
case.
Is there a colloquial name that goes with
this building?
    THAYER DONHAM: It is the old Sloane
building.
    HUGH RUSSELL: And the nature of the
variance is setbacks?
    LIZA PADEN: So they are requesting
relief on the setbacks. Right now, it sits on

Memorial Drive. There is no setback on the front yard on Memorial Drive. It has a one-and-a-half foot setback -- sorry. I misspoke. Zero setback on Main Street, one and a half on Memorial Drive, and zero on Wadsworth Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is the total floor area on
the lot conforming?

LIZA PADEN: It is below. The existing
floor area is 632,000. They are asking for 649 .

And they are allowed 847. So they are below by about 200,000 square feet.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the general nature of
this is therefore altering a non-conforming building. I hope they are visiting Charles Sullivan.

LIZA PADEN: According to this, they don't anticipate a Historical Commission review, but \(I\) am sure they have been to his office.

THAYER DONHAM: We have been to his
office.

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't feel there is any reason we need to comment on this case. We could comment that this is more of a technicality than a substantive request because the uses are permitted, the amount of the floor area is permitted.

What is in violation is adding to
existing non-conforming pieces of the building.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

The other case \(I\) wanted to bring to your
attention is the sign proposal for the new EF International building.

So there has been a revision to the
proposal since they originally submitted it.
The size of the signs proposed for the
top of the building, and they will be on the south side the building, mounted on the penthouse as originally posed during the public hearing process for the special permit.

The signs that they are proposing are the same size as the signs that are installed on the existing EF building.

HUGH RUSSELL: So my question is, why does a wonderful corporate citizen need five vanity signs on two buildings?

LIZA PADEN: We actually have people from EF International here. They can answer the question directly.

HUGH RUSSELL: It strikes me that they have got two signs the present building. Two signs is probably plenty. If they want to move one from the other building to this building, because it is blocked by this building, sort of, from some points of view, I don't know. It seems really outrageous to me.

Nobody in the city has five signs of this
sort close to the river. There is tremendous
sensitivity. They are signs that are seen from
the river. We had thousands of people signed
petitions saying they didn't want to see more signs when they were on the river.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I don't necessarily feel
it is outrageous, but \(I\) think that you can't see this building all by itself before you are
looking at it standing there. It is right beside the other building, so \(I\) think you would need to look at the signage. I agree with you that the signage with the two buildings together is one way of looking at it. It is not like this is in a field somewhere.
```

If you even read the approval that they

```
gave before, it was because of its circumstance
that it was kind of isolated off in the corner.

But this building is right beside the other
building. So I need to see some rationale as to how the signs work or don't work together with the two buildings, versus what may, from an advertising or corporate promotions sense, work for this building. That is where I am right now.

STEVEN COHEN: I would also add,
especially looking at the elevation that the
applicant submitted, where you can see two signs
on the same building, one on each facade, that
seemed a little bit more than might be
necessarily, a bit of overkill.

LIZA PADEN: Steve, you are looking at
the original proposal. I think that the one that
is marked in red that Bill has, it says it is
revised.

STEVEN COHEN: Has one of them been
deleted?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, so now there is three signs.

STEVEN COHEN: No. Actually, it is still the same. A slightly different view, but you can still see the two signs.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think my position
on this a changed a lot over the years. When we were debating the branding and the zoning bylaw a
```

couple years ago, I was fairly in favor of it.
And then City Council passed it and then withdrew
in light of the great opposition in the City to
it.

```
                    And \(I\) spent a lot of time yesterday
walking around this area and Northpoint, and I
think \(I\) have come over to the idea that signs
should not be visible from the river and from
across the river, and that we are going to get a
lot more buildings in Northpoint. And this
building, which wants the sign, say, facing the
expressway and other areas, I think we are going
to get a lot of other buildings saying they want
to have signs facing the expressway. And then we
are going to have a wall of billboards,
essentially.
    Now I think the way the sign ordinance
stands now, since they are not allowed by special
permit, it has to be by a variance. I think,
yes, they will have to convince the \(Z B A\). But my
```

personal opinion right now is that there is a
sign on the other building. And to the extent
this is a campus of two building, I think it is
pretty clearly marked.

```
    STEVEN COHEN: For myself, I am not
troubled my having one additional sign on this
building. It is the second sign on the same
building that pushes me over the line.
    HUGH RUSSELL: So you have heard us.
Let's hear you.
    RICH McKINNON: Thank you, Mr. Russell.
    My name is Rich McKinnon. I live at
Northpoint, at 1 Leighton Street. And I have
been working with the development of the building
through the permitting process.
    I think one of the things we realized
when we developed this building and we came to
look at the issue of signage -- by the way, these
signs have gone through quite an evolution. I
think the Board may remember, they were pretty
substantial and they were up on the roof. And then they came down to the penthouse, and then they came down to the side of the building. And they now come down to the size that is identical to the size and identical to the illumination technique on the existing building, which has been pretty trouble free for the neighbors over the course of time that \(E F\) has been out there.

We went through a process with our neighbors, with the East Cambridge planning team, with the immediate abutters from the neighborhood.

And I think all of us that live out there
realize that there is one tricky thing: That
finding these buildings isn't quite so easy. As
it looks when you are coming down Route 28 North, you have got Cambridge College on your left, and you almost go by the building before you see the building.

I ran into the same trouble when \(I\)
developed One Memorial years ago with Steve

Statulli [phonetic]; we had to almost bring people to the building to look at space. It is very difficult to see the building and to know exactly where they are. You are coming at high speeds.

And the very tricky approach now is the approach coming off of Storrow Drive, because you have got the Charles Street jail there, and you pass the jail and you come upon the building. So we have gone out there. We have really slowly sort of made all the different approaches to it.

The one sign that, in meeting with your
staff, the one that was adjacent to the existing building seemed a reach too far, and we agreed with that. We thought it made sense to take the west facing down off of the building.

But the other three, if you look at the application to the BZA, they really all have a particular issue of finding the building as you approach the building, especially if you don't
know where the building is and where you are going in the first place.

So that, simply stated, is how we got to where we are tonight, Mr. Chairman.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess the problem I have with that argument is that seeing a building from several thousand feet away with a sign and having to negotiate a complicated series of streets are two different things.

I mean, people that visit my house who use a GPS on their phone -- ever since I got the GPS in my car, is it like that is how I find things. I think that is the way almost everybody finds things these days. And that will probably allow you to maneuver on foot or by car.

This is just a question of a proud
company saying "We want to shout out our name as loud as we can and as in as many directions as we can." And how many signs does Novartis have?

How many signs does Harvard University have like
this? None. How many does MIT have? None.

Okay. Well, maybe finding things at

Harvard or MIT is really quite challenging if you don't know the area. But \(I\) just don't know.

Is there any more comments?
H. THEODORE COHEN: The only last comment

I have in rebuttal to your argument is that this building is going to be quite spectacular, and it is going to be very obvious to anyone who is going there; just look for this building with this glass waterfall down the front. I don't think anybody is going to have difficulty finding that building. And \(I\) think it just then becomes branding for the company's name on the building, which I can understand. But \(I\) think the city has spoken out against that, and you have to take it to the \(Z B A\) and try to convince them.

RICH McKINNON: I just would say, as
somebody that lives in a building with a very
large glass top on it that is pretty visible, you
spend a lot of time helping people find the way to my home when they come to visit, so.

HUGH RUSSELL: I just don't think these signs are way-finding signs.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Also I think
that as Northpoint develops out, and we are seeing that coming more and more, it is going to become more navigable, and \(I\) think the danger of it becoming a sea of billboards is very real.

And \(I\) would much rather see signs put at ground level to identify the building.

I think one building that is identifying
it as part of the campus is totally reasonable.

And whether that is, you know, a sign on each of two buildings or two signs on the one building, I am more indifferent to. But \(I\) think that five signs on two buildings is a lot, and it could really set a bad precedent for the neighborhood.

RICH McKINNON: I understand.

HUGH RUSSELL: Liza, do you have enough
```

to write a recommendation?
LIZA PADEN: Sure.
If you have any questions about

```
April llth, \(I\) can try to answer those now.
    HUGH RUSSELL: Adding a second story to
the first story on West Street right next door.
    LIZA PADEN: Which, if you look out the
window, you can probably see it. It is the red
house on West Street.
    HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. The one on the right
side of it?
    LIZA PADEN: Yes.
    HUGH RUSSELL: And they are subject to
the conservation district review?
    LIZA PADEN: Yes.
    HUGH RUSSELL: So we can probably leave
that in their hands.
    A mudroom, a chimney stack, two dormers,
and second floor addition on Cedar Street. All
of these sound like the things that we usually
leave to the zoning board.

LIZA PADEN: Okay. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: So there is Brian.

BRIAN MURPHY: So in terms of just giving an update, that I suppose the most immediate news is that the MIT zoning petition passed the City Council last night by a 7-1-1 vote. And there was a lot of kudos given to the Planning Board for the work that you have done in terms of setting it up.

Relatively few significant changes from
the work that had been done. More, I think, on
the two amendments that passed last night were --
one was increasing the amount of innovation space
eligible for the 50 percent GFA bonus from

10 percent to 20 percent. And then also to sort of taking out the specificity around the use of
the community fund and having it be silent rather
than specifying it of the uses of workforce
development, open space, and transportation.

But obviously a very important and
significant move forward and one in which the Board's work was invaluable and \(I\) think very much appreciated, and that will make a significant transformation to Kendall Square becoming a much more lively place in terms of making it a place and also adding incredible economic development capacity to that area, as well as a number of sort of really new, innovative steps forward, whether that is in the area of housing, sustainability, LEAD gold, building energy disclosure, the whole host of issues that are marbled in there that \(I\) think are very significant, both for the MIT petition and what it means for Kendall, as well as for the other K2 PUDs that will be coming forward.

So kudos to the Board.

In terms of other upcoming issues, we
have got next week, on April \(16 t h\), there will be a hearing at the Central Square Senior Center.

The two items will be the Martin Luther King School special permit application, as well as 240 Sidney Street, which is the Dinosaur Capital Partners building, looking to do residential in one of the old Vertex buildings.
Also, Town Gown comes under general
business. May will be a boring month, with only two buildings. I know you have gotten used to three. May 7th will be general business around K2C2. And May 21st will be hearings on continuation of the hearing on 33 Cottage Park Avenue, if needed, as well as 130 Cambridge Park Drive. And we are planning to also pencil in the T petition on lighting.

June 4th, there will be a public hearing on the Phillips petition, which is germane since it will impact 33 Cottage Park Avenue. Some people are referring to it as sort of a Bishop II petition, if you will, eventually building upon
that one. June 11th, we are planning to have
general business for K 2 C 2 .
And there are a number of other things
that are sort of making their way through the queue that aren't quite baked yet in terms of coming before the Planning Board, whether that is sort of -- the follow-up to the four-city
building with Millennium, \(I\) expect will be coming later on, within the next few months, as well as some other items that are making their way through the staff process.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

STEVEN WINTER: May \(I\) also comment that
everything \(I\) have read today about the MIT zoning
complimented the staff of the community
development department highly and said that they were really a key factor in the success of the issue.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Chair, are we
looking at two or three meetings in June?

BRIAN MURPHY: Three. 4th, 11th and

18th.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I will not be here next week, next meeting.

BRIAN MURPHY: I won't either, but I
think I am less important.

HUGH RUSSELL: The King School is a
special permit?

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I think we are
ready to go forward.

Planning Board case 276,33 Cottage Park

Avenue. We open the meeting. There is no
business to continue that to tonight.

So I believe the first order of business
is a presentation by the petitioner.

JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening,

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. For the
record, my name is James Rafferty. I am an
attorney with the law firm of Adams \& Rafferty
located at 130 Bishop Allen Drive in Cambridge.

I am here this evening representing the applicant, Tyler Court Limited Partnership, which is one of those names that lawyers come up with for legal entities. This is largely regarded as the Fawcett site.

Robert Fawcett, Jr., is here in the middle. And his family has owned this property, or the bulk of it, since 1970, when they relocated their oil distribution facilities from Portland Street for 75 years and actually were subject to a bit of a taking, as the history as I understand it, so they found a new home on Fawcett Street.

And back then, in 1970, when they arrived there, this was an industrial Al district. The Linear Park that you see there now was a rail line. And it had a very difficult characteristic than the area has today.

For better or for worse, however, as you will see in the presentation this evening, the

Fawcett Oil site retained all of the 1970 charm
that it had when it was originally developed. It has a dominant surface: Parking lots, unremarkable industrial buildings, but typical for an oil distribution facility where Fawcett Oil has served their customers for generations; and they service their oil trucks there, and they handle oil distribution. And it has been in active use for quite some time.

This evening, \(I\) wanted to, by way of
introduction, share with you a little bit about the history of the site and help you understand the site as it is before you this evening. The site is essentially really two
properties. This area right here where you see the beginning of that cul-de-sac, that was a historic -- or still is, a lot line that existed.

Everything to the right was the Fawcett Oil
properties. To the left here was the Norberg

Greenhouses. And Robert Norberg operated a
```

greenhouse business at this location for many
years.

```

In 2005, Ed Norberg informed the Fawcetts
of his intention to sell the property. The
Fawcetts had been engaged in the rezoning of this
property and the potential redevelopment for
several years.
    Back in 1999, I represented the Fawcetts
when a rezoning petition was filed through
community development that created Special
District 2. Special District 2 essentially runs
on both sides of the Linear Park, and was an
attempt to incentive residential construction and
advance the conversion from light industrial uses
to residential uses; not all that dissimilar from
the special districts throughout Cambridgeport
and other areas. And there has been considerable
success with that effort. A number of housing
developments have occurred.
    So in 2000, with the Fawcetts being one
```

of the largest property owners, they cooperated
in an effort that led to the creation of Special
District 2. And from that point on, I think it
has been clear to the property owners that the
long-range use of the property as envisioned
under the ordinance and by city planners is that
this should someday become a residential site.
HUGH RUSSELL: Jim, could I just stop you

```
there for a second? Are there any more chairs anywhere?
        Off the record.
        (Discussion off the record.)
        HUGH RUSSELL: Please continue.
        JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you. I will keep
this moving, because \(I\) am going to anticipate
that this will be a significant amount of public
comment. But the history the site is, I think,
quite relevant to ultimately how is has been
developed.
    So the Fawcetts acquired the Norberg
```

property in 2005 and, from that point on, began
to contemplate a residential development
consistent with the SD-2 guidelines.
In 2011, there was, the development team

```
you will see here tonight actually had our first
meeting in January of '11, hosted by the North
Cambridge stabilization committee, to share a
concept for a program containing what turned out
to be 104 dwelling units. And we had a second
meeting in July of '11.
Shortly after the unveiling of that
proposal, a rezoning petition was filed called
the Bishop Petition. And the Bishop petition was
filed in August of '11 and was ultimately
approved in the spring of 2012.
So we have been before you a few times in
the context of hearings on the Bishop Petition,
so \(I\) know for some members the site is not
unfamiliar.

But when we were here before under the

Bishop Petition, it was a different type project. It contemplated two buildings, building out to the allowable density of 104 units, and actually had surface parking in this area and surface parking all over here.

The effect of the Bishop Petition, I
would suggest, of the principal effect was
threefold. One is, it reduced the lot area per dwelling unit from 1,800 square feet to 2,500 square feet, which, as you may be familiar, is the same lot area -- the same density allowed in the residence A district. So it is among the strictest density restrictions that we have in the city. So now it is 2.500 square feet of land area for each dwelling unit that you propose.
The second change involved height
restrictions in areas close to the park, as well as within 50 feet of a residence B district. So in this area here, where you see the building -and Mr. Boise Watson will walk you through the
```

changes -- it is a 35-foot height zone. Our
building is proposed in that location at 30 feet.
And then similarly, there is a zone in this area
here where we actually don't have any structure,
that is also 35 feet.
So what the development and proposal is
today is that the petitioner has taken a portion
of the Norberg site that you see right here, and
all of its oil site, and created a single lot.
The balance of the Norberg site has been
subdivided into four separate 5,000-square-feet
units. And under SD2, each of those lots, the
5,000-square foot lots, each of those lots could
accommodate two dwelling units.
One of the things we heard throughout the
discussions around the Bishop Petition with
rezoning was the importance of creating context
in this corner: Could we look at home ownership
here, could we look at structures that were
sympathetic or compatible with the surrounding

```
uses.

So the proposal here, and the intention of the petitioners here, is they intend to sell that. In fact, at least one of those lots has a prospective buyer, who \(I\) believe is here tonight. And they will probably be, probably as individual 5,000-square-foot lots are developed, the Cambridge. They are somewhat of a rarity. But the zoning here will allow for two dwelling units; but someone could choose to create a single-family house. But no one lot could contain more than two units.

And there has been some questions about the uncertainty over that. It essentially simply isn't part of the program. It was an as-of-right subdivision, because it meets all the dimensional requirements needed.

The footprint of the subdivision was done deliberately, and \(I\) just want to share a few of the reasons with you. This area right here is
intended as a bit of a swale to handle runoff.

There is a significant grade change between the Linear Park and the property. And the thinking was, it would be important for the property owner to control this area.

Similarly, there was a desire to create a
bit of a green buffer between these properties and to the left, which doesn't appear here, which
is a large surface park lot owned by Grace. And those type of uses continue down the length of Whittemore. And over in this area here, there actually is a gas line easement coming in in this area. So this footprint was created to stay out of the easement.

So as a result, we meet all the lot area
requirements, we meet the open space
requirements, and we significantly exceed the
green and open space requirements.

The next slide, which \(I\) will conclude
with, and then turn matters over to Ms. Boise

Watson, is just to an attempt to give you a full understanding of how the newly revised Bishop Petition affects Special District 2. And I
largely did that before, so you can see that is the zone in which the height restriction is at 35 feet.

That zone appears again up in this park.

You will notice that a portion of the lot which
is not proposed to be built upon is located in
the Res-B zoning district. But we have
calculated the larger dimensional constraints
associated with Res-B than with \(S D-2\) as we ran our numbers.
And you can see, if you have good eyes,
the proposed number of units, we have got 67
units here. The site as a whole could
accommodate 76 units. So we have left 8 units
that can be constructed in these subdivided lots.

So the project has gone from what would have been
allowed under Bishop from 104 units to 67 units.

I will just conclude by saying, the one other message we heard fairly consistently as we met with the traffic department on this project was that the traffic principles that should be employed here are that, the more points of distribution for traffic, the better served the project will be, meaning that no one street will have to share a disproportionate burden. There are five streets that abut here.

But Brookford Street is closed off. And we heard consistently and early on with our discussion with neighbors, that was a condition that no one wanted to see changed, most of all the people on Brookford Street. We often talked about creating a pedestrian link in here to get into the Linear Park, which, as you will see from Mr. Boise Watson's presentation, there are new opportunities to access the Linear Park through the site.

But the message we continued to hear back
was not even a pedestrian link into that area. But it might be a question around connectivity and the like. But that is the reason we made it. And finally, \(I\) would say that the decision to orient the parking the way we did, and the open space, \(I\) just want to point out three things. This collection of open space, this collection of open space, and this courtyard have been aggregated to make the most effective use of the open space.

We had a scene earlier, when we meet with community development, that actually had some parking in this area. And it was at the encouragement of Mr. Boothe and others that suggested, could we get all the parking off of the park.

So it is important to note, because I
have read commentary about the interface with the

Linear Park, this property probably has the
frontage along the Linear Park of any property,
some 800 square feet along the park. The depth right here is 25 feet. And then those familiar with \(S D\) zoning, which has, as its base, Res-2, will know that the rear setback is an additional

25 feet. So that means no structure within

50 feet of the park in this area; no structures at all in this area, and in this area, a setback of 50 feet from the park. And then continuing on here, again, no structures.
Parking was here in earlier plans. We
had a series of parking lots. There has been a real conscious decision about the location of the parking as it affects the park, and also creating an adequate separation and open vistas around the park.

> This is a very big site, a three-plus
acre site. It has an open space requirement of

40 percent, and meets it easily. It really is
going to be a transformative project. If you
have not had the opportunity to walk this site or
experience its current conditions, one would be hard pressed to understand why this level of green space would not be warmly embraced. What is envisioned here is a building that can accommodate 67 units. It is, I would suggest, in the range of a mid-Cambridge multi-family style building. It is three stories and four stories. It is three stories closest to the park. It will have elevator access. It will be able to accommodate empty nesters. It will
accommodate people with handicaps who have access issues. It is designed as a modest, garden-style apartment building.
In many ways, it reminds me of the
project out on Normandy Ave. on the far corner of Cambridge where -- 30 and 32 Normandy Ave. is a multi-family building that is across the street from a series of two-family houses with a generous amount of green space.

This building, we believe, has the
```

opportunity to have the same effect, which is a
very strong owner-occupied rental building and a
good rental building.

```
\[
\text { In } S D-2 \text {, if you look at the language }
\]
about units, it encourages the diversity of unit mixes. And you will hear tonight from Mr. Boise Watson that there are a significant number of three-family units. With all due respect, with many of the multi-family building we are seeing built with high, high floors, these are units that, at three bedrooms, one can really envision a family living in this space with this amount of open space and the type of proximity it has. We think that his project should be a welcome addition to the neighborhood and also serve an important housing need in Cambridge. It is not going to be part of the genre of larger buildings we have been seeing. It is 66 units. It is a very manageable building. There are challenges associated with traffic, and we have

Giles Hamm here this evening who will share with you the analysis he did. We also have our
landscape architect, Leslie Franger, and David

Biancavilla, who is our storm water management.

We are not within the flood plain, so we
are not requesting the flood plain special
permits. It is a rather straightforward
application. We are applying for an Article 19
project review special permit.

In all other respects, the project
complies with the Bishop Petition. We have
applied for a multi-family special permit because
it would appear from the reading of \(S D-2\) that
that might be needed. And I say that somewhat
cautiously because it is not clear that it is,
but it seemed the more cautious, so we applied
for the multi-family special permit.

So the parking exceeds the one-per
dwelling unit. You will learn about the
bicycles. We have more than one bicycle per
dwelling unit. And the project really attempts to create new connections to the Linear Park and new connections throughout the neighborhood so
that pedestrians and others can traverse through this area. Presently, that isn't possible. So that is longwinded intro. Mr. Boise

Watson is going to walk us through the rest.

PAMELA WINTERS: So I just wanted to be clear here. So there will be parking to the left of that blue?

JAMES RAFFERTY: There are three parking areas. That is a small surface park area right here, six spaces. Here there is a control gate here. And on both sides of this area, 15 spaces under the building, and 28 along that area here. PAMELA WINTERS: What about to the right? JAMES RAFFERTY: Then that is the third, 23 parking spaces in that parking lot. PAMELA WINTERS: So because I used to
take dancing there, is the dance -- that little
```

dance studio, is that going to knocked down?
JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes. And Mr. Boise

```
Watson will take us through. But that is roughly
in the area right there.
PAMELA WINTERS: That is what \(I\) thought.
I was just trying to get an area. Thank you.
    HUGH RUSSELL: So I just want to sort of
follow up on the relief you seek. It is not
really relief; it is design review.
    JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.
    HUGH RUSSELL: Site plan review under the
multi-family criteria and the design review,
which includes a traffic review under the
Article 19.
    JAMES RAFFERTY: A far more precise
characterization of our application. You are
correct. There is no relief deviated from the
standard, which, as you know, in some districts
is allowed. We are not looking for waivers of
setbacks or anything of the kind. We are looking
for the type of approval and review that the Chair just described.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.

MARK BOISE WATSON: Good evening. I am

Mark Boise Watson from Boise Watson Architects.

And I am going to try and take you through to
answer some of the questions. I am going to
start sort of zoomed in on the site, just to give
a little bit of the flavor of the characteristics of the site and review those quickly with you; then talk about the existing sort of complex web of streets that impact the site and that the site impacts; then come back to the site again and just look more specifically at what the direct abutting adjacent properties are and their character; and then move on the site design in
response to all of that; and then end up with
building design; and then hand it over to Giles

Hamm with some of the traffic implications.

So just starting with a focus on the site
itself. Jim explained the site. So absent these 5,000 square foot lots, it is everything that is slightly shaded in gray here. And currently, I am just going take you -- let's just walk through.

> So basically, I am just going to show you
the three buildings on the lot. This is a truck storage facility here. This is Fawcett Oil's administrative building here. And that thing right up against the 22 Cottage Park newly constructed housing, that is the dance building. Then if you go on the site and just see what that looks like, as Jim said, it is really sort of a fairly outdated landscape here with pretty amorphous asphalt parking. I am going to go through those buildings.

So there is that truck storage facility.

All of these photos are the little foreshortened to get everybody's head. But that is the truck
facility, this is the dance building, and there
is the administrative office building, the three buildings on the lot. So this is basically
looking west.

Down below here, we look east. And here
is the administrative office building, there is
the truck facility, and you can see the backs of the buildings on Mass Ave. back here.

Interestingly, this is an NStar -- I am
going to come back to the adjacent later, but
just to remember. This is the side of NStar gas
sort of -- is a smell adding facility for the
gas. This is a converted industrial building
into condominiums, which you can see mostly has a
blank wall to the site, because this is the end
of the thing. You see this is the end of
Brookford Street.

I am going to keep going because it is
actually really complicated. I myself have
trouble finding myself.

What is interesting about the site is,
although this is all asphalt, there is actually

Linear Park, the end of the Linear Park and the trees associated with it. And there is actually quite a lot of trees down at the historic edge the Fawcett Oil site.

If we go to the next slide, just zooming
in a little bit, this is the dance center
building. And what you -- just go back one.

Actually, this is the newly converted loft-style 22 Cottage Park Road behind. So this building is coming down. All the buildings are coming down. This is the garage building again, and here is the administrative building, a little bit more zoomed in.

Then again, now we are just looking back
towards, just to give you a sense. Tyler Court sort of comes in here. Edmunds Street is out here. And here you are seeing, again, the backs of the buildings that face Mass Ave.

This is a little -- there is little neck
of -- I am not going to try to point to our
board. There is a little neck of the site that
links our site to Edmunds Street, which is at the end of this parking lot here.

So the street access is important to
review because \(I\) think obviously how we get in
and out of his site is important to everybody,
and \(I\) am just going to go through it. Bear with
me. I want to characterize and describe some of these things.

There is a street here called Tyler

Court. It actually rides up over the curb here, as will be a typical cambridge driveway type detail, comes down, and runs into the site. I am actually going to go all the way around the site and look at all of these. I am going to look at Tyler, Edmunds, Cottage Park, Brookford, Magoun, and Whittemore. So I am going to try and go
fast. Otherwise, we will be here all night. So
here we go.

Tyler Court comes in here. Edmunds is an
interesting street. And you can't see very well
on my slide here. But basically, it has a
sidewalk on this side. And it actually stops
before it gets to our site. We are going to try and fix that.
Here is Cottage Park. It comes down.

And that actually is a lovely street and has sidewalks on both sides. It is sort of slightly changes in character as it gets down towards the site. That is the loft building, the 22 Cottage Park, and that is the parking lot associated with Cottage Park. But anyway, here comes Cottage Park into the site.
Brookford, as Jim pointed out, comes
down, and no access is given here. And we will
look at that in a minute.
Magoun Street is a one-way street coming
down here. This entrance can intermittently be
fenced off, but it is a two-way street. This is a two-way street. This is a one-way street going this way.

What is interesting about that is that Whittemore comes this way. Madison goes one way this way. Magoun is one way this way. What happens is when you come down Whittemore here, you are stuck. You have to turn around, because there is a no-entrance zone right there at the bottom of Magoun.

So if we just quickly sort of show you
the visual implications of this. This is a view from Tyler Court, looking towards our site back here. That is the garage building. So I am going to take you back one more second.
Just to give you a sense, this is
actually a Cambridge street. There is a white fog line there. There is a white fog line there.

There aren't any sidewalks associated with Tyler

Court. That is something that we tried to deal
with in our design.

This is Cottage Park Road. This is an older photograph. This is now being renovated. And currently, they are selling condominiums in this building. What you see here is, this is Cottage Park coming down, terminating in the garage building, which blocks the view of those trees behind the Linear Park.

Right behind this building, actually
constructed as part of the site of Linear Park, is an access down. It just leads to the back of that building right now. You can't go anywhere from it. But that will factor into our site design also.

This is a view down Brookford Street.

Brookford Street is closed off by a chain link fence at the end. You can see, all of that greenery there is actually sort of just inside the site of the Fawcett Oil.

This is now a view down Magoun Street.

What you are seeing are the trees on the Linear Park here. And these would be -- this location here and this location here -- would be these 5,000 square foot lots with -- in the expectation that individual people or whatever will build projects, will build houses or structures that are exactly what you get in a Res-B 5,000 area foot lot. And I have got some illustrations of that later on, but they are not part of this project.

This is the view down Whittemore. So the site starts right. There this is the Grace parking lot. It goes pretty much -- the Grace parking lots and Grace buildings go all the way back to Route 2. And in the far background there, you are looking at the administrative building.
Just to get a sense of it, what we are
doing is -- these are going to be those lots again, here and here. And our building, and \(I\)
will show you later, is kind of about 50 feet in front of that far-away building there.

So the other major factor that Jim was
talking about is the Linear Park itself, which really became, and is for the neighbors, and is for us, a really important and delightful aspect
to this site. But right now, it is a bit
scrubby. So these are just views from the Linear Park.

\section*{Actually, you are looking towards}

Brookford Street there. You are looking towards the administrative building there. You are
looking sort of back across the street. Here you
can start to see that it actually is nicely
landscaped. These are wintertime shots, you can see something. And here just get you a sense. It really is a Linear route built on the old railroad bed, and it links all the way from Davis Square to Danehy Park; so it is along the access. And we are -- the cycling and all of
that is very important to us. We have space for 100 spaces, as we like the fact that our building is going to attach to this Linear Park.
So going through it a little more
specifically, because the neighborhood contact is complicated here. Just to go through, we are looking at the backs of the Mass. Ave. buildings. Basically, this is that sea of parking. That is not part of our site, and we can't change. Here was that little Edmunds extension. So there are one- or two-family houses here. This is that 22 Cottage Park conversion. This is their parking lot. This is the condominium building where we saw the blank wall here. This is the NStar gas building here. This is that buffering system that Jim described all along here in the single-family lots.

So what they do is, where there is --
these single families, the one- and two-families and that kind of scale of buildings, just
completing this corner with that is important to this project. What happens is, you can just see the pentimento of the building. We are going to get on to this next, the building.

What is interesting about that is that we are very far. We are like nearly 200 feet away from here. We are nearly 170 feet away from here. I am looking at that faint line, which is the building outline. Interestingly enough, the new building is only about 2,500 square feet bigger in its footprint than the existing buildings on the lot.

So just sort of zooming in now on the project. So the principals of what we are trying to do with the design here is make sense of the connections of these multiple streets and resolve whatever we can. We tried to locate the building so that at it least impacts any abutters. So you have got -- I told you about the 200 feet here, the 170 feet here. This is 60
feet or something, nearly 60 feet, 55 feet. So we have held the building away from its having impacts, like shadow impacts, et cetera, on abutters.

As Jim started to describe in terms of
the site design, although we have got these multiple streets, what was really important from the beginning, and the first complication with the neighborhood, they do not want traffic flowing through here, cutting from Mass Ave. through to Route 2.

So what happens here is there is a controlled parking facility with gates here and here. And that is specifically to control that connecting through. So that was really important to stop cut-through traffic. And then to reinforce, we talked about kind of the quality of this edge, the one- and two-family houses.
And then as Jim also reviewed, and it
came up early in the process, to the extent that
we can, that any surface parking lots are as far as they can be from impacting the Linear Park.

And in fact, on that then, the corollary is
working to make sure we try to get as much of
this green contiguous to the Linear Park so that views of the site are all sort of visual
extensions of the Linear Park.

So that actually leads me then to talk a
little bit more about the open space idea. I am just going to characterize a little bit what Jim started. But you basically have sort of three or four categories here. There is category of buffering. So we have areas that basically act as buffers to surrounding properties. So this kind of open space, everything is a buffer along here. We could include this.

And then we have the kind of open space system that really services the building. We have like an active play area lawn here, so a big lawn that is not going to be cluttered with
things, so it is for active playable kinds.

And then we have this interior courtyard.

It much more sedate, perennial gardens, and sort
of more private to the development. And then out here, this little bit here, there is that
connection that gets us on the path of the Linear path. And this little piece of landscaping is regarded as thickening the Linear Park visually at that point.

So let's go back, just to describe what \(I\) mean by some of those concepts. So I am going to start down here at this ends of the site. So here is Tyler Court coming in. Here is Edmunds. Here is Cottage Park. So Cottage Park continues through the site, allows access into the building here.

Basically, this building is broken into
two ends, because you can't get through here.

The public can't get through here at all. So you can enter here or here. So actually what happens
is this facade here is about 110 feet long. This
facade on Cottage Park here is about 90 feet
long. So this building here, which is a lovely
tall-ceilings and three and a half story
building, is of similar scale to this building here.

> But basically, you come down, you have
the ability for dropoff, you have the ability
either to get to Edmunds -- the Edmunds sidewalk
is extended down. There is sort of the
traditional sort of curb cut detail here, even
though we don't control any of these other edges,
even though there is not sidewalk one this side
of Edmunds. There is a connection here. There
is a connection to Tyler Court. Going back again
to what Jim was saying, is that we are trying to
maintain as many of these distributive
possibilities as possible, without allowing the cut-through.
```

That is the nature of this end. And of

```
this end, just before we go to the pieces, what is happening here, so we talked about Brookford, there is no entrance. So down here, what happens
is Whittemore is then, through a private driveway, extended onto the site. There is a turnaround here, gives access to the parking lots. There is that is second entrance. It also means that if you accidentally
come down here and didn't know that that was going to be a no-entry zone, you do have the possibility of turning yourself around and getting yourself out of there, whether you be a FedEx truck or anything else.
So basically there is two building
entrances. Those are the closed-off areas. Jim
did quickly review the parking. So there is a parking lot here, parking along here, and 15
spaces under the building here, and another 28
parking spaces here. I know parking, I think it
is 79 spaces, so 1.13 or something. I think that
is the ratio, or something like that. Visitors can park along this park of the sort of private drive at the Whittemore Ave. extension. There is some parallel park.
So the building is a 67-unit building.

You see here, there is two entrances. Here is the parking for bicycles. We actually got one bike for every unit. I know, as Jim explained -I will go very quickly through here. There are common areas. There is a common room here, an exercise room here, heading out to the landscaped courtyard here. Otherwise, there is a mix of units, ones, twos, and threes, and a couple of studios, but a fair number of these very generous family-style units that you can see in this light blue here. And if you just go up to the plan, you will see those units there. So we have a
real -- this unit here is a very much bigger unit
than you would see -- nobody is building units
this big around here. So they are really nice,
generous units.

Just to illustrate, that was
illustrating, under the Bishop, the newly-adopted zoning, anything above 35 feet should be 50 feet away from the Linear Park. So this is the roof of the third floor at 30 feet. And then you step back, and this building is 40 feet, a four-story building.

Just so taking you around the site with a series of views from the streets that we reviewed. So this is Tyler Court. As you come onto the site from Tyler Court, you are coming in on your road here. This one is going out to meet up with Edmunds. This is turning the corner and going up Cottage Park to meet back up with Mass. Ave.

Again, this building is -- well, you can
see there is the bit where it steps up from three to four. And here is the Linear Park here. That is an elevation, a pure elevation of that facade.

And this is just making the point, this is the exact same thing, the opposite end. The building is symmetrical on a central axis. So right here would be that circular turnaround on Whittemore and the visual termination of Whittemore.

This is the courtyard that looks onto the

Linear Park shown down here, so we are looking into this. We are seeing the elevation as we look this way. You can see that we have those two wings that are 30 feet tall that come out towards the Linear Park. And here is that courtyard. That wall is about 70 feet from the lot line, giving you a nice broad courtyard here. Again, \(I\) think there is 850 feet of Linear frontage along here, of which these two 70-feet long pieces are the only ones that approach the Linear Park. This is the elevation of the north side.

You can see the tuck-under parking here. And
this is a view, which -- just remembering that
```

this is the NStar building, this is the blank
wall of this condominium conversion. This is the
parking lot for 22 Cottage Park. 22 Cottage Park
now no longer looks into the back of the dance
building, but across here. So just getting a
sense of where we are.
So this is the view down Cottage Park
again, which we started with. You have got the
long building. What we do is this is -- Cottage
Park comes on down, and then it turns left and
goes back up towards Edmunds. So now, instead of
stopping here at the site, there is this sense of
movement through and that connection to the
pedestrian.

```
    This is the new building. The new
building has a slightly bigger setback. If you
considered that a street setback, which it isn't
on Cottage Park, it is set back slightly more
than or about equal to a typical -- these ones
are a little closer to the zoning, but what would
be typical in Res-B.

HUGH RUSSELL: With the trees, we
wouldn't see any buildings at all.

Mark Boise Watson: Exactly.

On Brookford, we are maintaining this
barrier as requested. There is our building at the end of Brookford.

Now this is the view down Magoun. And remembering that this is not part of our project. We just to give a sense, this is a sort of two-family house or a single-family house on that lot that was on Magoun. Here is one of maybe three. There is three lots of Whittemore, but you are just seeing that.

But if you can imagine, the multi-family
building is about 200 feet behind here, back here somewhere. So this is this idea of trying to maintain the scale and flavor of Magoun and

Whittemore, very much as it is today, or a little better.

This is a same idea over here. We are
looking down Whittemore again. And here are
those kind of structures that might be built.

And these are not proposed, so I am just sort of illustrating here. But this our building in the far background, 200 feet back from that lot line there. And here is that other structure here that could be one of these.

> HUGH RUSSELL: Mark, would you take a
question?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: So the question that I
have is the parking where the dance studio was.

So all of the traffic will be coming down cottage

Park Avenue and exiting Cottage Park Avenue from
that parking lot; is that correct?

Mark Boise Watson: What is happening
here is that there is a gate here and a gate
here. So any resident that is parking on the
site either is parking in this controlled
```

facility or in this lot or in this lot. The
residents can pass through the gates.

```
    So what is happening is, Edmunds is a
two-way Street, Cottage Park Ave. is a two-way
Street, and Tyler Court is a two-way Street.
Whittemore is a two-way Street here. Magoun, you
can't use.
    I don't know if \(I\) am answering your
question, but you can go this way, you can go
this way, or you can go this way.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. But it says here
it is a private drive.
    MARK BOISE WATSON: If you live outside?
Are you saying if you don't live on the site?
    PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.
        Mark Boise Watson: If you don't live on
the site, the way that this is designed is
that -- all that is saying is that it is not
proposed to be an adopted street by the city.
There is nothing preventing -- in the way this is
```

designed, there is nothing preventing anybody
from any of these systems.

```

PAMELA WINTERS: So what \(I\) would like to
know is, can people exit from that parking lot where the dance studio was, that little area there into Edmunds Street? Because it looks like it is blocked off into Mass Ave.

MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes, they can. That
is just the sidewalk there.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, that is a sidewalk?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Because we are
designing these not as streets, but as curb cuts.

So you are riding the sidewalk at that location. PAMELA WINTERS: Or you go out Tyler

Court; is that right?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: So you can exit both of
those streets to Mass. Ave. It looks like

Edmunds Street would be the shortest way, if you were going north, I guess. But you can exit.

Okay.

JAMES RAFFERTY: Just in response to the question, and you will hear from the traffic study, the approaching and departing traffic will likely be using streets that facilitate the direction that they are going in. So if someone was heading towards the Route 2 area, they might chose to go through the control gate and out Whittemore. If they are going east into Harvard Square, they might choose Tyler Court, which is the closest access point onto Mass. Ave.

So as we said, the traffic principle at work here is that the distributive quality of the streets is what will allow for less impact on any one street.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right. Because Cottage

Park Ave., I remember, having taken dance lessons there, \(I\) remember it was a very narrow street. It was very difficult for two cars to kind of go through.

JAMES RAFFERTY: The reality is that,
today, traffic on Cottage Park Ave. exits through
this site to Tyler Court, and vice versa. You
would find residents who live in the apartment
building on Mass. Ave. whose garage is on the
back side of the building today, come down

Cottage Park, through the Fawcett property, to
access their property. It has just become a
traffic pattern.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Bill, did you have a
question?

WILLIAM TIBBS: Just a quick one.

What are the little rooms at the end of
the, each parking space?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Those are little
storage rooms, just for resident storage.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It is enough for the
whole units?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Not every unit gets
```

one of those, no.
STEVEN COHEN: Just a couple of design
details.
First of all, the west lawn, which is
labeled "active play," is that just for
residents? That is not proposed as public space?
MARK BOISE WATSON: Right.
STEVEN COHEN: And the line between the
green space and the Linear Park, is there a
fence?

```
    MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes. That is a chain
link fence that various things are growing up
along right now. The strategy is to have that
kind of be a disappearing fence, such that the
vegetation on either side of it will just build
up. And it will be there, and it will separate
the two properties, but it will be not a big,
strong visual screen.
    STEVEN COHEN: The existing fence?
    MARK BOISE WATSON: Right now, I think we
have -- because the garage building was here, we have an existing fence that has got things on it now. It was being maintained. There is a new fence where we took down the garage building, because there is no fence. And then existing fence again.

HUGH RUSSELL: There is quite a grade change as you go off on the left.
MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes. I didn't really
go through the Linear Park. Although it is the most important thing, of course \(I\) didn't talk about it.

But the Linear Park is on an embankment,
so it is typically about seven feet above our grade. Typically. So there is basically a slope down. But unlike some things that are going on over here, where there are retaining walls, it actually comes all the way down to grade, and we meet the natural grade with our landscape design. STEVEN COHEN: Just one more question,
and then perhaps this is better posed to Giles. Brookford Street, are there
characteristics or conditions of Brookford Street
that warrant treating it differently than the other four access points?
HUGH RUSSELL: I think that is a legal
question.
JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes. There is a series of Superior Court cases and orders around restrictive use on Brookford. They did originate when it was being used as an oil distribution facility. But for some now time now, there has been a court order in place that does not allow for access from the Fawcett Oil site onto

Brookford Street. It is some 20-plus years old, and there is all types of interpretations. But it is out there. It exists. And the predominant sentiment we heard very early on was, that should be left in its current condition. We have respected that view.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Just a quick
question.

Was the Quonset Hut somewhere in that area?

MARK BOISE WATSON: Yes. It was right there.

JAMES RAFFERTY: On the parking lot off our property.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And that is now the parking lot for the building across Cottage Park?

JAMES RAFFERTY: It was owned by the

Emerson lung manufacturing facility. They used
it to build the iron lung.

And Johan Salk killed their business.

They told us that, honestly.

GILES HAMM: I am Giles Hamm with Vanasse and Associates. I was going to do about a 30 -minute traffic presentation, but with your permission, I'll probably keep it to a minute. I think that will keep people happy.

The traffic study was certified by your traffic department as complete and reliable December 19, 2012. It is important to note with this project that the proposed 67 residential units generates less traffic than the combined peak hour traffic of Fawcett Oil and the dance studio. So you will have no oil trucks out there in the future, you will have no employee traffic. And again, the dance studio will be gone, so it will be less traffic. And that is based upon counts we did out in the area and certified by your staff.
Having said that, we really did a very
extensive traffic study, looking at 10
intersections, including along Mass. Avenue and

Alewife Brook Parkway. So for the size of this project, it is a really a very comprehensive traffic study.
```

    With regard to your Planning Board
    ```
performance criteria, there are a total of 129
indicators that we look at in terms of measuring this project impact. What we call the "impact indicators" was traffic generated, level of service, residential streets, and lane queue. We don't impact any of those criterias, so we pass all of those measures. And we only really exceed

11 pedestrian levels of service, which are existing conditions and existing crosswalks, that, quite frankly, we don't change. So they are kind of really there today. So we don't really have an impact at all.

In terms of our travel demand management program, we will joining with TMA, if there is one in the area; there is one right now. We will be promoting a car sharing program on site for commuters and carpooling. I think you have heard a little bit about bicycle and pedestrian amenities. There is plenty of bicycle racks on site. We will be connecting to Linear Park as well.

We will be providing a free one-month
pass for the MBTA so when people become a
resident, they get a free one-month pass to encourage commuting, not via the car. And we will also post transit schedules on site to, again, promote non-use of auto.

And you have heard from a couple people
in terms of kind of the theme here. We have multiple access points, so that will diffuse any traffic that there is. They will be able to use five streets, so \(I\) think that is a good idea. We have heard from the City and the neighbors, there will be no through traffic through the site, so there won't be any cars from the through traffic, which would increase
neighborhood traffic. And again, there is less traffic than there is today. So really, in terms of traffic, obviously, we have some residents there, but it is less than what has been in there prior use with Fawcett Oil, which used to be
busier, as well as the dance studio that is there today.

So that is relatively brief.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. That completes your presentation?

STEVEN COHEN: Could I make a quick
question for Giles?
Giles, when you say there is less traffic
than there is today, is that overall vehicle trips per day, or is that peak hour?

GILES HAMM: We focused really on peak
hour. So we counted what is out there today in terms of the access points, what is coming in and out today peak hour-wise, and then what we are projecting. And it is less traffic.

PAMELA WINTERS: And you read Sue Clippinger's memo and agreed all with all of her recommendations?

GILES HAMM: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: If there are no more
questions for the Board, I think we should go to public testimony. And I suspect there is a sign-up sheet. That is where we start. A number of people have signed up, saying that they are not wishing to speak. You can change your mind at the end. But \(I\) want to ask everybody, if they are going to change their mind, as we go along. When \(I\) recognize you, please come forward to the microphone. Give your name and your address. Spell your name, if there is any possibility that it might be misinterpreted by the court reporter, because she likes to get things absolutely perfect. And please limit your remarks to three minutes. I would also tell you that one of the best comments we hear from people is, "I have heard my neighbors, \(I\) agree with them, and I don't have anything to add." That is a perfectly legitimate comment, and we do hear those. We prefer not to hear the same litany over and over
again.

So the first person who said they want to speak is McNamara Buck.

The next speaker will be Michael

Phillips. I sometimes give the on-deck call.

McNAMARA BUCK: So my name is McNamara

Buck, \(M-C-N-A-M-A-R-A, \quad B-U-C-K\).

I live across on Goldstar Road. My
concerns are a little bit separate from the people who are immediately affected. And one thing I have to say is, Tyler Court, which I think, the way this is designed, people will, if they want to go up towards Harvard Square or Porter Square, which they will want to do a lot, they are going to use Tyler Court.
Tyler Court is an extremely dangerous, basically, driveway/path. There may be room for two cars to go in there if they see each other, which they never could as they turn on, and if they both go two miles an hour and don't mind
```

scraping each other, and if there is no person

```
walking down there who would then be squished
against the giant brink buildings and killed.
    So I can't imagine that that can really
realistically -- and \(I\) really mean that -- be
used as a two-way street.
    My other comment is that the giant, long
chain-link fence is ugly. And somebody has
recently gone -- Mark, you talked about the
plants that are nicely growing up it. Last
spring, somebody chopped them all down, so they
are no longer there. And we don't want to live
with a chain-link fence there. It is ugly. You
can put up a nice fence.
    And the other comment \(I\) want to make is
that those wings that come out on either side of
the courtyard, \(I\) think they are only
seven-and-a-half feet from the Linear Path, and
it is 30 feet up. So that they kind of skipped
over that a little bit when they talked about all
the open space, and this, that, and the other thing.

And I am a big Linear Park user. I use
it. And I feel like I speak for the Linear Path.

That is why I come to these meetings. And I am
not the only person who uses it. It is a gateway into the city for bicyclists, for pedestrians, for all those people who are being built out over in the Alewife Place. If we want them to be coming into the city on foot, that is how they are going to do it. And to be blocked in by more buildings is a mistake, \(I\) believe. So thank you.

JAMES RAFFERTY: Just to interject, that setback is 12 feet. The zoning would allow 7 and a half, but we have designed it to 12.

McNAMARA BUCK: Well, my position stands, but thank you.
```

JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

```

HUGH RUSSELL: Michael Phillips?

MICHAEL PHILLIPS: Good evening, Members
of the Board. My name is Michael Phillips, and I own and reside at 57 Madison Avenue, right at the corner of Whittemore Avenue, at the intersections of Res-B, Special District 2, and Special District 3, Grace.

When my wife and I purchased this house almost a decade ago, before we had children, we did not expect to stay terribly long. We were young professionals, just getting our lives really going together, and had found we were able to purchase a small house on a half-sized lot marketed as a condo alternative.

Along the way, we came to love the
neighborhood and the people in it and really appreciate our city. The industrial feel on one side, Grace and the oil company in the distance, and lack of our own yard were mitigated by the

Fawcett family themselves. They allowed
Norberg's old flower beds to continue to be used
as a community garden. My wife constructed a garden on a piece of unused land next door. By the time our first child could walk, she was out there helping Mommy with the planting. And for that, the Fawcett family has my gratitude. We started to think that, yes, actually, we would stay in Cambridge and raise our children here. But if feels like since then, things are threatening to go horribly, horribly wrong. The Fawcetts started to sell the garden to the City, to preserve this beloved public open space for all time, which I applaud. When they found it was contaminated, they pulled back. They have a subdivision plan filed with the City and are courting developers. They may yet clean it up and sell it to the City, but we don't know. Across the street, we hope to get the two-family homes they envision, but the zoning does not prevent the construction of an apartment building. We don't know.

There should be a comprehensive plan.

The Fawcett family and you, through their
development, will determine the future of our neighborhood. They own 3.8 acres of space in our neighborhood.

I believe you cannot grant the special permit, as the application in its current form fails multiple of the special permit criteria, per the eight-page document \(I\) submitted. Sorry about that. It leaves us with something worse than the oil company it is replacing: No more community garden, no more dance studio.

Community space, and so much potential for good, lost forever.

There are a few shortcomings in the application. There are no after-views from the Linear Park. There is no 3-D models as they have done in the past. There is no lighting plan. I don't know if they have approval from the MBTA to construct that close to the Red Line.

It feels like they are leaving you to fix
their proposal and their business plan. I am
hoping you can direct them that they need to come up with a plan that isn't a large building that stands separate and in isolation, but instead continues the pattern of a neighborhood that we have now. It should not be apparent where the current neighborhood ends and the Fawcett properties begin.

Once they have this direction from you, once they understand what it's going to take, then the discussions with the neighborhood, which were initially quite productive, and which have been on hold for some time, can finally resume. Together we can create something better for everyone, current neighbors and the future neighbors we are looking forward to welcoming. We can encourage families to put down roots here. We can make a great neighborhood even better. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Julia Bishop. And after Julia, Thomas

Flynn.

JULIA BISHOP: Hi. My name is Julia

Bishop. I live at 9 College Park Avenue.

I hope you have had a chance to read the
narrative that was given to you by our
neighborhood, but \(I\) would like to make a few comments based on that.

I would talk about the unique location of this parcel of land. Like the buildings I have referenced -- I referenced them earlier. I am not going to mention those now. I am talking about the buildings -- 42 units is the biggest -on Mass. Ave. They all have parking off of Mass. Ave. They all have underground parking. This building is 67 units. And it nestles into behind our neighborhood. You have to access all of our neighborhood streets, which are not that long, to get to this parcel.

So unlike the buildings that \(I\) just
referenced, Tyler Green, set on the parcel, is
nestled behind a number of neighborhood

Residential B streets. The only access is
through our neighborhood. Try driving somewhere on Mass. Avenue during morning or afternoon rush hour, Route 16 and 2. We border that and Mass. Avenue.

I think the Board would be hard pressed to find a similar situation in Cambridge. It is because of the unique location behind our neighborhood that issues of traffic and safety have been a primary concern from our group from the beginning.
While I do realize that the Planning

Board is not the traffic department, in this development, \(I\) believe that an integral part of the planning is traffic and safety.

When members of the community first heard
of the traffic report which was just mentioned
again tonight, at the earliest meeting at the

North Cambridge Stabilization Committee, there was genuine outrage that these numbers could be
true. There was concern about the validity of
the results, as our understanding is that the
data was collected during the reconstruction of a
number of streets: Magoun, Madison, Whittemore,
and, I believe, Columbus. During that time,
parking was discouraged or even banned.

I would ask any member here tonight to
come stand at the intersection of cottage Park

Ave. and the Fawcett property on a weekend night
or weekend morning while cars roar down the
street to the business at Fawcett property. The dance studio, which I love Deb Mason and the dance studio, but the traffic on our street alone is a nightmare.
And that traffic used to access Tyler

Court to get to the dance studio, until the

Fawcett family decided to leave the gate open.

It is unsafe due to the length of our street.

And we have a really tough dogleg that never quite makes it on any of the visuals that are shown. There are regular head-on near misses. I would also like to address the address of this new proposed development. It is listed as 33 Cottage Park Ave. on the plans. If you had a chance to read the narrative, it establishes a history with the developer that is less than positive. There have been many times over the years that the developer could have reached out to the neighborhood as a whole, or Cottage Park Ave. specifically, because we bear the brunt of the traffic to that property.

There are not currently sidewalks that
extend onto the Fawcett property. To my
knowledge, the address of the main building on the property has been One Tyler Court. Thank you for, in the last presentation,
reminding us: In this day and age, people use

GPS to get to places. And if 33 Cottage Park Ave. is the address of this property, everyone trying to get there will come down Cottage Park Ave., the second shortest street that goes into this development.

I feel like you can't have it both ways.

For years, the Fawcetts have reaped the benefits at our expense of opening or closing gates that separate its property from our street as best fits its needs. Now the Fawcetts would like to be considered part of Cottage Park Avenue. I know I speak clearly for the neighbors of Cottage Park Avenue when \(I\) say that we are concerned about the use of this address. And \(I\) just want to say something of
comment on Brookford Street, at the expense of my neighbors hating me forever. The only people I
know of in the entire neighborhood that have
spoken to not wanting to have pedestrian access
on Brookford or even challenging the vehicular
```

blockage are the people on Brookford. Everyone
else in the neighborhood sees that this is a
major problem with this project.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I spoke that way.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I feel that way as

```
well, Julia.
    JULIA BISHOP: Okay. Two people. It is
my turn to talk. The people \(I\) know do not feel
that way.
    HUGH RUSSELL: Please, can we not have
cross talk? It is going to be a long hearing.
    The next person is Thomas Flynn. After
him, Paul Robertson.
THOMAS FLYNN: My name is E. Thomas
Flynn, lifetime resident of Madison Avenue.
    Some of the parts \(I\) would like to pick
apart is this supporting statement here for a
special permit. Item E, their answer is that it
meets the residential uses district in form and
density, compatible with the adjacent residential
neighborhood.

I was one of the ones that put together
that packet that you received. The buildings in that packet meet the form and density of the neighborhood, not a building 266 feet long, 116 feet deep. We are going back to the light industrial building size, 40 feet tall.

And as far as the building, the way they have got it designed, the roof stairways, they come up out of the roof on their drawings. They are not exempt from the height. So that makes it a 50-foot building, if they are going to use those roof stairways. Talking with the building commissioner, roof hatches are the thing, not stairways.
And the elevators that are sticking up
there, you only need three and a half or four feet. I spent 40 years in construction. You don't need them 10-foot tall.
```

Because you can see this roof from Linear

```

Park. It needs screening. All the vent pipes, everything that goes up on that roof should be screened or blackened so you can't see it, if we end up with this huge box.

Now to go to traffic. Maybe they ought to hire a rapid transit engineer. First of all, they haven't given the people in the complex an easy way to get to the \(T\). You have to go all the down the complex of 266 feet, come out, and then go this way to the \(T\), because they want to keep their private yard. To me, it is only for their residents; it is not helping us in the neighborhood. I would much rather see smaller buildings filling in that yard. I would give up the green space.
And the Linear Park fence, they said they
are going to leave it. It is horrible. It is
six feet tall. When they go through there, I
would call it, dog and pony show, they don't
cover items that the neighborhood can see.

And as far as the streets, most of the streets have doglegs. And all of the pictures they shows us of the streets must have been a holiday with nobody around, because there is no cars on the streets. Very convenient. Their parking lot at the dance studio, empty. Must have been well into the early evening on a weekend night.
```

Let's face reality. This thing is too

```
big. And you people have done it in Cambridge Lumber, got it to fit with the neighborhood. We are looking for the same workout on this one. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Next is Paul Robertson.

Mike Connolly in the on deck circle.

PAUL ROBERTSON: Good evening, Board
members. My name is Paul Robertson, third
generation owner of 45 Magoun Street in

Cambridge.

I was born in Cambridge in 1946. I have
been married to Judith Robertson for 43 years. I worked for a famous university in town for

46 years. And \(I\) have seen a lot of change. This
kind of change, \(I\) do not want to see.

In my opinion, and \(I\) have been on a lot
of safety committees throughout my career, this design is very dense, dangerous, monolithic, monstrous, and a bloody quagmire.

How would you fight a fire down here?

What happens in a fire is people panic. People
will be in this 200-resident -- 200 to 300 people
will be trying to leave the neighborhood while
the fire department is trying to get in. This
building belongs on a Chapter 90 street with
access so the police can stop the traffic, make
the people keep their cars in the garage under,
and then the firemen can fight the fire from the
street. These people who come out of the
building, they will try to get those cars out
from under and get out. They will be coming up

Cottage Park when the fire department is trying to get in.

And I went over there after Nemo,

25 inches of snow. All these streets were
impassible for 48 hours. This is a joke. This
can never happen in Cambridge.

I am a little upset because I lived
through the Vendome fire. I worked for Morris Gordon, the owner of the Vendome at the time, and my father-in-law was an executive for Morris, and

I moonlighted as an electrician. And on June 17,

1972, the collapse of the building took a crew,
nine firemen killed, eight fireman injured. I
survived. I don't want to see it happen again.

This is an example of where it can happen.
You can't fight a fire along the Linear

Park. 800 feet, with a fence and trees.

Seven-and-a-half feet to get in back, you can't
fit a fire engine in there. Seven-and-a-half
feet, you can't get in.

Magoun Street, one way. Right now,

Brookford is closed. That has to be open. The developers has been trying to develop this place for five years. He hasn't taken the City to task to open that street. That would help. But it is not going to make this building comply.

I am sorry if I am little upset. I am a
third generation owner. This should never
happen. These people are just after the money.
HUGH RUSSELL: Mike Connolly. And after

Mike Connolly, Ann MacDonald.

MIKE CONNOLLY: Good evening. Thank you,
Hugh. My name is Mike Connolly, \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{Y}\).
I am an attorney. I live at 20 Harding
Street. And I also serve as the secretary for the Association of Cambridge Neighborhoods. And
in my capacity with ACN, I have had the
opportunity to come to some of the North
Cambridge Stabilization meetings. And \(I\) just
wanted to show up this evening to express my
```

solidarity with the residents.
I have been involved with the MIT
petition, and I think we ought to take a moment
to note that that was a 26-acre parcel that we
discussed, with 2 million square feet of zoning
changes. And there is about as many residents
here in opposition to this one parcel. And I
think that speaks to the impact that it has on
these residents.
If you look at the enormity of this
parcel -- I heard it described as a cruise ship
in one of the North Cambridge Stabilization
meetings. And if we go back, I know we were
shown some drawings of what it looked like from
the street view.

```
But those drawings seemed to me like they
were 100 or 150 yards away. I don't think you
would appreciate it if you had actually one of
these residences that was abutting the proposed
development.

So I agree with everything that \(I\) have
heard. And one other point \(I\) would point out is,

I understand that the Bishop Petition was passed with tremendous organization and support of residences, and that was in 2011.

So I don't know what it says about a democratic process, if the residents themselves can express their views for what they want to see on this property, and here we are, just a few months later, and all these people are here this evening to speak out against it.

So I would encourage you to put the
brakes on this special permit right now. And I am also a big supporter of the citywide master plan, so we can really appreciate -- some of these questions about fire trucks or traffic on Mass Ave. or one-way streets, these are the kinds of things that really need a lot more careful review.

So I would really be disappointed if the
proposal goes forward this evening. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

The next person is Theresa Walker. After
that, perhaps John Walker, perhaps now.

ANN McDONALD: Hi. My name is Ann

McDonald, and I live Columbus Avenue near the corner of Harrison.

I want to echo the sentiment that we
really need your help. We were involved in

Bishop Petition, and that took us a certain
degree. But the ability to create something here that is going to be with this neighborhood and change this neighborhood considerably, hopefully for the better, we need your help with that.

And \(I\) think the part about the \(S D-2\) that
I understood was that what was to be built, or
the intent, was that it be compatible in form and
scale. And \(I\) think the Bishop Petition dealt
with density, but not with form and scale.

I don't know why there needs to be one,
large rental building. I am looking for neighbors where it is not versus them, where we are all one continuous neighborhood.

I would be happy to buy something in this space if it was something that -- I think there is many families that \(I\) know that are trying to find places to own, not to rent. Our concern with some of these larger units is that it is interesting, but probably the only people that can afford these rents are busy college students splitting it three ways. So we are worried about
a transient population coming through here as well. So I appreciate the larger scale units, but \(I\) just don't think it is feasible for a lot of families.

I do want to echo the densely packed
cruise ship that just landed in our neighborhood.

And it didn't drive down Mass. Ave., because it
can't get there from Mass. Ave. It was
helicoptered in, dropped in. And I feel like
```

when I look at Emerson, and say there are 16
ownership units in that one building at the upper
left corner, and this thing is 67 units, packed
into a very tight space, that to me suggests
something is wrong with this picture.
I don't want the buildings hidden away so

```
we can't see them. I want them integrated with
our neighborhood in a way that we feel like we
can be a neighborhood together.
    And I don't know what all happened in the
Cambridge Lumber petition, but \(I\) know that you
were able to make an impact. And as we have seen
it built, it is still large, but at least it
feels compatible with the number of units, and it
feels the fabric of the neighborhood hasn't been
disrupted, hasn't been disrupted as much as I can
anticipate this would.
Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
John Walker. Do you wish to speak? And
```

after that, Robert Cyr.
MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You forgot

```

Theresa.

HUGH RUSSELL: I did. Sorry.

THERESA WALKER: That is all right.

I am Theresa Walker. I live at the top
of Magoun Street, 3 Magoun Street. I can just imagine my street becoming a long driveway for this huge monstrosity that's going to be down at the bottom of our neighborhood.

I agree with everything that my neighbors
say: It does not fit scale. The density has
been reduced. I appreciate the green space. But I agree, it is all hidden behind the trees.

And the proposed picture that we see, you
see a tiny little corner of what it is going to
be. And I just can't imagine what it is going to
do to impact the sense of neighborhood and family
that we feel down there.

There is controlled parking, and so it
feels like a gated community. You have an active play lawn which, as residents, we can't use. You have to live in this huge apartment complex to be able to use this additional green space that they have added.

You have one entrance to Linear Park,
which another neighbor mentioned. So, just as Mr. Flynn said, you have to go all the way down towards Cottage Park Ave. to go all the way over to the \(T\). And with all of the proposed bike spaces, \(I\) just can't imagine people having just one way to get to the bike path.

I oppose this. I don't feel like it is going to be neighborly at all. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. John Walker?

JOHN WALKER: My name is John Walker. I
live at 150 Whittemore Ave. I have lived there since 1943, sort of off and on. Theresa is my neighbor. No other connection.
```

The first thing that I want to speak to

```
is the massing of the building. It is just a huge box.

And I want to thank the Planning Board
for the work that was done on the Harvey street
lumber project, which is fantastic. Since they
started construction, I stopped by there and
talked to Peter Levy, the owner. I tell him all
the nice things that he is doing. And it really
is an ideal development for the Cambridge
neighborhoods.

What is unfortunate is the people who buy
these units there for a lot of money will be
sitting out their back windows and looking at
this thing staring back at them. And then, worse
than that, is that the rental people will be
staring at this beautiful neighborhood that is
across the bike path.

But I think the massing is bad. I think
the building could be cut up in the smaller units and will work better. I am an architect for 40
years. I was born designing buildings. And
there is lot of opportunity that has just been sort of missed.

One thing is nobody has mentioned, but
there is a 240 feet corridor that runs from the
doorway. Imagine walking in the door with six
bags of groceries and you are headed for your
unit, going down door after door after door.

I have designed buildings nowhere near
the size of that that, but four stories, that
have been made of the brick, concrete floors, bar joists, fire proof, sound proof. And still when you walk through those buildings, you hear
everybody's business. And this is a tough place to live, a tough place to negotiate. I don't see any storage from inside.

People come with a lot of junk they have to put somewhere. I don't know where they are going to put it. I am afraid that all the green space will be sheds at later dates that have to be
built to keep snow tires, skis, bicycles, and on and on.

But I have got to go quick.

So I have concerns about the access from the bike path to all the people who live in the Whittemore neighborhood. We go through a little gauntlet of chain link fences that take a right turn. You can't ride a bike through. There is birds, and you don't know who is there when you go through.

I have been traveling that route since I was born, mainly to go to school. We used to walk up the railroad track down to Wesley Ave., which has been cut off from the public.

Everything is cut off, and the bike path is becoming sort of the place to go rob people. And I use the bike path a lot, and I have been robbed right around the corner from the bike path, on Lincoln Street.

The penthouses. Why do they have
penthouses? What it indicates to me is some future desire to put decks up there and have parties on the roof. But you don't need the penthouses. All you need is a roof hatch. Also there is, I think, all of the mechanical equipment is on the roof, and you will be able to see that. That should be screened. That is a problem.

One other thing is, the roofline of the building, they look like buildings that someone shot them on the forehead. They have windows that are almost against cornice line.

And the plan seems to be -- the picture
isn't here, but it mimics like three-decker
houses. They divide it up with colors and everything. But the detail on the building is so minor and insignificant that it looks like -- I think of it as grain and feed warehouse that you see in like built towns like Reading and other suburban towns that used to have an agrarian
background.

I just want to point out that we are getting 2,000 units within a half a mile of here in the next six months or eight months, and traffic is going to explode geometrically. That is a problem.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Robert Cyr.

And next will be Bill Fox.

ROBERT CYR: I am Robert Cyr, 13 Cottage

Park Ave., Cambridge, Mass. I have been living on Cottage Park Ave. for 45 years now, or a little more maybe.

Now there is one thing that is nobody
seems to be taking consideration, and that is

Emerson is going to have 16 condos on Cottage

Park Ave. Now they have to be there because they
are on the street. But Fawcett's property is
technically at the beginning of the street,
really. It is not even at the end. And you say

67, and then you say 16 condos. Now that is 83 apartments that has got to use Cottage Park Ave. to speak of.

Because they are going to control the
gate. Who is going to watch them? It is not
going to be a law. It is going to up to their discretion whether they let them in or not.

But Cottage Park Ave. is a small street, very small, with a dogleg on it. And we have that 16 condos, which we are not disagreeing with. We agree with that because the building is on the street. But Fawcett is not on the street. Where does he come off saying 33 cottage Park Ave.? For 40 years or more, it has been Tyler Court, and the City took land, imminent domain, from these people on the other side there to connect Fawcett's property with Tyler court. And that was done in 1972.

Now he is going to do away with it? He has got no right to do that. Where does he come

> off with 33 ? It has been One Tyler Court for at
> least 40 years or more, once they took the land away and they connected to Tyler court.

So you have to take this all into
consideration. The streets are just too small to handle that, especially Cottage Park Ave.
And I hate to say this, but I have been
told by the City years ago, "Don't worry about Brookford Street. If it ever changed zoning" -now it is commercial. And you are right, the court said no commercial could go through, or cars or anything.

But that can be changed. Once the zoning
is changed, then maybe every street should be open, to relieve some of the problem.

All I am trying to say is, take into
consideration, 16 condo and 87, again, on that
little street of Cottage Park Ave. Consider it
also has a dogleg.

And there are rumors going around, they
might want to knock off parking on one side of
the street. So what about all the people on

Mass. Ave. live on Mass. Ave. and can't park on

Mass. Ave., especially in the snow? They come down Cottage Park Ave. to park. So what do you do with all of that traffic, if you eliminate one side of the street?

So I mean, they are not taking into
consideration at all of the congestion in there.

And what Cambridge Lumber has there is fantastic.

That is what we should have down here, and
everything open, getting in there. It would be really nice, pick up the neighborhood.

Thank you very much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

After Bill Fox will be Judith Robertson.

BILL FOX: I moved into Cottage Park Ave.
in 1975. I bought the house for \(\$ 8,000\). So I
can't lose any money-wise, and I don't care about
money. I prayed to God that he would convince
the minds and hearts of the Board just to make our street safe and in some way to build a building so that everybody can use it, so

Mr. Fawcett can have the land and use it; but build it in a responsible way, so that he won't combat the neighborhood.

Now the order of law says you can't build
a property and enforce your street with unsafe traffic. That is the law. Now they don't hear the law. They don't want to bring up the law and say what the law is.

Our street is commercial traffic
restricted. If you give the address 33, what do you do? You open commercial traffic to the end of the street. That is mail people, UPS, all of the commercial vehicles. The court orders: No commercial vehicles on the street.

Now make the law; enforce it, what is
right. That is all I am asking for. I wasn't
going to say anything. I said I am going to come
```

down here tonight and just rely on the Board.
I know I have been with the Board for
different people on the Board. I know you have
got your problems. I understand. Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Judith

```
Robertson. And then, \(I\) have run out of sheet.
Is there another sheet?
    (Pause.)
    JUDITH ROBERTSON: My name is Judith
Robertson, owner of 45 Green Street. Thank you
for giving me this opportunity to speak.
    When my husband and I first met Rob
Fawcett at the Peabody School, he referred to his
future development and said they were new to this
business, real estate, and did not know what they
were doing. That was maybe five or more years
ago. And in that time, the Fawcetts did nothing
to prepare their site for the infrastructure
needed to develop and fit into this North
Cambridge neighborhood.

Rob Fawcett told my husband at a

Cambridge City Council meeting on the Bishop Petition that there was no pollution on his land. However, the City of Cambridge found pollution in the garden. "Our land is clean," said Rob.

How can his land be clean when it is next to W.R. Grace, and was used, not only by an oil company for 70 years, but was originally a freight yard? And to add insult to injury, the more recent purchase of the Norberg Nursery, which we all know used chemical insecticides for generations.

After attending a City Council meeting regarding the Bishop Petition, my husband and I were in my car on Bishop Allen Drive, Cambridge, and about to leave, when Rob Fawcett approached and said to me that if the Bishop passes, we were going to lose the two-family units on Magoun and Whittemore Avenue and get one big building.
We thought it was a strange statement for
a developer to make, but that is exactly what the Fawcetts did. They said they would improve

Magoun/Whittemore by building some units that would comply with the surroundings, basically townhouses, but instead removed them from the plan entirely. As for future plans, mum's the word. Sell, build. Information on this area is totally undisclosed.

The night the Bishop Petition passed, Rob approached myself and John Walker in the lobby of City Hall, reached out his hand to shake ours and said, "Congratulations. You just lost \$10 million." Just another odd encounter with this developer. You can't lose \(\$ 10\) million if you haven't made it; an inexperienced developer counting his chickens.

All of the above encounters are an
indication of the type of neighbors the Fawcetts
are to this community. You have all heard the story of the farmer who holds out one hand with a
carrot for the donkey and in the other hand holds the stick.

We have surveyed our neighborhoods, and
the people want compliance with the surrounding neighborhood and a safe environment for families. You, the Planning Board, have the right and the power to turn this development around. Cambridge Lumber is a perfect example of the Planning Board taking the reins and accomplishing a more cohesive community rapport.

This big box building does not belong in
a residential neighborhood that is landlocked to the northwest by Linear Park. It is not easy to get into the property, and very difficult to egress at Route 16 and Whittemore Street, especially from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. It is a unique neighborhood in the fact that a police officer directing traffic has to take his life in his hands to let the motorists out of the triangle Monday through Friday.

It is time for the Fawcett/Norberg
developers to take the responsibility of providing and paying for some infrastructure.

The fact that the new plan has a Cottage Park Ave. address and a Whittemore Ave. entrance says there is something askew. When surveyed, 86 percent of the families on Magoun Street were in favor of Residential B.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Carolyn Mead.

CAROLYN MEAD: I am Carolyn Mead. I live at 15 Brookford Street, and \(I\) feel very strongly about Brookford Street remaining closed. My husband and I instituted the lawsuit which ended in the judgment that Brookford Street should still remain closed.

I would like to compliment whenever put
together this flier. It was very informative.

And I wish the Planning Board would pay attention
to each of the sections on the back, because
there must be things that you could do to improve those situations that they put forth there. I
find that the community concerns that the project
isn't well integrated with the existing
neighborhood in form and scale should be
compatible with surrounding neighborhood,
buildings should be smaller in scale, like

Cambridge Lumber. I agree with that section
wholeheartedly, 100 percent.

But the other sections have very cogent
issues that need to be addressed. I don't think
the developer has done them, and \(I\) hope that the Planning Board will do it.

I served on this Board for many years.

It is nice to see you all again. Thank you for
hearing me out.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Heather Hoffman. And after her, Maria

MacFarland.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. My name is

Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street, which is nowhere near this neighborhood, but I have spent eight years going to rehearsals at the dance studio. And those are on a Sunday. I can't imagine what it is like during the weekday, when there is all of that traffic on Mass. Ave. I can tell you what it is like on a Sunday. And I can also tell you what Linear Park is like.
Now I don't drive a big car. And yet, there is barely enough room on these streets as it is for my small car. Now \(I\) doubt that everybody is going to have a teeny, tiny car in this building. It should tell you something, that people are arguing over whether to open Brookford Street, when the traffic study says there is going to be less traffic. That doesn't make any sense. And \(I\) can just tell you that
there isn't room for people to be going in and
out of this. It is scary as it is now.

And the last thing is something that \(I\)
have mentioned every time \(I\) have been here to talk about this neighborhood, and that is Linear Park. When I don't drive, I use Linear Park. I walk from Davis Square. It is an incredible place. You don't want something looming over it. Because right now, you have ugly but low-scale buildings on this site, and they aren't close to the park.

> And I would also reiterate what people
said about having enough entrances so that people can actually use Linear Park to get from here to there, because not everybody is going to want to go in the direction of Mass Ave. Some of them are going to want to go to the \(T\), and that is the other way. And it is nuts to make them go, especially on foot, so far out of their way to get there.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
```

Maria MacFarland. And after Maria

```

MacFarland, Ashley Adler.

MARIA MacFARLAND: Hi. Maria MacFarland.

I am a brand new resident on Brookford Street.

I first came, not thinking I was speaking for or against the project as a whole. I was more thinking in terms of being on Brookford. And \(I\) think \(I\) am along on this, from what \(I\) hear. But \(I\) was wondering if there was possibility of a pedestrian-controlled gate at the end of Brookford.
I also wanted to say that essentially we
very much like that it is a dead end and that traffic can't come through it, and \(I\) think \(I\) would probably be in a different place if \(I\) was on one of the other streets.

I was surprised that this is rental
units. I do like the idea of condos and owner occupants, if possible.
```

That is it.

```

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Ashley Adler. And after Ashley, Maureen Arkle.

ASHLEY ADLER: Hello. My name is Ashley

Adler. I live at 49 Madison Avenue.

I have lived there for about four years now. When my boyfriend at the time and \(I\) moved in originally, we thought we would be there for a year. We said, "Oh, tenancy at will? Great. We can leave whenever we want." And it turns out we really like it here. My mom keeps getting mad at me because we won't move back to Chicago. We are engaged now. I would really to keep living here. I would like to buy a house here. I really like my neighbors. It turns out they are great people. And it just seems like, why would we ever leave, except that it turns out it is really hard to find a place to buy in Cambridge.

When I first heard that the Fawcetts were planning on developing this site, \(I\) thought, that
is amazing. Because \(I\) have been looking at these broken down greenhouses, wondering why are these left like this? It seems dangerous. There is broken glass. That is great. There should be a useable thing there. Maybe if they build houses or even smaller townhouses, that could be an option for us. That would be really great. And then \(I\) find out that it puts the community garden in jeopardy, which they didn't really talk about, but is the empty white spot in the corner of Whittemore the Magoun. And that I found upsetting because, as a current renter, we don't really have a gardening space. I thought, what a great community resource. And it is beautiful to look at. Right now, in the pictures, it is not. Everything is dead and brown. But if someone actually put some resources, even minor
resources, it could be lovely. And it is full of flowers and vegetables and all this awesome
stuff.

And I, with a couple friends from the
neighborhood, one weekend two years ago, went
around the neighborhood and collected almost 200
signatures in just two days in support of saving
that garden. And when Fawcett first started this
process, \(I\) went to the community meetings. I
thought, great. They are really working with us.

This is exciting.

I mean, I had no history with these
people. I am coming in as a new entity in here.

I am like, these people are really working with us. This is awesome.

And I feel like we have been strung along
on some of the issues that at first they seemed very positive about, like the garden, like the connection to the Linear Park. My fiance and I use the connection to Linear Park almost every
day to take the \(T\), to go on the bike path. And
right now, it is owned by Grace, actually.

But the little path to get from our
corner of North Cambridge to Linear Park is a
little tunnel in a chain link fence, and you have to turn tight corners. It is really hard with a Radio Flyer wagon, by the way. Really hard. And it gets full of water and ice, and it is really dangerous.
And I said to the Fawcetts, "This is
something \(I\) am really concerned about. Can you please build a new pathway for us to get to Linear Park?" And they said, "Yes, we will look at that."

And now, \(I\) see the only path to Linear Park is down all the way at the other end. And so \(I\) am going to be stuck falling on the butt on the ice still. And I mean, where is this going? And these things that they are taking away from us, they are taking away green space they we can actually use to put in green space that we can look at.

And I like looking at green stuff. I
really do. I don't know how much time you have ever spent with a really active four-year-old, but looking at the grass isn't that helpful.

That is about it. So thank you very much for listening to our comments, and \(I\) hope that you can help us. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thanks.

Maureen Arkle.

MAUREEN ARKLE: Thank you. Maureen

Arkle.

I am like on the SAT test, what doesn't fit with these other things. I am representing a business in the area, 2500 Mass. Ave., the Marino Center. We lease parking spots from Tyler Court. The parking lot that they showed, we rent for our employees. We also have 12 other spaces in the back.

I feel a little bit at a loss because I was not really aware of this development, and \(I\)
was notified by one of our nice neighbors that
this is going on. And so we, as recently as
two years ago, made a major investment in our
building and did a \(\$ 2\) million renovation. We
have been there for 20 years. And so this really
creates a big risk for us, because we have about

40 employees, and probably 25 people park in the area back there.

So like I said, we weren't notified of
this, and I am not sure what the options are.

But I thought I needed to come and just make you aware of that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

CHARLES TEAGUE: Charles Teague, 23

Edmunds Street.

I was going to start with everything that you hate, which is traffic and parking. The

Marino Clinic is a neighborhood institution. It
is one of three that probably will go away. We
are going to lose the garden; we are loosing the dance studio. And I don't see how they are going to survive with 25 spaces. And actually, 14 of those spaces were required by their variance.

They had to prove that they had a lease for the parking spaces.

So I think you really have to do
something creative with parking. They talk about shared parking nowadays. That is something for the Board to figure out. Because all over Cambridge, the Marino Clinic is a well-known institution.

Traffic, just for humor, \(I\) going was going to ask, how can there be no traffic increase on Whittemore and Magoun when there is zero now? So it has to be more than zero. So there is something wrong there. On ownership and townhouses, you saw the
memo that was from 2011. And then we actually
built a model, as you see out in the hallway.

And then we have the townhouse incarnation. So not only did we say what we wanted, but we actually showed everybody what we wanted. It is a lot like a usual community group who just comes and says, "We want something different." We had a vision, and we implemented it.

So there is the package with one of the many traffic maps that we were bored with before. But just remember that, when you look at it, that the turn on -- when it was illegal in the evenings, that one of the neighbors counted 54 cars making an illegal turn in 45 minutes. We have video of this. The neighborhood is a cut-through. There is a lot more traffic than apparently is counted.
In the package, it has some site plans
that show some really nice access into the Linear Park. So it is really nice. And then on the Tyler Court side, it has this nice oval thing. So those side plans were sort of nice.

Now of course, as you all know, I walk
the Linear Park every day. I think this is too
close to the park. And in some sense, that is my
fault because, despite the building commissioner
ruling the Cambridge Lumber had a 35 feet
setback, when it came over here, it was very
surprising, it was a seven-and-a-half foot
setback. That was after the down zoning was
filed. But we didn't want to change that because
we felt that, with the Board, got the Cambridge

Lumber site reduced. So we couldn't change the petition after we discovered that.

So that is really about that. We are
losing two neighborhood institutions. Let's not
lose the third. There is some work to be done.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

PAUL DOBLER: Paul Dobler. I reside at

47 Magoun Street.

I am glad to see that the site is going
to be transformed from a light industrial to a residential area. People who own it have every right to develop it.

I do not understand why we need a
building this large. I was told previously that the developer needed a certain number of units to make it financially feasible to develop the site.

I look across the way to the adjacent site at the

Cambridge Lumber site, which is 22 units, and
they have managed to develop that site, obviously
financially, without a huge megalithic building.

This building is a skyscraper on its
side. And we keep telling people that we don't
want tall buildings adjacent to the park. This
building is 12 feet away from the property line,

12 feet, and 30 feet tall. It is almost a
three-to-one ratio.
I ask this Board to protect our
neighborhood. We have a dense residential
neighborhood that is two-family, three-family
buildings. The building at the Cambridge Lumber site are three-family, two-family buildings.

They are in keeping with what is there. The City of Cambridge does not need more rental units; The City of Cambridge needs more residential units.

I forgot. I was going to say something
else. I will wrap it up. I hope that you will not support this design.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

DOUGLAS WYNYARD: Good evening. My name
is Douglas Wynyard, and I live at 60 Lexington

Avenue. I hadn't intended to speak, but I will give you something of the different perspective. Mr. Flaherty had sort of alluded to the fact that there was somebody here interested in buying one of those lots, and that is me. So I speak as someone who is looking to buy into the neighborhood and make an investment. And in so doing, I have sort of done my due diligence on
the project.

And I find that, yes, it is a lot of
apartments. But \(I\) think it is very sensitively
designed. I think there is a need for this kind of housing. I am looking and speaking with

Mr. Fawcett to purchase the land on Magoun Street right on the corner, and \(I\) have no problem with that building in my backyard. And that is what \(I\) would like to say.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

DANIEL CARR: I am Daniel Carr. I live
at 16 Cottage Park. My house is one building away from all of that.

All I really wanted to say was two
things, that \(I\) was driving out of Cottage Park
this morning. There was a bicyclist coming down

Cottage Park. I had to yield to the bicyclist.

I am driving a Honda Civic. It is not a big street at all.

And the other thing \(I\) just wanted to
mention that \(I\) kept hearing was how in disarray the current Fawcett property is. You don't get rewarded -- you don't get special permits by neglecting your property.

That is like if I had a building, a
garage, and \(I\) wanted to convert it to
residential, and \(I\) continuously just spray
painted it until it looked ugly, until finally
somebody would let me do something. That is
really not right. And \(I\) don't support this.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Anyone else?

AMELIA WESTMARK: Good evening. My name
is Amelia Westmark.

And I own the house at 115 Harvey Street, and that is right smack dab in the middle of the Cambridge Lumber project that they are doing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, yes.

AMELIA WESTMARK: I definitely have been here before. And I agree with everyone here who has all of the same concerns I had. They are very legitimate concerns about the size, about the traffic, about the design. It is ugly.

And we worked with Cambridge Lumber.

When they originally came to us, it was 39 units. And they don't show it on there, how wide Cambridge Lumber is, but if you basically picked up Cambridge Lumber and put on the top of the building, it is somewhat of a similar size. I don't know if the lot is bigger. But we worked with them to go from 39 units to 20 units.

And someone here brought up the point
that they have two-family houses, they have three-family houses. But if Charlie can point out, there is actually three single-family houses that they put in there. And what is does is, it helps it fit in with the neighborhood so much better. It is so aesthetically pleasing, if you
drive down the street.

So just to support all of you guys, I
would hope that this new project going in would
take some lessons from Cambridge Lumber and put that into the new area. Thank you.

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

DARA GLASS: My name is Dara Glass.

I rent an apartment on Edmunds Street.

It is at the end of Edmunds Street. I will try
and make this brief. I just wanted to say that I
agree with everything that my neighbors have said
here today, even the gentleman from Lexington

Street who said he wants to by one of the
parcels. I agree with him too, because my
boyfriend and I would also love to stay in

Cambridge and buy a house. In which case, I
would love to see this be a better opportunity
for people to buy a home in Cambridge. This is
not a good opportunity for people to buy a home
in Cambridge.

Also, \(I\) just wanted to highlight one
thing that \(I\) think has been glazed over, which is
that this is going to be a gated community. I
had the misfortune of living in Florida for a few years, and that is filled with gated communities,
and I hated it. I hated it because you never
knew your neighbors. You never felt like part of
a neighborhood. You had to use a FOB to get into
a gate, and you were worried about if someone was going to come in after you, and you were
protective of everything. And \(I\) just felt
terrible. I mean, it just felt unneighborly.

And that is not the feeling of Cambridge in
general, but especially this area of Cambridge.

And having a gated community is just not what
belongs here. I thing that would be a big, big
mistake for this area.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Anyone else?

MINKA VANVEUZEKOM: My name is Minka

Vanbeuzekom.

I am Cambridge City Counselor. I live at 20 Essex Street in Cambridge.

Central Square, I believe, is the heart of Cambridge. But this neighborhood, as you all know from the great turnout here, really has its own little heart. It is a wonderful
neighborhood. And you don't often find such a well integrated community.

So I think that their points about the size, the scale, the fact that it doesn't fit into what has been created heretofore, is really important to listen to, and \(I\) know that you will.

Keeping the scale of this building or of
these units that need to be, for financial
reasons, built, makes sense. But the way it is constructed just doesn't fit in. And you have heard that many times.
```

I also want to reiterate what Dara said

```
about the gated community. As you know, I was here when Novartis wanted to gate off their courtyard. And we are not a gated community.

This is Cambridge. We are open. MIT's campus is open. Harvard's campus is open. Novartis's campus will be open once that is built. And creating a gated community here just is not compatible as well with the spirit.
I also wanted to question a little bit
the traffic studies. So this part of Cambridge does not have the high adoption rate of using alternative of transportation. And the traffic study makes the same assumptions, about 50 percent of people will use things other than cars to get around. And the traffic study, based on
guidelines from City, requires that you try to
predict out into the future what the additional
traffic will be, based on what you know is coming
down the pike in terms of other buildings. And
normally, the City has said you have to do that with a . 5 percent increase each year.

And Sue Clippinger very wisely said, no,
let's do 1 percent. But \(I\) think this situation, with what is happening so close by, that

1 percent figure is also completely not relevant to the reality that we know is coming.

So I really urge you -- I know you will
do it, based on what you have heard from the articulate neighbors talking about. I urge you to really take all those things into
consideration when you continue to try to shape this project.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No voices heard.)

HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one wishing to
speak. So now it is thrown back to us.
We have been sitting here just as long as
you have. So what we would ordinarily do is, we would lay out on the table, certain questions
that we want to see people address, and then take a break, and that will probably take us until ten o'clock.

I am also determined not to start a major hearing at ten o'clock in the evening. So I think we may want to think about postponing the CambridgePark hearing until maybe the first meeting in May. So I am sort of seeking some comments from other board members on procedural matters.

PAMELA WINTERS: Do you want me to start?

I agree with you, Hugh. I think if we go around and just -- like \(I\) have a little list of
issues. And if all of us speak our issues, that
is going to take us until ten o'clock. And I
think we are going to all be pretty tired by
then. So that is my opinion.

HUGH RUSSELL: The alternative would be
to take a break now and get back after the break to do that, talking about the issues.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Given that \(I\) really do
have to go to the men's room, I think that is a good idea. But we should just do it real quickly and come back. Provided that we will have
sufficient time and approval window for the other hearing, it would be great, if we could, to postpone it.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I would support a
five-minute break right now.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Let's take a break
and come back and talk.
(Recess taken at 9:28 p.m.)
(Recess ended at 9:44 p.m.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Back on the record.

So I think at this point in time, we will
do one of our traditional going around the table,
asking each member to put on to the table, issues
that they want to see discussed, before we take
this up again.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, are you just
looking for topics to address, rather than my own views on matters?

HUGH RUSSELL: Of course, I am interested to know what your views are. Feel free to intersperse the two.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, among the issues I would like to see addressed, certainly, I would like to -- the biggest issue that I see is not the number of units, it is not the FAR or the density, per se; but rather the massing and the form of the building.

Certainly one of the criteria for the
issuance of our special permits is consistency with the established patterns of development on
the street in the neighborhood. And whatever
else may be said about the appeal or desirability
of the design, it is certainly of a different
nature and massing than the surrounding
buildings.

> It is a funny thing. If it had been an
existing building, an existing mill or factory, or what have you, of that scale, and it was a rehab of the existing building, I would say that is one thing. It is part of the existing fabric and certain industrial history of the neighborhood.

But as a new building, I am not sure that that approach of a single monolithic building is the way to go. And I would really like, would like to see the applicant at least present other options as to how that number of units could be organized and arranged on the site. In my mind, that is the overarching premier issue on the site.

There are a number of subsidiary issues;
certainly the relationship between the site and
the Linear Park, and how that border is done and
what the fencing is. And \(I\) think in terms of
```

affording access from the surrounding
neighborhood to the Linear Park would be
important in terms of walkways and access points.
The traffic, we have certainly heard a
great deal about the traffic. I guess that is a
secondary issue. On the one hand, I am inclined
to assign great weight to the evaluation of the
city's traffic department. And yet, when you
hear about these streets, it certainly does raise
concerns.

```
    And I note in the traffic department's
letter that they point out the virtue of having
five separate access points to the site. And I
thought that was an important point.
    And while I am, certainly, understanding
and empathetic to the views of the residents of
Brookford Street, I still am troubled by the
notion that a new development here is going to
have an impact on the traffic patterns of the
neighborhood and will have an impact on the
residents of these various streets, except for one street. And unless it is a really good
reason in the nature and geometry and
configuration of that street, it is difficult for me to see why it wouldn't be advantageous and in the best interest overall for that street to sort of bear its fair share of the traffic consequences here.

And I guess I would want to hear more
from the applicant, Mr. Rafferty, on that, as to exactly what that court order says and whether,
in fact, the circumstances that the order was
originally intended to address no longer prevail
in the site.

I think I have said enough.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, in the spirit of
what we asked the folks to do at that public
hearing, \(I\) agree with everything you just said.

Basically, this is a difficult site. It
is difficult for all sorts of reasons. One, the
goal we have in the zoning that we have passed is to take these kinds of industrial sites and make them residential properties. And the reality is that, in most cases, that does give us a site that has a density that is more than most people would like if they were sort of starting from scratch.

This also has the particular problem that
the Bishop Petition was passed, and the Bishop Petition does kind of limit you. I mean, it has limits on the height; it has limits on some of the dimensions. So it kind of defines an envelope that you can kind of work within.

That being said, I definitely agree
that -- I have note here that says, "Were studies
done within the limits of what the Bishop

Petition has?" Did you look at some options in
trying to make it less massively one building?

In my mind, I think the number of units
have been reduced from what could have been done
before by the Bishop Petition. So I agree with you, it is not the number of units. The units based on the sized of the land area, it does have its limits.

But \(I\) am interested in just knowing if you even looked at, in preliminary studies, what it could be. And I am interested in seeing some of those options. If you didn't, I am interested in just seeing what the ramifications can be.

The idea of selling the properties, it is interesting. It is an interesting balance, which I am not quite sure how \(I\) feel about, but \(I\) can see the balance by having four properties there that can be developed in something that is of a very residential scale, has its advantages. But the trade-off is that you have something that is going to be bigger and denser. And so I am just not sure how all those pieces work.
I think this is an interesting thing
because, you all don't know it, but we have been
sitting through very long and lengthy meetings about Central Square and Kendall Square. And I find this interesting because, in Kendall Square, we have a series of fairly large parcels of land which has a small number of relatively large owners. And then in Central Square, we have parcels of land which has a lot of small owners. And this one, even thought it is a small smaller piece, it is an amalgamation of the two. We have a lot of small property owners who actually live there, who a lot of you represent. And then we have a very large piece of land that needs to be developed.

And from a master planning point of view, and that term has been used many times tonight, I really think it is the City's responsibility to kind of give us a little bit more focus, because so much of the problems here, particularly with the streets and the traffic, is just out of the control of this one single landowner. I mean,
the landowner is landlocked. We passed zoning to encourage this kind of development.

And believe me, I have come down Cottage

Ave., because, in the course of the many things that have come to us in this area, including the condominium complex on Cottage Avenue, I have driven down there. And \(I\) can't imagine -turning from Mass. Ave. onto Cottage Ave., even your model outside with the little cars on it make it seem a lot more robust than it is.

So this idea of at least understanding
how the those five streets work, Tyler Court and Cottage Ave, and I think at least with the traffic department in the City, I think we just need to have a better understanding of, if you think of this not as just one site that is being developed, but a neighborhood that we are trying to do, I would really like to see the City kind of get into this a little and just help us out with some thoughts on how to the make this work.

And I agree with you wholeheartedly.

Even though I understand the history of why it happened, to have a development of this size on this scale in this neighborhood, and to have Brookford Street just totally out of the picture, just doesn't make any sense to me.

So having all said all of that, \(I\) do need to say, however, that in general, if \(I\) look at what it there now, \(I\) don't have too much of a problem with an approach that tries to develop this.

I do think the scale of the building, I would like to see some options on that. And I am just going to go through a few things, a little more specific things that \(I\) want to make sure we talk about.

The fence clearly is something that I -literally, when \(I\) heard you say it was a chain link fence with stuff growing on it, that didn't go over very well in my ears. And I think the
```

development is of such a scale that that fence is
such a critical part of what is going to make
this right, that at least I would like to hear
some options on what can happen there that makes
it reasonable.

```
The whole idea of -- and I don't know if
you looked at this already, in terms of fire and
fire access. As I look at that, \(I\) even try to --
having gone through several of those exercises in
other places and in other forms with the City
fire departments, where they really are concerned
about where the trucks come in and the turning
radiuses and stuff like that, \(I\) would like at
least a little clarity on that.
I am assuming you have probably done some
of that, and probably traffic and parking has
looked into that issue. But \(I\) would like to know
what it is too.
    I talked about Mass Ave. and traffic and
all of these ways of getting around. The Linear

Park access, I agree wholeheartedly that there should be more than the one access. I think, Mr. Rafferty, you implied that there was some reason for not having the access on the other side nearer to Magoun or Brookford, but I just think, unless there is some problem that the neighbors have or something, I think just being able to have at least pedestrian access on more than one side makes a lot of sense to me.
I would also be interested in how
deliverables works in terms of, if you have UPS
trucks or FedEx trucks and stuff going in there, and also how trash is going to be managed, and how the snow is going to be managed in terms of removal in the winter.
I think the issue of the address, I would
just like to get the City to say, I mean, how much leeway does the proponent have, in sort of picking their address on this? I think, given the traffic problems, I think the point was made
that, given that address, it is going to take a lot of traffic down what \(I\) think is probably one of the worst streets in there as far as access, Cottage Ave. But \(I\) am just not sure. I would just like some clarity if that is an issue, and does that make any difference.

I think it is the City's responsibility,

I think, to look at this Brookford Street issue and to see, given the changes and the fact that we are redeveloping it, if it makes logical sense to try and do something better to make the site work from a traffic perspective. That is better. I would just like some clarity on the clean site issues, and if there is any hazardous material. There was talk about the garden, and someone said the gardens wasn't a clean site. I was just want to be clear as to what that is. And this issue of the other parkers, too, are there any kind of binding contracts or whatever on the site for the people who are
currently parking that we are displacing, if that is going to cause some problem elsewhere. I just want a little bit more clarity there.

I think, when we talk, we can talk about
the differences between the Cambridge Lumber
site. Obviously, there is a much smaller unit
count there. There is some issues around that.

But that is something we can discuss as we are starting to talk about it.

And people have talked about this as a
gated community. As \(I\) look at it, it is not
quite a gated community, because \(I\) define a gated
community is where you actually are prevented from driving in. This is a gated parking lot,
which I think it should be. But I wouldn't quite
call it a gated community, other than the fact
that its configuration at the end of very long
streets kind of can give you that feel. But \(I\)
think calling it a gated community is probably
not quite the right perspective.

And with that, I think I have said enough and can pick up other things as we go along. PAMELA WINTERS: I have a couple of your comments on my list here, too. But in the interest of time, \(I\) am just going to quickly go down some of my issues.

Did the landscaping person talk, the person in charge of landscaping?

JAMES RAFFERTY: No.

PAMELA WINTERS. They should. My issue is, of course, the chain link fence. Because having gone to the dance studio, and having looked at it a lot, it is really ugly.

And we have a little chain link fence in the back of our property. It is only three feet tall. But what you can do -- I am really into landscaping. But anyway, what you can do is plant yews there. And the yews will cover the chain link fence very nicely. And they grow to be like 10 feet tall, and they grow quickly, and
```

they require very little maintenance. So that is
just one suggestion to cover the chain link
fence. And it would add privacy and be very
nice.
The height of the building I have an
issue with; the penthouses and the rooftop
mechanicals; the fire safety issues with the fire
trucks coming in and out. Bill, you mentioned
that.

```
    Rental versus buying. I would love to
see these made into condos, instead of that.
People can set down roots and make this more of a
neighborhood. That is just my opinion.
    What is the address? It is One Tyler
Court? Is it Cottage Park Avenue? Again, you
said that, too.
Certainly the Cambridge Lumber is only
22 units versus these are 67 units. But \(I\) am
concerned about the massing. I would like to see
it a little bit smaller, perhaps broken up. The
massing is an issue for me.

And the traffic and the parking, of
course, that needs to be really looked at a little closer.

And in terms of the dance studio, the good news is that it is going to be torn down because, after dancing there, the rugs had mold in them. There was no ventilation. It was a really difficult place to dance. I did the hula, and you have dance in bare feet, and \(I\) would always get splinters in my feet. And it was just really awful.

But the thing is that it is, to see the little kids doing the Irish step dancing, it was such a delightful thing to see these little kids doing modern dance or ballet or Irish step dancing. I was like amazed. How do can they do that?

So anyway, now if \(I\) had a magic wand -and this has nothing, perhaps, to do with the
project. But if \(I\) had a magic wand, \(I\) would love to see maybe the City Arts Council do something
to try to help Deborah Mason to perhaps find a place where they could be. Because dance is art.

And find a place where that can be replaced.

So those are just some of my comments.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Most of my comments have already been brought up by my colleagues. And I will just say that \(I\) didn't hear any of their concerns that \(I\) thought were differing from my view of the project.

The big question here is exactly what Steve said, could this be a townhouse development, or a development of multiple smaller buildings? Or do we what has been designed here is, from a bird's eye view, a big building?

But from a pedestrian's eye view, it is,
in fact, a roughly 10 -unit building on cottage Park at the end; another 10-unit building, the
same mirror image, seen from the end of

Whittemore Avenue; and then a stealth section in
the middle that is difficult to see unless you
are in the parking lot. So it will present
itself not as a steamship, but as -- and then
also, if you look at the architecture, the way
the end is expressed, it is expressed actually as
three or four separate buildings that are
attached to each other.

So what that gives you is lots of open
space. Because you take the space that would be
slivered up between buildings and combine it.

But you are not necessarily using the
open space to the best advantage. I would like
to see a plan for a community garden. I would
like to see that there are enough gardens so that
persons who are living in this project, if they
are renters and don't have access to the ground.

But also, that there be twice as many as
that number so that people in the neighborhood
can do it. I think you have got the land. And it is messy. Actually, it looks messy. It is a lovely mess in the summer. It is kind of a sad mess in the winter. But you know, some things that are very good look messy sometimes. And I will say that \(I\) have ridden my bicycle from Linear Park to Whittemore Avenue down the path that was described, and \(I\) will say that is everything that the description made of
it, but I managed to get through. I was dismayed
to discover that \(I\) couldn't get down Whittemore
Avenue back onto the site, that the fence was
really very effective. And so I ended up
actually bicycling down each of the connecting
streets, just because \(I\) was there and \(I\) wanted to
remind myself.
    I also would love to see a plan that
accommodates Marino Center parking in some
fashion. I think that is an important community
resource, and we lose a lot if they can't
function.

Now they may have other options that I don't know. But \(I\) think maybe they may need some assistance to explore some of those options, and maybe some of those options will end up being in part in the Fawcett property.

I am going to give the microphone.

One of the challenges, you will see,

Catherine, is trying to have something to say when it gets to you. We don't always start at that end.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I have next to nothing to say, because it has all been said before. I do agree with all the comments that have been made.

The only one or two points I would like to make is I, too, have spent more time that I would like in southern Florida, and I don't like gated communities. I don't like the feel of the gates on the parking areas, because it does feel
```

like it is cutting off everything, all the
streets going down.
If Brookford is opened, I am wondering
if, whether there is some alternative. I realize
people don't want to cut through from Whittemore
all the way through to Mass. Ave., but I would
like traffic and parking to think about that
again, especially if we can get Brookford open,
which I think it probably ought to be. And that
goes into the whole access issue about fire
equipment and other emergency vehicles.
And the only other thing I would really
like to see is a better, I think, north elevation
that shows the parking in the building. Because
I don't really see how it is working in this
drawing.

```
    Other than that, all the issues that my
colleagues have raised are ones that I am
concerned about and want to hear more about.
    STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I concur with
the comments of my colleagues, and particularly Bill. I thought you said it very, very well.

And all of the other issues about the massing, about the -- I am not certain that we are getting a real good perspective of what this building looks like to a pedestrian. And I think there may be more to it.

And Hugh, I think that you are coming up with some really interesting ways to wrap the external community into the project so that it does feel like one issue.

I want to mention that the rail trails,
the rail beds, offer very challenging
geographical terrain issues, because they are built up high, and then they slope down, because the train used to run up on top of it. So they are very challenging to work with. So we have to really work hard with the architect as he designs the border to it.

You know, what \(I\) want to see is
pedestrian permeability. We see it all over

Cambridge. And we don't want this to be a
campus. Harvard and MIT have been really, really cooperative about pedestrian permeability as one of their core values. Everybody walks through. We have to be able to have that in some sense. This can't be like walking through somebody's backyard. I think that would be a mistake, and it would set it off from the rest of the community.
I also want to close my comments by
reading an e-mail, April 9th, from John Phillip, who is an architect in New York City, with John Phillip \& Associates Architects and Planners. He says, quote, The building would introduce a significantly large transient population into the neighborhood that is antithetical to developing a feeling of community, close quote.

We have got to stop talking about renters as vermin. Okay? Cambridge can do so much
better. We are really much better than that. We have to stop talking about rental units as bad. They are not bad. I rent. My son grew up in Cambridge. He rents. When we start to say, certain people who do certain things, we are going to treat them in a certain way, that is dehumanizing people. And we know better than to go there. So I would just ask us to all to take a step back from that.

Thank you.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It certainly
is a challenge, going last. But \(I\) do agree with most of what is been said.

I would love to hear from the fire
department, if they have had a chance to review the plans, and if they are comfortable with them.

I think the address issue may be dealt
with by a change in massing. And if it was
broken up into several buildings with several
addresses, that might be less of a concern. So I
```

would like to see some more information on that.
I agree with Steve about the pedestrian
permeability. I know that that is a challenging
slope, getting up to Linear Park. I would like
to get more information on how that is going to
be achieved, not just at what appears very much
to be a private access point that is planned
here, but I would like to see some public access,
that people can get bikes up to the park from the
neighborhood.

```
    That is all \(I\) have that is different.
    STEVEN COHEN: Hugh, could I add one or
two points?
    HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
    STEVEN COHEN: First of all, the
interesting question of ownership versus rental.
I think there are pros and cons of each. But I
don't think that the question is within our
purview to address; and therefore, \(I\) don't think
we should address that question. It should be
left to the applicant to decide.

Another point \(I\) would like to address is
the four other lots which are designated under
the plan, and we heard the intended uses described.

But they are actually not part of this application. But \(I\) think actually how they are ultimately addressed is of some interest and concern to us. I think as described, it sounds fine. But if that is how it is being described to us, I would like to see it somehow incorporated into a discussion by way of conditions or otherwise. One other comment I would make, Mark, if in fact, you are going to come back and show us some other studies of how the square footage could be organized on the parcel, I hear what Hugh said about how the building actually does look to a pedestrian. And Hugh described it as sort of broken up into a series of connected
buildings, perhaps.

But I must say, when \(I\) look at the north elevation, that \(I\) am not seeing that. It looks somewhat relentless and long to me. And so, while \(I\) think it would be helpful to see how it would be broken up into a large number of smaller structures, \(I\) think perhaps another thing that might be interesting and useful to look at would be that, if it is going to be a larger structure, whether that elevation could be better articulated to, in effect, break it up and create the perception of connected smaller structures.

And I must admit -- and am not sure which
way this would cut. But looking at elevations frequently, they may be accurate geometrically, but they frequently don't really tell a fair story about what it would actually look like.

And in fact, when \(I\) look at your elevations, and then \(I\) look at the perspective drawing that you do on the cover, it doesn't even look like the
same building. So you might do yourself justice by showing us more perspectives of this project, so we can get a better sense of what it actually looks like.

> WILLIAM TIBBS: If you don't mind, Hugh. Mark, I just want to say, obviously you
have been before us a lot, and we kind of know your architectural style and the kind of
buildings you do.

And in this one in particular, \(I\) go by
the Harvard residents in Cambridgeport almost
every day. And \(I\) think that this one looks like
it could fall into that category where you
actually have a series of entries and kind of the
feel of townhouses, but it feels like a fairly
large and connected building. So I think you
tend not to go in and out too much in your
buildings, as best as \(I\) can see; even though the
one on Broadway, \(I\) found that interesting, even
though that is a building.

But you tend to have a certain flatness,
even when you are changing materials and stuff.

And \(I\) think that this might not work as well
here. So that is something to keep in mind.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I think we are
complete on this.

Brian, do you have -- I think you said
you thought we would be discussing - -

BRIAN MURPHY: Do you have the list of -was it June, or May 21st?

LIZA PADEN: May 21st.

BRIAN MURPHY: May 21 st would be when we suggested to have that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So thank you all very much for coming and being so articulate and being patient.

We will have one more short piece of
business to do. And so if you could make your way out of the room quietly, we would appreciate that.
(Discussion off the record.)

HUGH RUSSELL: We are going to open the hearing for 125 CambridgePark Drive with the intention of adjourning to a fixed date where we can have a real discussion with enough time.

The staff has advised me that the best
time they believe is to add that to the third
meeting in May, which would be the 14 th of May.

And I gather the petitioner is agreeable
to that?

BRIAN MURPHY: We thought we would add
the 14 th, and have the petitioner come back

May 7 th, and then \(K 2-C 2\) on the 14 th.

HUGH RUSSELL: Rick, do you want to say
anything?

MR. McKINNON: No, just that that is fine
with us.

BRIAN MURPHY: And we will schedule it as
the first hearing, so that we don't find
ourselves in this position again.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you need a formal
motion?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I will move to continue the hearing relating to the various special permits for 125 CambridgePark Drive and 150 CambridgePark Drive and 180R CambridgePark Drive to May 7th.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second?

WILLIAM TIBBS: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: And discussion? All those
in favor?
(Voices heard.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All in favor.

BRIAN MURPHY: Can you announce the time?

HUGH RUSSELL: 7:20.

LIZA PADEN: And we will do another
mailing as well.
(Whereupon, at 10:22 p.m., the hearing
was adjourned.)
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