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## PROCEEDINGS

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This
is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. My ears are plugged up so I can't hear myself.

LIZA PADEN: I'11 turn it up after we're done.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's fine.
So the first item on our agenda is the review of the Zoning Board cases.

LIZA PADEN: So this evening Dan Winny is here to present the information on one of the cases. It's a Planning Board Special Permit, 174 which is a 301 Binney Street, and currently one of the occupants is Ironwood and they're looking to amend the plans to convert some space from mechanical to active research space. And I have Dan Winny here to go -- where did he go? Are you

## the one presenting it?

DAN WINNY: I'd be happy to.
LIZA PADEN: Okay.
So, some of the materials were
submitted to you and I'd like to have Dan come up and just run through quickly what they're requesting and answer any questions that the Board has and be ready for any comments for the BZA.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I don't see this as a very challenging recommendation.

LIZA PADEN: We11, maybe you don't have any questions.

DAN WINNY: That would be fine.
LIZA PADEN: That's okay, too.
HUGH RUSSELL: Somebody's got a parking garage that's way too big. It's 120 extra spaces in it. The building was built as a telecom building with lots of extra
mechanical space.
DAN WINNY: Correct.
HUGH RUSSELL: And so now they want to put some people who are going to give jobs into that space, and they'11 park in the garage and see how it works and Adam has blessed it I believe.

DAN WINNY: Yes.
LIZA PADEN: So that's --
HUGH RUSSELL: In a nutshel1 that's the case. I don't know how much more --

STEVEN WINTER: The documentation was very clear.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
And the City Administration strongly supports this.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: What is our
actionable item?

## LIZA PADEN: We11, this is a Zoning

 Board of Appeal case. So, like any BZA case, you can make comments to the BZA, support it, have comments, have recommendations, no comments.H. THEODORE COHEN: And the ZBA grants the Special Permit, too?

LIZA PADEN: They do -- yes, they do all of the permitting.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Because that's what the Variance request and the Special Permit for reduction in parking spaces.
(Pamela Winters Seated.)
HUGH RUSSELL: We should, let the job, as people would suggest we should recommend supporting this.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Be in favor of it
because it seems like it's just using a piece
of building that's not used and providing jobs.

## LIZA PADEN: Okay.

STEVEN WINTER: And I'd also like to state that the documentation and the papers were very clear. So it was very clear what was happening. Very easy to understand. And, you know, I do support that.

## LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: If anybody would like a presentation who wants to discuss it at more length?

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay?
Sorry, Dan.
LIZA PADEN: Moving right along,
Mr. Winny is also here representing a request for a Sign Variance. And if you remember back in October there was a request, a
presentation by Sanofi down at 640 Memorial Drive, also known as the Ford Assembly Plant, for signage at the top of their building.

And after discussion and one thing and another, I actually had misremembered and I thought they already gone to the BZA. They have not. And they will be going in the immediate future. And so the sign proposed is a little bit different than what you saw the first time. And the Planning Board recommendation, which I believe I sent to you, what your comments were before, did I not -- did I send them?

HUGH RUSSELL: I didn't -STEVEN COHEN: I didn't get that. LIZA PADEN: Okay. So, I'm misremembering a different case. I apologize for that.

But there were a number of comments
that the Planning Board had. And Dan has a proposal for what they want to go to the BZA with at this point.

Do you have the drawings?
DAN WINNY: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: As I recollect, this proposed sign wasn't integrated with the architecture superstructure. It basically said fit it within one of the bays.
H. THEODORE COHEN: That's correct.

DAN WINNY: That was one of the comments, that's correct. Would the Board like materials?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, please.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes, me too. Thank you.

DAN WINNY: I'11 very quickly
summarize where this was the last time you
saw it which was in October when Sanofi came
before you to ask for two signage Variances for the building. One was for the sign looking out over the river, which required a Variance both for its height above grade and for the size of its internally illuminated element. I believe it's true to say having scrutinized the transcripts, that the Board generally felt supportive but felt that the sign on the building was not ideally located. It straddled a penthouse. The drawings now show the sign to be moved over between the penthouses.

The second sign that Sanofi was
pursuing a Variance for was on the parking lot side of the building, the opposite side. And that, again, was going to be above the allowed height. I think the Board felt distinctly less enthusiastically about that one and Sanofi is no longer pursuing a

Variance for that sign. It will be fully code compliant.

The Board had a comment that it would be better if it was more closely associated with the main building entrance, and that will be addressed. We're currently working with the owner to make sure we have a signage program for all the tenants in the building that's consistent and attractive.

So the only Variance that we will be asking the BZA for and we would like to get your comments about is the sign facing out towards the river, which is being shown to you tonight in two sizes at Sanofi's request.

The first size is the exact same size you saw last time.

And the second size is slightly larger.
So if you look at the two, 11-by-17
photo montages, you'11 see those two sizes
shown. They're obviously both higher than normally allowed. They both have elements of internal illumination that are bigger than 30 inches high, but none of them exceed the 60 square foot limitation.

So that's -- that is what is going to be requested from the BZA. The single sign looking out over the river. Sanofi would like the BZA and the Planning Board to consider the slightly larger rendition which they prefer.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: The, on the sign
location A, option 1, the $S$ on the Sanofi and the part of the branding is over the column on the building. Is that just a misrepresentation in the photo or is it
actually on top of the --
DAN WINNY: No, it would straddle the two pilasters. It's centered between them but it does overlap the two. That's what the larger one does.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I have a question. We're showing only a portion of the building, right? And the building's actually longer than this rendering; is that correct? DAN WINNY: Yes, that's correct.

But the full length of the building is shown in the plan. That's the 11-by-17 sheet. So you can see that the proposed location for the sign is about in the center. Oh, wait, I'm not correct on that. The sign does extend all the way to the left.

HUGH RUSSELL: This thing that says drive that's cut off, is actually in the middle of the building.

## DAN WINNY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So considering the
size of the building versus the building, we have to imagine that the building is actually twice as long.

DAN WINNY: Right. Thank you for clarifying that point.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm sorry, I wasn't here for the presentation last fall being a new Board Member. BUT can you tell me is it a single tenant in this building as a massive building or are there going to be the biotech companies in the there?

DAN WINNY: Sanofi is the largest tenant. They have slightly more than half of the building. There's another tenant on the other half that is getting installed and one more tenant that wi11 come. And so the idea has been to sort of have a dual approach to
the signage so that each -- because each tenant owns its own half of the building.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So we may be asked to entertain Variances for other enterprises that will be tenants in the building then?

DAN WINNY: You may.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: We may? Okay. HUGH RUSSELL: And of course this is a curious, as a curious history to all of this which I'm going to try to encapsulate briefly. There was a proposal to sort of rework the Sign Ordinance several years ago, and one of the pieces that was proposed was a piece that would allow signs of this sort under certain circumstances. And we thought it was on and we convinced the Council, and a vigorous effort was made to change the public's mind which appear -- I mean, my husband signed that petition. He had no idea
what he was signing.
PAMELA WINTERS: He should have talked to you.

HUGH RUSSELL: And he's a musician, but nevertheless. And it was a lot of scare tactics that weren't really very realistic. But we're now in a place where you have to get a Variance to do this. We can't apply the standards that we thought out, because ultimately the Council repealed that. And so we're a little, little worse off than usual here because I think we as a Board have felt these signs are not unreasonable if they're properly sized and not too many of them. So, I guess my personal feeling is that there's no reason to exclude Sanofi from the -having a sign when many other places in the city have it. And sort of the question is really what size sign do you like? And it's
not -- I mean, the one that doesn't fit in the bay seems better scaled to the building. The one that does fit the bay, fits the building better.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm not quite sure what to do with those two observations.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, I feel the
same way, Hugh.
It would have been nicer to get a pick -- because I'm not an architect. It would have been nicer to have a better visual of the entire building without all of the trees and everything and you can sort of see, you know, what was going on there a little bit better. I do like the larger sign. I don't have a problem with that, but I don't like the fact that it straddles the two columns visually. So I don't know if there's -- how
you resolve that.
STEVEN COHEN: I have the same
feeling as both of you. I have the exact
same reaction. The larger one is better for the scale of the building. I'm not thrilled with the overlap on the pilasters. I want to be sure which way to go. But then I became sure when I heard that you could not rule out the possibility that other tenants might be seeking signage on the building. And I think that pushed me towards the smaller sign.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, that's a good point.

STEVEN COHEN: It's a more conservative approach, less prone to making a mistake later.

PAMELA WINTERS: Good point.
HUGH RUSSELL: Roger, do you have a recommendation or a discussion?

## ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, please. I

absolutely agree with what Steve just said. And I think that we spent a lot of time on that rooftop mechanical. Charlie Sullivan and I worked very hard with MIT because neighbors were very upset about the mechanical equipment going on that building. It's very top heavy possibly. But if you look at it, I think they did a really good job designing it. So even though a lot of the times we think the rooftop is not being so important in terms of things like overlaps. In this case I do feel it's been architecturally well done. And so I would rather it stay inside there. I mean, there is a little room. It could get a little bit bigger if we're reading the drawings right and just be tangential to it. You wouldn't object to that. I do think if we're going to
have possibly more signs, it would be terrible to start getting involved.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I agree
with everything that's been said. And I -and I think for the, public one of the factors that entered into our originally agreeing to the sign was the fact of the location of this building with the overpass on Memorial Drive, so that a sign that was within the height allowed by the Ordinance really wasn't going to be seen by anybody. And so we felt having a sign on the penthouse made sense. I do agree that with all the comments that straddling the pilasters is not a good idea. And I know that if we just see a tiny piece of where it says, I believe it says Memorial Drive on the building, which is large, but is within the band on the building. And so I think, you know, this
sign also ought to be within the band of the pilasters.

PAMELA WINTERS: So you have a
little extra room there on each side to -- if you wanted to make it a little bit bigger. Yes?

DAN WINNY: Well, I appreciate that.
I think the comments are very reasonable, and if we were to pursue Roger's suggestion of maybe making a middle size, and then we can submit to staff an intermediate size and make sure it feels comfortable there before we go to the BZA. And then with the BZA whatever is agreed would be a reasonable as well.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, could we indicate that the staff negotiations about this would be something we would support? We don't know exactly what's going to happen to it, but I'd like it to be able to move

## quickly.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would say we
could say we would support a sign within the bay and one that gets -- that has been reviewed and approved by the staff.

DAN WINNY: Perfect.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Sounds reasonable.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay?
DAN WINNY: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you, Dan. You want these back?

STEVEN WINTER: Do you want these back?

DAN WINNY: We11, I guess I'm going to adjust them. Feel free to frame them. Thanks very much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
LIZA PADEN: Speaking of signs, I
want to update you on the new E.F.
Internationa1. They went to the Board of
Zoning Appeal and the Board of Zoning Appeal agreed that two signs would be fine, but the two signs should be smaller. So the proposal is now for two signs that are 170 square feet instead of two signs that are 247. So the signs are half the size that they were before. And so they'11 be at the Board of Zoning Appeal this week? No?

RICHARD McKINNON: Wel1, as luck
would have it, Mr. Chair. As luck -- and actually we've also agreed to take the rear sign off of the existing in-fill. Okay? But as luck would have it, construction supervisors Skanska thought that the hearing had been held already and rather than being continued, and so we cleaned up the entire site on Friday, pulled the signs down, the
notice signs, and the Chairman of the BZA went out there Friday night and noticed that there were no signs. So, we are going to be there I think another month from now.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, you probably
stil1 have time to get the sign up by the time the building's done.

RICHARD McKINNON: They're back up
already .
HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I mean the rea1 signs. We11, that's a good outcome.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question about 275 Fresh Pond Parkway.

LIZA PADEN: Yes, that's the next sign I have for you.

STEVEN WINTER: Is that building -is that Shel1 Station where the owner constructed a steel building that was not

## appropriate?

LIZA PADEN: No.
STEVEN WINTER: This is a different place?

LIZA PADEN: No.
STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thank you.
LIZA PADEN: This sign that's proposed is the Cambridge Honda, and they're proposing to remove the existing freestanding sign which has a number of signs on it that have been added over time. And they're going to replace it with one sign which will be like this, but will have a header that says Cambridge -- that will give the Cambridge Honda sign. You can look at this more closely. It is in the Parkway Overlay District. The frontage on the building is 364 feet, meaning they're allowed to have 364 square feet of signage. The freestanding
sign exceeds the height limit per sign which is 15 feet to the top. And this sign proposed is 25 . And it also exceeds the area. The requirement is 30 square feet. They're proposing 100 square feet. And they're also proposing that the background is going to be opaque, but the letters will be internally illuminated. So those are the pieces of relief that they're going to ask for for the Board of Zoning Appeal.

I will say that this was a Planning Board Special Permit to allow them to have open display of parking, parked cars for sale, and that was back in 2000. And I will also point out that one of the conditions of the Special Permit when it was granted by the Planning Board was that the Applicant is encouraged to comply with the Sign Ordinance with regard to any changes proposed to or
replacement of the freestanding pilon sign.
HUGH RUSSELL: And this is also on
the Parkway Overlay District?
PAMELA WINTERS: It is.
LIZA PADEN: Right. And that's what they got the Special Permit for was to park the cars that are for sale in the Parkway Overlay District.

So, what is happening is the proposed sign is going to be further into compliance, but it's stil1 not complying.

HUGH RUSSELL: So usually what we have done in a situation like this is say show us the complying sign and show us -- and tell us why that sign doesn't work.

## LIZA PADEN: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: The hardship.
What's the hardship?
HUGH RUSSELL: We11, just the
practical difficulty.
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And it's a funny
parkway district. We take little tiny steps to make it look more like a parkway. And if we do that with everybody, eventually it will look like a parkway.

LIZA PADEN: Well, as a side note on the parkway, the Special Permit that the Planning Board granted for the Fresh Pond retail that's between the two gas stations, they had their groundbreaking ceremony today. So they're going into the ground.

HUGH RUSSELL: Where the fish place used to be?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I want to make a comment if I could. The -- I'd like to note that Cambridge Honda has been a good
corporate neighbor in terms of the way they display their vehicles. And one of the problems that we get into is that the owners of these car lots like to display the vehicles so that they are in awkward or odd or odd-1ooking positions so that it catches the eye of the motorist or pendants or balloons or something and it's all very unsafe, that's not safe.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
STEVEN WINTER: And Cambridge Honda doesn't do that. And I think we need to note that.

## LIZA PADEN: Okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, can I ask you a question? Did they ever plant those bushes that they were supposed to at the gas
station? Did they ever do that?
HUGH RUSSELL: This is the next one
down.
PAMELA WINTERS: This is not a -the next one?

LIZA PADEN: This is the car dealership not the gas station.

PAMELA WINTERS: No, I understand that. I'm just asking out of curiosity.

LIZA PADEN: They planted some bushes.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. This is a couple years ago.

LIZA PADEN: Right. And I don't think they're alive anymore.

PAMELA WINTERS: A11 right, thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. When I was on the Zoning Board, which was a very long time ago, there were conditions in which we finally got enforced briefly.
H. THEODORE COHEN: If I could just comment.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean, I would like to see why they don't think a complying sign would work because it really is a very visible location. And I think any sign is going to be visible to all the cars going back and forth. I don't know why it needs to be higher than the Ordinance would authorize and any other non-compliant issues. I think it's going to be the only sign that's there.

LIZA PADEN: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: People will see
it.

## LIZA PADEN: Okay.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I too have a concern, especially about the height. I think the public interest perspective is
especially important from Fresh Pond Park -from Fresh Pond. And so a sign that's high could, you know, most directly impact the ability of the general public to enjoy that park, never mind its affects on wildlife.

I'm no expert in that regard, so it's the height that I find particularly objectionable.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: So that's my
comment.
Thanks.
PAMELA WINTERS: I agree with that.
STEVEN COHEN: I'd also mention,
though, that those signs are a vast improvement over what exists.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
STEVEN WINTER: That's true.
STEVEN COHEN: And on behalf of good
planning we successfully oppose this proposal, are we left with what exists?

LIZA PADEN: I don't think so. I think that they're looking to improve the signage at the site. I think there's a definite -- it may slow it down a little bit, but I did not get the impression that if they don't get this sign, that they won't do anything. I think that they're looking to reuse as much of the existing equipment and structure that they can and that's why the sign may be designed the way it is.

ROGER BOOTHE: Could I add a few comments?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
ROGER BOOTHE: I live down the
street from this so I hear from my neighbors a lot about this facility. And while I agree with Steve that they generally keep the cars
pretty orderly and they're not too crazy about displays, they haven't been good about keeping the cars off the public way. They tend to nudge out into the sidewalk, and we also -- I don't know if you recall back when we did that how many Board Members were here, the Permit, the city actually agreed to put in plantings along that fence that have helped screen it quite a bit, and they actually mush out into the fence. They haven't done a good job watching the edges, while I agree they keep the cars fairly orderly. So I wouldn't mind a little footnote saying by the way, remember you're supposed to keep the landscaping happy here. And I certain7y do not think that they need a big sign there. I mean, it's so visible as you say. They really have no call for a bigger sign I think.

HUGH RUSSELL: So can you make that into a recommendation?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Great.
LIZA PADEN: Are there any other
cases that people want to look at or have any questions about?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Just where is 57 JFK? What's there now?

LIZA PADEN: So 57 JFK is the corner of Winthrop Street and JFK. So the --

HUGH RUSSELL: The Galleria, right?
LIZA PADEN: The Galleria building.
The shake Shack is going into where OM was.
H. THEODORE COHEN: OM.

And where is 820 Somerville Ave.?
LIZA PADEN: 820 Somerville Ave. Is
the Porter Arcade. This is proposed to go
into the space where the Uno's was.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Across from the CVS.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, where the Walgreens is?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: That whole space is not becoming Walgreens?

LIZA PADEN: No. Uno's was on the right-hand side of the building. Pier 1 was on the left hand. And Walgreens is going on the left-hand side where Pier 1 was and that will be two floors.

PAMELA WINTERS: So Walgreens wil1
be right next to CVS?
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Across the street as they are in Central Square.

LIZA PADEN: Across the street.
PAMELA WINTERS: Oh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
LIZA PADEN: So if you're not
feeling well, you're covered.
PAMELA WINTERS: And the CVS is 24
hours which is always a good thing.
LIZA PADEN: Yes.
Are there any questions on BZA cases? PAMELA WINTERS: No.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.
I do have two sets of transcripts. One was for March 3rd -- I'm sorry, March 5th and one was for February 19th, and they've been certified complete.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We have a motion to accept those?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Second?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. And accept
those transcripts.
(Raising hands.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
LIZA PADEN: Since Mr. Murphy isn't here yet, I can go over the upcoming schedule.

So, the next meeting is here on May
14th which is going to be the Central Square Zoning discussion. It's what's in the manila envelope is the materials for that discussion. It's a single item agenda, and we can start as close to seven o'clock as you wish and get right to it.

The meeting on May 21st is scheduled to have the continued hearing for 33 Cottage Park Avenue and possibly 130 CambridgePark Drive, depending on this evening's public hearing, the outcome. And the Zoning

Petition for the Teague, and this is a
petition about lighting and the lighting trespass.

June 4th is going to be a public
hearing for the Harvard Inn to convert the hotel use to dormitory use. And the continued hearing for 240 Sidney Street which we failed to get a -- they asked to have seven Board Members for that public hearing. And then the Phillips Petition which is the proposal to rezone Special District 2 which is an area up around the linear path area. It was a subject recently of the Bishop Petition.

And then June 11th, back to whatever is going to be pending on the Kendall Square Central Square Zoning. And that's as far as I've got at the moment.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I wil1 not be able to participate in the Harvard case.

## LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: So my colleague here
wil1 have to chair that.
LIZA PADEN: Okay.
PAMELA WINTERS: And, Liza, we're only have two meetings in June and two in Ju7y?

LIZA PADEN: No. It's June 4th, June 11th and June 18th.

PAMELA WINTERS: So July and August we only have two meetings?

LIZA PADEN: Yes. The dates for July, are July 9th and July 16th.

And the dates for August is August 6th and August 20th.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
LIZA PADEN: My goal is to get back to two meetings a month.

PAMELA WINTERS: A11 right.

## LIZA PADEN: See how I do.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. The next item on our agenda is a public hearing for 125 CambridgePark Drive. And as I recollect, we opened that hearing and postponed it to today; is that correct?

RICHARD McKINNON: May we take a minute to set up the projector, Mr. Chair?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
STUART DASH: And, Hugh, I thought if it's okay just to take a few minutes and briefly speak especially to the new Planning Board members, a few minutes of background of the Concord/Alewife planning that will -while they're setting up is fine.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, if we can multi-task that's good.

STUART DASH: Stuart Dash.
The Concord/Alewife area was rezoned
during the Citywide Zoning in 1997 to 2000 that reduced the commercial potential in Concord/Alewife as well as throughout the city. Between 25 and 30 percent of the commercial potential of the city was reduced at that point. And that was the -- the reason for that was two-fold; one was to add housing and to keep the balance of housing and jobs in a positive direction for the city. Also to reduce the growth of traffic, especially peak hour traffic.

Subsequent to that the ECaPs study did the same kind of thing in 2000/2001. We rezoned the areas shortly after that. They had to be 4 and $4 F$, the Faces site and that area and the Alewife Reservation.

And then in 2003/2006 the
Concord/Alewife study took place and like citywide and ECaPs, had a public committee, a
series of public meetings, and they had to do finer grade planning that we weren't able to do during the citywide which planned for the future of the Fresh Pond Shopping Center, positive changes in the Quadrangle. That still remains sort of the wild west kind of thing in terms of very small parcels, and very little official streets.

Shift the direction to growth in the
Triangle, and especially as you've seen recently in terms of housing, improve the Concord Ave. edge, and create a pathway overlay which is actually also now looks to being used positively.

We started as we did in ECaPs, reducing the base districts, what's allowed as of right. Scale the uses at the neighborhood edge and heights of the neighborhood edge of the Cambridge High1ands, and addressed storm


#### Abstract

water and very much in this area as you've probably heard the storm water issue is very important and made part of the Zoning and requirements to meet the 25 year storm. And put in place design guidelines, much as we're doing with what we're talking about Central Square and Kendal1 Square in a similar way to promote more pedestrian-friendly environments.


And we also put in place incentives for cooperation to achieve the planned goals which you'11 hear from the proponent tonight which is one of the things they're also working on.

And we have sort of a map of recent housing pieces. And actually I mentioned -for Catherine probably knows this more than many of us, because she was the instrumental part of our transportation team during that

> Concord/A1ewife Zoning. She'11 remember it very fondly.

And we've actually mapped out sort of the recent housing projects that have come before you to sort of see how they're piping out on the maps. And something that's worth keeping an eye on. In terms of the amount of housing, it's nothing that we didn't expect. It's a tad faster than we expected, but it's certainly within the realm of what we had mapped out as part of the overall eventual build out for that area.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just remembering al1
those hours I spent as a student building models out of cardboard, balsawood, and scaled trees that were gathered in the Fresh Pond rotaries when they were rotaries down by the Eliot Bridge. It was pretty.

RICHARD McKINNON: I took two of my
granddaughters over to Arrow Street about a month ago to meet with Jim, and the six-year-old came back and she told my son, she said, I figured out what grandpa does. He makes little tiny models and little tiny trees and little tiny....

May I start, Mr. Chairman? HUGH RUSSELL: Please.

RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Rich McKinnon and I live at One Leighton Street in Cambridge. I'm a developer of Blackstone Equity Properties, the owner of the site. The project that we're going to be discussing tonight involves two buildings;

220-unit residential building and adjacent to it, a 156 car garage that tries to collect a lot of the surface parking and put it into a separate place.

## Just to give you a little bit of

context here. Here is the site that we will be developing.

Here's the Alewife T Station. Of
course we're very fortunate to have such proximity to it.

Railroad tracks are behind us.
Cambridge Discovery Park to the north. The Alewife Reservation up there as well, and the Little River. All of these are terrific amenities for the project. Very nearby. And, you know, we do a lot of planning around them.

The -- if we just go back for one second. Thank you, Amy, I appreciate it. We also own two office buildings; 150

CambridgePark Drive and 125 CambridgePark Drive. And there is another office building in front of the project that are owned by

Cambridge -- by Transamerica Real Estate.
One of the things you notice, these are both 110 -foot buildings. We're a 70 -foot building so we're kind of struggling with the fact that we're kind of tucked away behind the both of them.

These are the formal requests that we've made of the Planning Board,

Mr. Chairman, as was the case in previous meetings. These are coming on pages 15 to 39 of the application in very dense print.

Kevin Renna is here from Goulston and Storrs, so perhaps I could just put them in as part of the record and then we can speak to individual ones if the Board Members would like to. It will take a lot of time to go through that.

Thank you.
When we were here a month ago, and by
the way, thanks for getting us back so quickly. We -- listening to Liza we know how busy the Board is and how busy you're going to be. And we appreciate the fact that because we weren't able to get on that night we're still back here four weeks later. It's very helpful.

That evening you received a letter from Sue Clippinger and it went over really all of the things that she wanted us to do and went over them in great detail covering the issues of traffic, transportation, and parking. And those issues along with as Stuart said, flood storage and the issues around working the floodplain are really the two challenge issues are really up here in the Alewife planning area.

Sue and Adam have given us a tremendous amount of time. This is a complex set of
agreements. But we're -- as did Stuart's people, the planning staff in the Community Development Department. We're happy to report that we have come to an agreement on all of these items, so we're prepared to implement everything that's in Sue

Clippinger's letter as a condition of the project.

Let me just touch on a couple of things that we're doing here before I go on to the issue of working in the floodplain. We have wonderful TMAs down in East Cambridge, as you know, that have been built up over the year. We don't have one at all as yet up in the Alewife area. And we've agreed to join one if one is instituted. But we've taken it a step further. As you may recal1, when I was here before, Carol and me and a Board Member had asked that we take the initiative and see
if we can begin to get the data and get a TMA actually up and operating. And so we've already contracted with VHV and we've given them the challenge of going into the various parts, the shopping center area, the Quadrangle, the Triangle, and actually going up and speaking with Discovery Park, the Martinettis and the Faces people to see whether or not we can get a traffic management association, a good shuttle service as well as the other things that those entail going up here at Alewife the way we've got them to working so successfully down in East Cambridge.

We're one of the first developments to
live with the new Bicycle Ordinance. We agreed to that long before it really saw the light of day, and we're happy to do that. We are doing shared parking. Again,
other words, the first shared parking
agreement in the city was the one that we did with the Hanover Project at 160 Cambridge Park Drive. Once again here we have a residential project, and as I explained earlier, we also control the two office buildings. So it makes a little bit easier with unified ownership to do shared parking where you have the residents and the office users using the same spaces, but using them at different times of the day, because the demand is there at different times of the day. We've agreed on the Hanover Project.

And I see Dave is here tonight, too, keep five years of good data. We'11 be doing the same thing so that it will encourage other people to take that leap and to do shared parking when those opportunities are available. It just creates less parking
bulk. And quite frankly we believe in it. We're not worried about it. And plus it creates less cost. It's just that much less parking that we have to build and still be able to satisfy the demand.

And then the final thing is you see these green arrows, for as long as I can remember, ever since we got the Alewife T Station back in the early 80 's, there's been a desire to connect the Quadrangle to the Triangle and the Alewife T Station, but the railroad tracks have been the barrier between that. The City's advanced its planning and is going out for bid, I believe, on the project shortly to build that bridge. We don't know exactly where it's going to start from, but we do know where it's going to land. It's going to land on our property. We've agreed to put it on our property. So
it will be landing either within this garage, at the rear of the Hanover Property, if they carry that obligation, or in the parking lot to the east where we have a large surface parking lot that goes down to where the Summer Shack is. So one way or another the bridge is going to have a place to land. And as Jim Match will show you, we think it might make sense to land in the garage just that much less pitch it has to do when it crosses the tracks.

So, let me just get to the one other sensitive issue up here. We're working in the floodplain. We're not working in the wetlands or the buffer zone. We're well beyond those. We're in the outer reaches of the Alewife floodplain, but we are in a floodplain. But because of that that raises issues with flood storage in particular. And

I think most of us that have dealt with projects up in the Alewife and the zone in Alewife know, along with traffic, is the biggest issue that we face up here.

We have already gone through the Conservation Commission. We're asking for a Floodplain Special Permit from you so it requires that you hear from the Conservation Commission.

You have in your possession the order of conditions that was issued several months ago by the Conservation Commission. They, as you know, enforce the Wetlands Protection Act, and they deem that all of the safeguards that were taken are appropriate and they've issued the honorary conditions to allow us to go forward.

Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: May I just
confirm --
RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: The document you're talking about is the March 12, 2013?

RICHARD McKINNON: That's right.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.
RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, it is. Yes.
That was the evening we went there.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.
RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you.
You also have a letter from Owen
O'Riordan that came the night when we were previously scheduled. And Owen's job goes beyond just the enforcement of the Mass. Wetlands Protection Act. It goes towards some of those additional restraints that were part of the Concord/Alewife Planning Zoning, that the Planning Board instituted.

Additional floodplain storage. And I think
if you take a look at Owen's letter, you'11 see that we comply fully with all of the new requirements that go beyond what the Conservation Commission itself calls for.

I've had the good -- Ingibord is not here. If she were, she'd throw a shoe at me for putting her picture up here. But I had the good sense and fortune to go to work with Ingibord when I first did my first project up in Alewife Discovery Park. She's got a long history with the Cambridge Conservation Commission. She worked as a tremendous amount of pro bono work. And we're all proud of her. She was just honored for lifetime achievement by the Mass. Water Resources Authority and by the Mystic River Watershed Association, excuse me. It was their 40th anniversary.

So one of the things that Ingibord
taught me is that it is not necessarily wrong to develop in a floodplain, what really counts is what's the condition of the floodplain when you come upon it, and what condition it's in when you leave it. This is the floodplain we're working in. It's an impervious parking lot. And this last example to the fact when we did Discovery Park together with BSC, David Biasi (phonetic) from BSC was here as well. We came upon 450. It's odd, it's the same number as the parking garage that we're building. 456 car parking lot that had been given by the Alewife -- by the MDC to the old Arthur D. Little property. And it raised the environmental community that the custodian of the environment had allowed the parking lot to be built in it. That's what we started with. This is what we ended with. We tore
that parking lot up. We converted it into a meadow, and then we put through the meadow, a pathway that takes you from the Discovery Park Project over to the Alewife T Station. So, excuse me, one more.

This also shows the Harvard Smithsonian as the physical observatory that we built. It was surface parking lots, and this is what it was like when we finished.

You can do a tremendous amount of good work in a floodplain. You just have to have the will and the mud to do it. And I think I've got a team here that really does know what they're doing. It is committed to doing it.

So, finally design. The last time I was here what the Planning Board said is let's make sure we can at least strive for some uniqueness and some variety and design
up in the Alewife area. A lot of residential projects are coming on-7ine as a big group with some staggering between them. And we wanted to be sure that it wasn't the same as all the buildings weren't looking like one another. And so to answer that challenge I went over to Arrow Street. Someone, Jim Bachelor and his team, people I've worked with for many, many years, have a huge amount of faith in them, and we think that we, they maybe answered the call. We have a building that doesn't look like the young buildings. We're very happy with the way it looks. And I think we have one more. We have a parking garage that unfortunately it's hidden behind our own building and behind 100 CambridgePark Drive. But we went through a lot of work with Roger and your planning staff to really try to animate it and make it something
interesting. And even though we don't, we're not visible from the public way, we have abutters that we care about. The Hanover Project is being built next-door. We wanted to give them something attractive to look at. We've got our own office buildings. We've got the Vekner, the folks from Vekner who are busy up there inventing robots. And so we took it upon ourselves to try and come up with a good design.

That wraps up my part of it,
Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask Jim Bachelor if he'11 come up and just walk you through the architecture and then we'11 be done.

JIM BACHELOR: Thank you, Rich.
My name is Jim Bachelor. I'm with ArrowStreet. I'm joined by Amy Korte and

Claude Van Draze1. Together we've been doing
most of the work on this project which we think will be a great addition to what is becoming a wonderful mixed use neighborhood.

So we're starting from parking lot and we are trying to create a mixed use neighborhood. One of the really important issues for us is that we are, as Rich has alluded to, behind a couple of office buildings. CambridgePark Drive is our address, and we are looking at one of our first important goals is to create a good connection from where one first will have an image a view, down towards our neighborhood, and to improve what is now pretty basic roadway. One of the challenges for improving this basic roadway is that we don't own all of that property, but we are in communication with the abutters and they have been in general supportive. This shows in a lighter
color some areas that are not directly under our ownership, and a little bit brighter color of those that are. And I'11 say a little bit more about that. And essentially what is happening here is we are creating a new street, and this new street will be fronted by units at grade as well as we are creating an urban plaza here. So our goal is to have a destination as you drive down, which is an urban square or plaza. It wil1 be fronted by another project to the right at some day soon. But our goal is to create a good facade along this edge facing the plaza. A good facade along New Street and appeal in the corner at that one point.

This is what we're starting with. This is taken essentially standing at the CambridgePark Drive.

This is the existing office building.

This is Vekner's property here. And we will take a short walk down in that direction. This is a view which is pretty close to right on our project and we will show you a view in a minute which has the project at an interrupt.

But this is today's building -- today's view. This building is actually on the other side of the fence. It is on railroad track land.

So here's our new improved neighborhood. We have chosen a set of materials which are -- we think complementary to what is here. It does include some ribbed metal as well as fiber cement panels. We have used a color which we think will help people as they turn from CambridgePark Drive to recognize that there's something special. There is, and people I think know a little
bit about this neighborhood. This building has a child care center in this corner, so there is an entry to child care center here and there is an outdoor play area for the kids there as well.

This is the plaza. And this is the beginning of New Street.

Another view of that corner. And at this points you can see the full extent of the residential building that is here and a little bit of the parking garage which Rich showed you down to the right.

Coming down New Street, looking towards the parking garage, we have landscaped both sides of the drive. And I'11 say more about the landscaping.

Looking back from the corner of the parking garage along New Street, these are fabric banners which we are designing on a
steel system that supports them off a fairly traditional precast concrete structure.

This is a little further back, our view from the Hanover corner. This is the elevator for the parking garage.

This is kind of completing a circle, if you will. This is a view into one of the courtyards that face south. They face towards the railroad tracks, but that is also happily south. So these are nicely day lit courtyards.

And this is at the plaza and looking at the other primary elevation for this building.

At the first floor will be bike and what we have referred to as a bike cafe, a place where people can gather to repair, take care of their bikes. And this is the primary entrance to the residences.

So this is back to the landscaped view. Now, in full vibrant color are our hopes for the entire area.

So we have lined this drive with new trees as well as an improved sidewalk on the Vekner side. And we have done a more informal planting of some additional trees on the 100 CambridgePark Drive side. We have been in preliminary conversation with both. They are supportive. They are in this area working towards what we're thinking of as a more naturalistic landscape. There will
still will be more important lawn areas associated with the office building, but around the housing neighborhood we're trying to bring back a little bit more informal and naturalistic set of plantings.

This is a more modest version. This
shows trees only on what we consider our own,
what is our own. So this edge here we have shown only a minimal sidewalk treatment here pending working things out with the neighbor along this side, and we have shown the landscaping only on this side of the line. But, again, we have begun those conversations.

Just a detail of this. We've worked on some preliminary selections of plant materials which are shown primarily to illustrate this, but also the other residential entry sides so that these trees are along a street which will have entries into individual units on the ground floor.

Another tour of a few more views again our in our principal entry.

This overall diagram has a little more detail for something which Rich talked about. This is extremely preliminary because a whole
study is ahead of deciding how the crossing for pedestrian and bike might work. But we have identified a place where it would be possible and where we have tried to anticipate that a bridge could go and could land on a corner of the parking structure that's here.

So, next.
This is a little 3-D view that shows how this might work. Obviously the tracks are going through here. This is showing how you gather pedestrians and bikes, bring them across on the bridge, bring them to the elevator down and then they would come down and connect with CambridgePark Drive. Again, only an idea, but we have had conversations about what we can do in terms of our site planning at this edge and our building design to make it easier should this be desired.

Ground floor plan. These are the residential units with the entries. Here is the major residential entry for all the apartments in the outer floors. There are three bike areas. We have quite a few bike spaces, and we have spread them out a little bit.

The white area is the at-grade parking. There will be at-grade parking here. And underneath this at-grade parking there is a storm water retention system which has been designed to help with the flood storage.

That system extends under the parking garage.
You can see a corner of the parking garage here, and we are anticipating that it will be possible to connect by the vehicles driving from one to the other.

This is up at the courtyard level.
There are three courtyards created. They're
all facing south. They will have slightly different themes. This has more of a playground theme. This has more of a pool or a bike courtyard. But the -- these are created by the arrangement of units. We have the break down of the units for those that are interested.

These are the plans for the parking garage. These are all the floor plans that are typical. This is where you'11 enter at grade and you rise up. In this corner is where you connect to the other building.

We have provided material indications for the elevations. They are a combination of some metal systems, both panel and ribbed. And also we are using fiber cement so that we will have those two materials. We think they're a good combination for bringing residential scale, some visual interest, the
light reflectance of the metal, the metal also having some associations with both office and the industrial history of the area.

Similar but slightly different pallet, more of the fiber cement panel on the side that faces the railroad.

Some overall elevations. You can see the residential entries that are along New Street as well as the primary entree that's here. And this is the famous parking garage elevation that faces the west, and this is the elevation that faces the east.

So three-dimensional views just for orientation. Again, these are the courtyards showing their general geometry and obviously they all face south, just different views of them.

Elevations. Generally perceived more
easily in perspective.
Next.
And I think that's the end of our entry to our new neighborhood. So thank you very much. Obviously if there are any questions, we're here to discuss.

RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you, Jim.
Mr. Chairman, because you've heard from Sue on traffic and you've heard from Conservation Commission and Public Works on flood storage, we're going to waive those formal presentations, but we've got them all here in the computer if that's the testimony you'd like to hear.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I can't put me hands on a Transportation Department's recommendation. I just don't have a copy of it.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Do you want a
copy of the letter?
HUGH RUSSELL: I think maybe this is sufficiently complicated in terms of the parking deal that maybe you could come up and explain it to us.

RICHARD McKINNON: Here's another
one.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So in the letter the we talked about parking and some mitigation suggestions. So the parking is relatively complex, and there's a chart in the letter that is our attempt to try to boil down where this is all going. These projects were -- a bunch of these parcels have been in common ownership and have come before you already for the previous housing project, and throughout those discussions we've been looking at the parking associated with new projects as well as the parking that remains
for the old projects in trying to make sense of it as the changes are made. So the chart, what we've done is tried to list each of these parcels that are in this area and kind of summarize where we've gotten to both from this particular project before us and the one that had come before and what's left over. And so we are going to have to do this simply. We're left with, you know, these projects are now becoming separated from the single ownership as they proceed. So we have a series of building some of which -- two of which have shared parking. The previously permitted building and the proposed building and the remaining sites have single use parking on them, some of which support existing buildings that have been there for sometime. I'm not quite sure how to make a simple conversation out of this. But we
tried to do is to work it through the proponent to get to the parking supply that are needed for various projects. Some clarity as to where it got to so as we go forward, we know what we're dealing with and trying to utilize the shared parking from these two residential projects to continue to be more efficient in the use of parking.

I can try to answer specific questions to this if you want. If you come back that it's not clear enough for your needs, I'11 quickly say what the mitigation is if that's helpful. So the Triangle, as everybody knows, is a pretty congested area at the peak hour. It's actually relatively quiet off peak. So one of the, one of the things we're doing is looking at the intersection of what we call CambridgePark Drive and Alewife Access Road. So it's the first light if
you're coming out of the Triangle toward the parkway, and we're asking for financial support to get some cameras in there that will allow us to try to be more responsive to these various peak times. We're not going to improve the level of service at that intersection so that it's not a very busy congested intersection, but we want to try to make sure that we're doing the best we can to minimize the, the time in which things are cueing and be responsive to the traffic.

HUGH RUSSELL: So this is the one that's behind the garage if you were to -SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. HUGH RUSSELL: -- if the front was

Alewife Brook Parkway.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's the furthest in from Alewife Brook Parkway.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

## SUSAN CLIPPINGER: The second

mitigation area is familiar where we're asking for contribution toward the feasibility of the pedestrian bicycle bridge that Rich McKinnon had talked about. So we had done a lot of work on this side of the railroad tracks thinking about we now have three potential sites. We're utilizing the funds that have come from the previous projects and this project to start a feasibility study that we're hoping to very much that we can advance the thinking about what makes sense, what's realistic, and be prepared and then hopefully the landing point at the other side of the railroad. And that opportunity will happen in time for us to be thinking about this bridge. It's a very substantial undertaking obviously. But I think it's one we feel strongly we want to
try to advance as best we can so that that option of improving the bike and ped connections between the Alewife and the broader area and also as the retail activities along the parkway have improved and improved the access from the retail to the people in the Triangle, I think, we're seeing this as an excellent opportunity. And then the third thing is the --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I ask a
question about the bridge? Is there
opposition or hostility to it from any entity?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: There has not
been. It's -- it may be harder when we pick a landing and are trying to build it. Just to have it integrate within people's sense of what their project should look like and what they want them to look like, but I think
generally it's been seen as something that is positive improvement for people on both sides of the bridge.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And the track areas is owned by is that the T or CSX? SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's owned by the MBTA.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And are they supportive of the bridge?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I haven't asked them directly. They will have requirements for height and relative to their right of way, but you know, they are part of a -- we are trying to have a multimodal
transportation -- state transportation department that thinks green so I'm ever hopeful.

PAMELA WINTERS: And, Sue, we've been pushing for this bridge for at least ten
years now I think. You know, it's something that's been on the agenda for about ten years. Since the Alewife --

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm wondering if it was in the 1980 plan.

ROGER BOOTHE: There was a bridge in the 1980 plan but that actually contemplated cars and there was opposition to that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. There was a lot of opposition from Belmont and places like that.

ROGER BOOTHE: Right. I don't think people -- I haven't heard who doesn't like the idea of the pedestrian bicycle.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we've been talking about a bridge for 33 years.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, all right.
That was before my time.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think one of
the -- one of the things, you've got three projects that are making contributions that has allowed us as a city, Community

Development is, you know, I think as Rich McKinnon said, trying to get a consultant on board to start to do the feasibility studies, so we have a much more specific sense of what's required, what we're going to need to do to do this. And, you know, advance it further so that as these opportunities come, you know, we have a chance of knowing, you know, what do we need to do if we're going to make this a reality. This will not be a cheap bridge. So it's still a challenge to make it real, but I think this is an excellent way to -- for all of us to be better informed about what it means and what kind of things we need to do if we want it to be a reality.

## TOM SIENIEWICZ: So I guess relative

to the case that's before us, the developer's obviously seems to be anxious to move forward, and the pace at which this project hopefully will be realized is not in step with the planning or the inevitable realization of our pedestrian bridge and yet that's a public amenity that would be fabulous to take advantage of the offer of the developer to land it. I mean, if he's got an elevator there, that's a huge asset for anybody with limited mobility to be able to use that. And I think as we get into the case, I really would like to figure out a way to cement and take advantage of the good will that the developer is putting forward to say go ahead, and land it on my garage. So there's lots and lots of particulars that I'd love to discuss; structure and, you know,
some guidelines about how we can have it in the future.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think we've been very fortunate to have that level of support in pursuing this in the letter which may have disappeared in all of the delays. There's a lot of elements that we talked about in terms of working with them and talking about the garage design and trying to make sure that it functions today as a standalone garage, but it can also play a role in the future if that's where things go. And they've been extremely responsive in working with us to try to preserve that option. So, you know, we've got a bunch of sort of operational criteria in the letter which we're hopeful you would see as appropriate to put in as conditions to the permits so that that relationship is sort of
able to go forward and we can continue to work if that's what's going to happen.

HUGH RUSSELL: I was surprised at the size of the parking garage. And I am wondering what's the -- how much parking's being provided for the office buildings? And counting in that they're shared portion? Is it one space per thousand or two or five? When they started out there, there were many spaces per thousand.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think when we
started it was running three per thousand. RICHARD McKINNON: 2.7. SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Oh, excuse me. I rounded up. It's now at two per thousand which for those that's a part of what remains here.

HUGH RUSSELL: What's the present
utilization of parking in those buildings, do
we know?
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: We did. And we
also, you know, I think one of the
difficulties right now is most people are seeing improved tenancies I assume. You guys are as well, right?

RICHARD McKINNON: We are, yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So the buildings
weren't fully tenanted?
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Right. Right.
Right. So it's a little hard in the time frame we were looking at to know exactly what's happening.

RICHARD McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, we think we're going to be back up around 85,90 percent by the end of the summer. We have a couple of leases that we're finalizing.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: And there is one more large surface lot which may at some
point be proposed for use, some use in which those questions would probably be asked again with whatever time has gone by and additional information is available.

HUGH RUSSELL: How does the total number of spaces -- what's the total number of spaces today before any construction of any residential buildings on the lots that serve them?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Do you know what they are now?

ADAM SHULMAN: It's going up 149 spaces from like 1575 to like 1724. So it's a 149 net new spaces.

HUGH RUSSELL: And there's, what, about 600 net new? 500 or 600 net new apartments?

ADAM SHULMAN: That's just 220 for this project 220. For the other projects,
it's accounted for in the other, from a previous number but also accounted for in the total. So but the other --

HUGH RUSSELL: But both buildings are being built on what were parking lots serving the two buildings, correct?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Correct. And both are shared facilities where the total residential and the total office parking is being shared, so the total supplies that one plus the other one but a sharing.

STEVEN COHEN: Just to clarify that, in the project before us is 220 residential units and a net increase of 149 parking spaces?

ADAM SHULMAN: Physical, yes.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. A1though there's still a parking space for every unit.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: But it's not part of new parking. Some of that is utilization of employee parking that is not being used at night.

STEVEN COHEN: So many of the spaces, the residential designated spaces are in fact shared spaces with the office use; is that --

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Some of them.
ADAM SHULMAN: Some of them.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Some of them.
RICHARD McKINNON: If I may, Sue.
We have dedicated use of the spaces under the building for the residential use, and then for the remainder, about 118 down there. For the remainder we wind up having a situation. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, the one difficulty of shared parking is that it makes it difficult
for the housing developer, whoever it may wind up being to finance, because it's very tough to get these lenders across that line of thinking well, I really don't have one space per unit. I've only got, you know, 0.5 or 0.6 that are really buying it. I'm gonna swap contest. I'm in a shared contest with the rest. We've done it. Hanover has bought it. And we made it a condition of the sale if we're going to be selling this parcel.

But that's been one of the challenges.
HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I guess the given the actual parking utilization, the first apartment building which was six-tenths of a space. I don't know the addresses of all those.

## SUSAN CLIPPINGER: This is

utilization of the already built?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So that's the Archstone Building.

ADAM SHULMAN: Yes. 0.5 or --
DAVID BLACK: Nighttime is $0.8,0.85$
if I could. We studied that in association with the long --

ROGER BOOTHE: Everybody needs to speak up and identify themselves.

DAVID BLACK: David Black from VHB.
And I worked on the traffic and transportation for previously referenced residential project. And we did at that time look at nighttime occupancy of the residential parking to get some level of comfort of how intense that was. And it, my recollection is that it was, it was somewhere in the region of 0.8 to 0.86 at night.

RICHARD McKINNON: That's right.
DAVID BLACK: And I think the, and
to sort of, to put this in a nutshe11, I think the previous projects set the stage by bringing the parking ratios down from the previous 2.75 to something closer to two spaces per thousand square feet. And by also embracing the concept of shared parking managed to have a net increase, increase in parking that was less than the number of residential units. And, again, on this project, we are continuing to maintain that reduced ratio for the offices that just over two spaces per thousand square feet. Adding in 220 residential units, but only adding a net increase of 149 spaces because of the sharing.

HUGH RUSSELL: And, Sue, what I hear, what I heard you comment which was if this proves to be more parking that's needed, the last redevelopment of the parking lot can
readjust based on facts that would be before us at that time based on the utilization of the office buildings and, I mean, if there are no other options, you can't park much on the street. There's no other place to park. You've got to park in off-street parking that's provided. And so, it's got to work. But at the same time we've got, you know, some large parking garages around the city that have lots of empty places and it doesn't seem prudent to build empty parking garages. SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, and I think the proponent is always quick to say, you know, this is not Kendall Square and so that we are trying to be sensitive to what is the character of this particular area and what makes sense so that we're providing the parking that's appropriate but we're encouraging the use of the $T$ and anything
else we can that will discourage the single occupant vehicles. Which are not only is there a shortage of off-street parking easily available, there's a pretty congested Route 2 and 16 that people are also influenced by and hopefully when they're making their choices. DAVID BLACK: Sue, if I might, if I could just add one other comment, and I did have the privilege of working with the city staff on the Concord/Alewife Planning Study, so I'm very familiar with what the goals were here. But the other, I think, important point about parking is that this is an opportunity to eliminate surface parking and put in structure which we all, I think, for obvious reasons think is a good way to go. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thanks, Sue. It seems like a very small question is the siding being painted or pre-painted.

## JIM BACHELOR: Pre-painted.

HUGH RUSSELL: You can bring in your hardy book and tell me which color is which?

JIM BACHELOR: I think we can talk further with you about colors if you like.

PAMELA WINTERS: You know, it's ironic $I$ was just going to mention that. It's the painter in me that just -- I was just curious. Not that I like or dislike the colors, I was just curious with how you came up with the green for the banners in the parking and the red. I was just wondering who made those decisions and why.

JIM BACHELOR: Sure, it was
definitely a group discussion.
PAMELA WINTERS: I think you need to get up. I'm sorry.

JIM BACHELOR: It was a group
effort. Some of the group is right here. So
you may get more than one opinion about this. I think for the red, one of the things that we felt is that the red is upbeat and catches your eye from a distance. And so I think we felt like when you turned the corner from CambridgePark Drive, that would help you register that that there was something of significance there, hopefully welcoming and warm. I think when we thought about the parking garage, we were thinking about something which was complementary. In other words, the fact that green is cool we felt like we were up for bringing the temperature of the color down a little bit, and we thought it's a green that has a little bit of, a little bit of spike to it.

PAMELA WINTERS: Chartreusey almost. JIM BACHELOR: A little bit. PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Just

## curious.

JIM BACHELOR: Yes.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Jim, while you're still up there.

JIM BACHELOR: Sure.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: The question about the fabric panels, you know, it's certainly a striking image in the elevation and we're gonna be living with this thing for a long time. I just want to understand technically how you think that might age and how that's going to work. You know, how durable is that?

JIM BACHELOR: We have discussed that the fabric has a life, that it's not forever. And I think that whether it's 10 to 15 years or something like that, the ownership does have a responsibility for maintaining it. We have discussed that.

HUGH RUSSELL: You don't like green for 10 or 15 years? It precedes Roger.

STEVEN COHEN: If I could go from the fine grain detail of the color for the moment to something a little broader. You know, frankly I'm kind of confused with the application. I mean, the amount of relief being requested is many and is complex and in general it's difficult for me to get my hands around it at all. But, gosh, there's dramatic relief sought in height and FAR in yards and setbacks and permeable open space.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, but it's -STEVEN COHEN: Pardon me?

HUGH RUSSELL: It looks like a lot, but really the way the Ordinance was set up said the office zone can be modified for this kind of a use.

STEVEN COHEN: Clearly, and I can
see from their text that we have the right to issue a Special Permit and that's why we're here. I guess I'm just trying to figure out what the criteria would be upon which -well, to evaluate and to grant relief. I mean are we totally subjective at this point? You know, it looks kind of like a good plan or not. And, you know, in many other projects, I feel that I can evaluate it with reference to the content. But the context here is kind of out of the ordinary and atypical of Cambridge. I mean, it's more of a suburban office park than the rest. And most of the neighbors are more akin to the scale and type of project that we're looking at. So I guess I'm unsure how to evaluate the request and I guess I'd appreciate some guidance from the chair or the staff. I know one of the criteria for granting relief here
is the extent to which the relief sought is consistent with and advances the goal of the plan.

RICHARD McKINNON: That's right.
STEVEN COHEN: But I'm not clear, not having been here, what those values and goals of the original Alewife plan were. So again, I'm seeking assistance.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, in the application there's, on page 21 there's Section C, criteria approval of an Alewife Overlay District Special Permit. I think that's the basic section that's -- and then it goes on to list objectives and to select the relevant objectives to this project. I think, I'm not sure that all of the objectives are listed, and only the ones that are applicable to this project have been listed. But, you know, it's a very long
list, and I think we have to -- we have to look at that list and make sure that we agree that this project is doing what it's supposed to do. But I think the Zoning strategy was to encourage people to do things, give them height and FAR to do that after we take it away. Essentially we take it away and then we give it back to you with these list of facts.

RICHARD McKINNON: And in fact,
Mr. Chair, we're not even close to the height. It's 125 feet is the backs of the height that you can grant where it's 70 .

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And so as you
say, this is important, this is really the essence of the making findings for the relief. We have in other cases sort of relied -- that are much less -- have much less detail relied on the statement. And we
may need to go through this kind of page by page at some point to make sure that we understand this all, because it's, you know, it's all of a bit of a learning process for all of us I think.

Now, this is a public hearing. We'11 have opportunity for the public to speak. And in general it's about now when we do that. So we have asked some questions of facts and now I think we want to hear what the public wants to say and we can start digging into it. Does that make sense? STEVEN WINTER: Sure. PAMELA WINTERS: Sure. STEVEN COHEN: Sure. HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm going to ask is there a sign-up sheet? And no one signed $i t$.

LIZA PADEN: Correct.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Fine.

Would anyone like to speak on this project?

ATTORNEY CHRISTIAN RIVERA: Sorry, I didn't see the sign-up sheet. Mr. Chairman, Christian Rivera, R-i-v-e-r-a of Brown Rudnick at One Financial Center in Boston. I represent CambridgePark Apartments Limited Partnership, abutter and owner and developer of 160 CambridgePark Drive. We generally support the use development --

HUGH RUSSELL: Could somebody point that out on the map?

ATTORNEY CHRISTIAN RIVERA: It's the one that was just permitted back in July. So it's -- it abuts directly the proposed parking garage.

HUGH RUSSELL: So is that -- Stuart is pointing at one. Is that, that's the one?

ROGER BOOTHE: On the board over here.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, great. Thank you.

Please continue.
ATTORNEY CHRISTIAN RIVERA: Thank
you. It's the one under construction.
And we support continuing development of residential uses in the district. We understand that, you know, these are the goals of the planning goals of the city for this district. We just have some concerns with the design and the quality of the proposed parking facility. There's a long facades that the structure will visually impact the residents of 160 CambridgePark Drive as they look upon, you know, the size of the facility. And we'd love an opportunity to continue to talk with the
proponent to sort of figure out how we can put a little more uniqueness and variety to the design of the parking structure. So our only comment this time would be that we would respectfully request a continuance of the hearing in order for us to continue to begin discussions with the applicant, the proponent. This is our -- my first opportunity to really review the plans up here and we would like sometime to review what these plans are.

That's all.
HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one.
So, I think we can start talking to ourselves. In accordance with our recently adopted rules we don't close the public
hearing of testimony until we've finished all the dialogue, got all the information, and are at the point of saying yes or no. So....
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can we take a five-minute break at this point --

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and then not interrupt our discussion?

HUGH RUSSELL: Fine, let's take a real five minute break.
(A short recess was taken.) HUGH RUSSELL: Let's get going again.

So, maybe what we should do next is try to put out on the table things that people want to dig into or discuss some more. And usually when we do that, people start expressing opinions, so that's okay because your opinion expresses why you want to put
something like that out there. And I'm getting a signal from Mr. McKinnon.

RICHARD McKINNON: If I could take a minute just to respond to the public testimony?

PAMELA WINTERS: You have to speak in the microphone.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is that okay with the rest of the Board?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
RICHARD McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, if
I can just take a minute to respond to the public testimony.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you.
We've met with all of our neighbors on the street. We've spent time meeting with folks from North Cambridge. As you noticed, there was no opposition that was expressed
tonight other than the folks at Hanover. We've heard from them, we met with them a number of times. They made two things abundantly clear; that they would buy the property from us if we sold it to them at a deep discount and allowed them to close on it a year from now rather than now. And un1ess they did that -- unless we did that, they've told us that they will appeal the project and they were going to appeal it for the sole purpose of slowing us down so that their leasing gets a head start on ours. I live in Cambridge as a Cambridge citizen not just as a developer here. I think it's a lousy way to use our process and it's a lousy way to use the time of the Cambridge Planning Board. Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

STEVEN WINTER: Are we putting this
stuff on the table then?
HUGH RUSSELL: I think we're laying out the discussion.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay, I think I'd like to talk more about the residential entries. I'm -- I can't see the definition in them and that's in the -- we're not -Mr. Chair, are we actually having the discussion at this moment or are we simply making a list of things that we would like to talk about?

HUGH RUSSELL: We're trying to make a list but we have to explain why it's on the list.

STEVEN WINTER: No, and I'm
wondering if the proponent wishes to get up and speak is that part of what we're doing?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think when we get
through the list then we would --

## STEVEN WINTER: Got it. Okay.

So I'm not sure that I see that definition.

And I also -- I would like a little more clarity on the TMA, the Transportation Management Association, and maybe a little more help from Sue or the City or somebody and whether or not that's -- what role would the city have in helping that to occur? I mean, is it -- I know that it's an application process. I know there are state funds available sometimes for startups. But I just think that the thought that we need a TMA, is that we need more than that. We need something happening like the 128 Business Council or something like that down there helping us out. I guess for me right now that's where I am.

Anyone else want to add to the list?
TOM SIENIEWICZ: Sure, Hugh. I
understand that there's a request for waiver of yard requirements under the Special Permit here. And during the course of the presentation it was revealed that they actually haven't approached the maximum height in the district. So I'd like to discuss that, whether there was -- the reason for amending the yards around a residential building when there's an opportunity to go higher and potentially reduce the footprint and provide open space to provide where people are living. So I'd love to have some discussion about that. And that's it for now.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I would
like more information on the management of the parking. I'm a big proponent of shared
parking, and think it's great when it can work, but I'd like to understand more about how the parking's going to be managed. Will the residents have designated spaces? Will they be paying for them separately from their units? How wil1 visitors be handled? A11 of those things that go into making this work, I think it's generally, you know, residential and office make for decent shared parking users, but the devil's in the details and I'd like some more.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
PAMELA WINTERS: I guess I just
wanted to say that I really like the fact that the three different courtyards have different functions. I think that that was a really good idea. The one negative that kind of, I don't know, I'm just kind of thinking about a little bit, is the sense of
domesticity in the building. It seems a little -- there's a coolness to it that I would like to somehow see more inviting. And I don't know how, you know, not being an architect I don't know how that would happen. But there's just a sort of an office-y science lab kind of feel to the building, that I would like to just sort of see warmed up a little bit and more domesticized but, again, I don't have any specific recommendations as to how that can happen. Thanks.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I've already said that I'm not quite sure how to evaluate the proposal in many respects, but I'11 just mention a couple of sort of random subjective reactions.

One is the New Street elevation. I
really like the corner with the red and the
metal and the different textures and different materials. But then as we go down the street, it converts into a very long consistent, to my eye, almost relentless stress. I guess to my eye I would have wished to have seen more action, more texture, something to break it up. Many of these elevations where -- wel1, as that, as we focus on the corner, it's great and it may be no mistake that you didn't show the rest. HUGH RUSSELL: You can't see it from this view. It's cut off by the next building.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, and a lot of it has to do with what you see and from where. And, again, as I keep saying the content is always important, and in the context of this location, it may not be quite as significant that elevation may continue so relentlessly
because you won't see it from the Main Street. But nevertheless it strikes me as a bit overwhelming and lacking in interest.

We talked about the bridge, and Sue talked about the contributions of funds, but I imagine, I assume, somehow in the course of this approval it would be advantageous as Tom put it, to take advantage of the good faith or the wishes of the proponent here and actually get a commitment for some sort of landing arrangement if as in when, you know, that opportunity presents itself in the future. You know, to my eye again I think I would have liked to have seen more green space, not enormous amounts more. A lot of the open space here is actually in the courtyards in the rear for the benefit of the residents, and I understand that, and that's important. I'm not sure, again to my eye
that there's as much on New Street as there might ideally be. And the concern is it's a little bit exacerbated by the fact that some of that land that you'd like to landscape is owned and controlled by you, and I guess as of today you're not in a position to commit to what happens in that space.

I think I'd also echo the point that somebody else raised about the fabric on the garage. It looks kind of cool but, you know, fabric, I don't have a sense of how that plays out over time. Whether it fades, whether it gets dirty. You know, I'd like to hear about that. And I guess I should be looking more closely at the plans to figure out exactly where at that fabric is and are there sections of the garage in which we're really just seeing that conventional garage rather than the kind of interesting fabric.

I think that's the extent of my random comments for now.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I would like to make a couple of comments. Probably my biggest concern, and I am not sure there's anything that we or the developer or anybody can do about it, is the traffic situation. I tried going down at 3:30 this afternoon to take a look at the site again and gave up trying to get down Rindge Avenue at 3:30 after about 15 minutes of trying to go a quarter of a mile, it was just impossible. And but I realize that, you know, the area was Zoned for residential and we're looking to put residential -- I'm just wondering if there's anything that can be done to try to improve the traffic because I certainly think the time I was going today was not what I would think is peak, and it's just going to
get worse and worse for hours.
I would like, you know, more
information if possible about the bridge.
You know, the North Point pedestrian bike bridge is just so wonderful now that I think it would dramatically change this area. And if indeed Hugh is correct, which I'm sure he is, that we've been discussing this for 33 years now, I would love it if, you know, there was some end in site. I think, I do like the red a lot, but -- and I do like the pops of color, but I think, you know, a lot of it is very monolithic looking. I think it's the northern facade which then segues into the garage and it just seems like a very long and unbroken space and I would be curious -- I actually like the grey, too. But I think if there was some way to en1iven it up more, I think it would be terrific.

Then the last thing, I'm curious about what the envisioned layout of the interiors, some of the interiors might be as they relate to the doors and I guess the little Juliet balconies. I was recently at Sierra and Tango at North Point where there are similar doors, and most of the units that I saw were set up so that sofas or beds were up against the window -- the wall of window and doors so that they just become totally useless. And I understand the idea of having them to enliven the facade and, you know, to actually let people get outside if they choose to, but I am just curious, you know, just looking at this what the layout is intended, whether they're actually going to be in the walls where one is going to assume the inhabitant is going to put a couch or a bed.

And those are really my comments at the
moment.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I think that's everybody except me and it's great because you've all hit fortunately all the points that I'm interested in. I want to say one thing that happens often in renderings, if you look on page 10 at the New Street elevation, it looks pretty relentless and featureless. If you look at the close-up on page 13, it's the same building but you're much closer than just a small piece of it and you begin to see that there's actually more detail than you might have thought when you look at it. When you looked at it in that other rendering, it's -- the rendering's always a challenge, how you convey what you're trying to do, particularly on a building which is one of 10 is not a view you can actually ever get, because I think the
building is already blocking some of that.
And so I guess I'm interested in a
little bit more discussion of the materiality of how you're achieving particularly the outside elevations. The inside ones seem to be livelier and there's a different kind of a problem. They're smaller. They're more broken up. People are looking at them, and there's a lot, it's a lot looser in the courtyards. They seem very deliberate, you know, decision to be able to more formal when you're facing the public. So I would be interested in some discussion.

My other point I'm interested in hearing about is the fabric on the garage. It doesn't seem to be, as I look at the rendering, completely uniform. But I'm wondering if it can be even less uniform. There are different kinds of things that are
happening and maybe that's a way of
addressing some of the issues around what does the adjacent project see and what do people see.

Now, I have a list. I'm wondering if we might want to ask several people to comment on these things. One would be Jim obviously. Another one might be Roger.

Maybe we should ask Roger --
STEVEN WINTER: Yes, I'd like that.
HUGH RUSSELL: What's your reaction
to the -- are we hitting the right points?
Are we worrying about things that we don't have to? What do you think?

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, we're
certainly, I think, we're at the right points and certainly things that we've tried to talk through generally speaking with the proponent before they got here. I think your last
point, Hugh, was a very important one, the scale is deceptive in its elevations that do look relentless and I agree that they can have that tendency. I'm pretty convinced that they did a good job of having a lot of detail. As you get closer to the building, they've thought about the issues. Whether the color issues could help some of that maybe. I personally think the red is great. I wore my shirt red today in support of that tonight. And Sue did, too, you know. So the question about the residential entries being unclear, I think that may also be a rendering problem. I think they have put some thought into that. And I don't know if you have anything that you can put up on the screen that shows residential entries a little more? They're all pretty small in these -- than what we've been looking at.

Tom's issue about the height versus the setback, I'm not sure how that -- I hadn't thought of that. I don't know if that's something that the team has thought about. As I understand it, Tom, you were saying could they go higher in exchange for having some more open space? Really that would be a question for Jim as to whether they thought that through. Let me just get on through the list and maybe Jim can talk about that.

And certainly courtyards, I agree, you know, it's really nice that they've been treated differently. We've actually seen that in almost all of these -- there are similarities to these projects with all the others that Stuart had mentioned coming out here, that they're struggling with some of the same contextual issues. And the broader question that Steve raised about, you know,
how do we deal with so many requests for relief? I think Hugh was saying what was in my mind which was that, yes, there are a lot of points, but these are Special Permits, it's not a Variance and if they're doing what we think makes sense basically with the guidelines, you know, they have a right to the permit. Not like a Variance where you show some sort of hardship. And clearly the overall idea that David Black mentioned that, you know, in the Concord/Alewife plan is exactly what we were trying to do, is get rid of so much surface parking out there. And so environmentally I think having habitation here with less impervious surface is quite important. And given as someone said that this is -- I guess maybe Stuart was saying this is happening faster than we expected. We are having a potential for a new
neighborhood. And so we're looking at all of these projects trying to think about how they make the ground plane and, you know, the things that are in the guidelines, trying to look at an active and usable streetscape. Looking at the context. And literally the context is a moving target out here, but -STEVEN COHEN: Literally. ROGER BOOTHE: -- but trying to make it hospitable. Overall it's clearly where we're headed with all of this. And so, again, given the traffic issues that's why we tried to favor residential is that it has less of a peak hour problem.

The concerns about the bridge connection, I do think it's really great that everybody's trying to be cooperative. It's still a tall order, so we can't hang our hat on that, but I think we're pleased that the
proponent is really trying to work on that.
So, let me see. More discussion about the materiality and the whole question about the fabric. You raised those issues also. This is not the first garage with fabric on it. There's another one right across the way there at Discovery Park, and that was something that the Board struggled with a little bit. I personally think it's been successful in giving some texture and warmth. Is it going to be doable for the long term? I'm sure it will have to be replaced in ten years, and I don't know if this one's more elaborate structurally. So I think the point about how, you know, it is actually
structured and will it be durable? We should look that some more of as a strategy for dealing with these parking garages. I think it's preferable to not having some sort of
decorative on it.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Roger, I'm not sure you're the right person. There was one other point that I meant to raise and I would like to have you or anybody else to comment on it. I'm concerned about the unit mix that we've been really trying to get three-bedroom units in a lot of buildings. And considering the size of this building there are no three-bedroom units at all. And I really like to know why? And, you know, whether there's some way, you know, we're talking about swimming pool, you've got a playground. You're looking to have families, and families need larger units. And, you know, I think, you know, we've been trying to do that with lots of buildings, and why a building this size doesn't have at least a smattering of three-bedroom units.

ROGER BOOTHE: I would tend to agree with that so I would turn that question over to them.

RICHARD McKINNON: Jim?
JIM BACHELOR: Sure. Thanks.
I think we are good to work with a number of the ideas and maybe one or two of them might be hard. I'11 acknowledge the difficulty on the height first. As people probably have a sense, many of these projects are coming in at about the same height. And there are at least two reasons that I could mention that are causing that.

One is, this is a height, which if you exceed, you get into the high rise requirements.

And the other is that this construction system of wood frame over plinth is also maxed out at this number of stories. So we
have difficulty getting that additional story which would give that flexibility.

I do think at the other extreme in terms of things which are definitely good to discuss and to critique and to work on, I think we wish very much to have the right mix of scale, liveliness of color and articulation left to right. We've looked at a couple of different levels of articulation of the color and we can also look at different articulation of the materials. I think our general sense was that we need to strike a balance. And I think we're happy to talk with you about what that balance is. I also appreciated the observation about the courtyards, having sort of a different sense of life. And I actually think those courtyards will be really wonderful. And although I initially thought looking over the
tracks and it's self-facing. I think also we've noticed some of these courtyards really get to be quite nice. And that I think that those are coming out well. And I think we could look at some of the color and material mixtures on the north side and introduce a little bit more of that. We've got a certain amount in the detail at the windows and elsewhere, but I think we're good working on that.

## There's also a comment about the

 entries at grade. Definitely look for those to be taken well care of. At this scale and this drawing there is only a limited amount that shows, but we definitely agree with the intent. We look at them as activating the street edge. We look at them as being landscaped in a way which is -- acknowledges that they're on a public way, but that overtime will hopefully will have some individual character as people take care of them. It is an apartment as opposed to private residence. So the management for this probably in the end is more likely to be by one central point of responsibility. But there are ways in which people personalize their space indoor and out.

And I think we're conscious of the Juliet balconies as being particularly good, but also sensitive to furniture around arrangements. We're not proposing one bedrooms. So the intent is that these would be living room spaces. Not to say that this problem won't occur. I think it is possible that people will put furnishings in front of doors, especially if they happen to be a personality type to be less inclined to open the door.

RICHARD McKINNON: I could try a few others, Mr. Chairman.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
RICHARD McKINNON: Thanks, Jim, appreciate it.

In terms of tying down a commitment to providing the landing, when you do get a chance to look through Sue's letter, that is a commitment. So -- and by the way, we have good will, but Sue has a way of negotiating good will as well. So in any event, there's a very firm and iron-clad commitment on our part to provide a landing for it on our property one place or the other.

And in terms of making it feel a bit more residential, one of the things that we have done already is to try and provide some balconies, but perhaps we can provide more. We've also provided four residential units
right along New Street which don't show up -it's a shame, they don't show up in the rendering very well. Perhaps we can zoom in on that a little bit more and do a better job. And maybe we can break up the texture a little bit more on that stretch of New Street.

The big issue about traffic out there, Ted, it's obviously front and center. I mean one of the things that we had tried to do is take a look at providing traffic relief that really goes well beyond our particular project. Being a part of a bridge solution really has the opportunity to reduce traffic dramatically in the Quadrangle by making it much easier for those people to opt out, to take the T to work, and to be able to get over to their job to the Quadrangle much easier. I think going beyond the requirement
of joining a TMA, getting to work, people at VHP Charles River TMA and of course working with Sue and Adam to at least do an inventory out there to see if we can take the first step and try and find out whether or not there's interest. Again, those are the types of things that can help lessen the traffic that's out there.

And, Steve, obviously, you know, that's really our first step out there. How it's going to work exactly? I think it gets a little bit beyond what we're doing. I think that's something that Sue and the TMA wind up working out in terms of schedules and locations, etcetera. But we at least would like to get it started and do the inventory of all the property owners to see if we can engender some interest.

Tom, as Jim pointed out, it really
changes the economics completely if we get that 75 -foot mark which is why you see so many of them at that -- and then I think, Steve, just on the issue of compliance and relief, we're in the Alewife 6 Overlay District. And I think what you have to understand is that a lot of the relief is relief from the base underlying zone. And it's really encouraged -- the district is really inclined to encourage people to use it because it gives Planning Board extra planning tools. And so, we're not seeking relief within the Alewife planning district, we're seeking relief from the base zoning, but it requires the Special Permits that the Planning Board has. And, for example, as I said, we need relief from the base zone in FAR but we're within the FAR right down the line. And we're, you know, we're only half
as tall as we could be.
And the devil's in the details. It is.
I just don't know if we're gonna get -- we're talking prescriptively, Catherine, and Hanover's got a head start on us. They're going to be the first ones out there that are actually doing the shared parking. This is the first instant that we got city, citywide. But we're happy to give you our best shot at how we plan to use it. We've obviously thought about it. We have a plan. And we can spel1 that out. And, again, just on traffic, there is a whole series of traffic mitigation. Sue's cited some of it. But everything in Sue's letter we have agreed to.

And then finally just on, you know, we've met with Hanover. Of course, you know, we're happy to meet with them again. We don't need the Planning Board to hold up here
because of that. We'11 meet with whoever you ask us to meet with and we've always done that. We just don't think that the garage is really the issue at hand. So, I hope that answers some of the questions.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Hugh,
just before Rich leaves, I just encourage you on the TMA question to talk to Stephanie Grol1 because as I recal1, there are a number of projects in the Quadrangle that are required to join a TMA.

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, they have.
CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: If one
exists, and she could probably give you a 1ist of what those are.

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes. Same is
true at Discovery Park.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe, Catherine,

you're the next one to ask this question to. What would a TMA be like and what would it do in this area of the city?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So a
TMA in this area of the city would probably serve the residential and the office uses. It could provide residential with -- the main reason you create a TMA financially, aside from just encouraging things, is to get economies of scale and things like shuttles. And so if you get all the property owners to cooperate here, you start looking at the feasibility of a shuttle that would get residents to shopping, that would get office workers from the T to their office in the Quadrangle without having to walk and, you know, despite the bridge with making that more pleasant on a rainy day, having that
option. You can also do things that
education-wise provide information on options for getting around, for pooling bike parking, for working together to get other solutions. But I would say the biggest thing that it does is it brings an entity together that can run a shuttle system of some sort together. Would you agree with that, Rich?

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes. No, absolutely those are the benefits. HUGH RUSSELL: Sue, did you have a further comment?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think this
particular area is interesting because you have the Alewife Station right there with very good transit service to the east and then you have much more limited options when you're going west. And so a TMA can really play a role in trying to think through some
of the challenges of the specifics of this area. And I think as Catherine is saying, you know, if you're trying to do any kind of shuttle or any kind of things to try to compensate for the westward movements, those economies of scale become really important to make them affordable.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Sue, I'm just curious or, Catherine, either of you, in other areas of the city where there are TMAs and there are shuttles, are the shuttles successful?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: We11, Charles
River TMA is running EZ Ride and EZ Ride, that's fantastically successful. And if I was on my game, I would tell you how many people they're carrying.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's in the militions. SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Right. They've
done a really phenomenal job to fit the need between North Station and coming in through the eastern part of the city where it would otherwise be a double transfer for people trying to go there or triple depending on what you're doing. So, yes, they can be incredibly successful.

RICHARD McKINNON: Just on that,
Mr. Chairman, just on the EZ Ride, the Galleria alone, we run close to 800,000 people a year. That's a lot of people that aren't coming there in cars. STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, could I just follow up on one point for Jim and/or Rich, probably doesn't require a response. You don't have to call Jim up. But, you know, I mentioned before what I characterized as sort of relentless facade to the right, and I'm glancing through the plans and I'm
actually going to look at the floor plans and I -- in looking at the interior, I also notice, you know, how very long the corridor is up front. And, you know, it makes me immediately think whether it will might be an opportunity to create a second entrance up front, perhaps two-thirds down and incorporate some more color there and some more texture which would certainly break up an enliven the front facade and perhaps enhance the experience for your perspective tenants. And the experience of your perspective tenants is primarily your business and not ours. But it is a long corridor.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I mean it's
-- I've done -- planned a lot of these and I've done a few of them, but that's the nature of the business at this point in time.

At I have a client that I studied 12 sites for and it looks like one might go forward. And developers bid against each other to get control of land and they want to know what can I get on it? And, you know, and, you know, I'11 make a little sketch and it will get sent to a contractor who will say, yeah, we'11 do that for $\$ 26$ mil1ion. Or you've got to carry -- I mean, to me it's, my client is fairly experienced and in business for 50 years. They don't win many of these things because they actually have a pretty good idea what, how they're going to work. And people who are maybe have less of a good idea. STEVEN COHEN: You only win if you delude yourself?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I think that is possible. But it's all sort of a -- it's kind of sad, but it's not to say that anybody
in this room or anybody who has appeared before us is deluded and there are different kinds of business strategies. And there are some developers who develop properties and for the purpose of developing them, getting them rented, and then selling them because now they're, it's a different kind of a real estate deal if you sel1 something that's fully occupied. And anyway....

STEVEN COHEN: So long as cap rates are low, that's a great strategy.

RICHARD McKINNON: We'11 look at the second entrance. HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I'm going to comment on the second entrance because -RICHARD McKINNON: Yes. HUGH RUSSELL: -- when you start looking at that, you have to think about where are people coming from? So the people
on foot. There's only one direction they're coming from and that's the T station. And the entrance is as close to the T station as it can be. The people who are driving cars are distributed around the building. And I was going to try to find the plan, but I'm imagining there are multiple elevators in the building that sort of respond to people. STEVEN COHEN: No, not really. H. THEODORE COHEN: There are very few.

STEVEN COHEN: And the, you know, the horizontal distance may be the same whether you're walking outdoors or indoors. It's more pleasant to walk in the outdoors rather than a long corridor. Again, I think that's more of an internal issue.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And you also know from the diagram whether the corridor is
not otherwise broken up or will be when they get done with it, because you can do lots of things.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: And so, you know, the -- it's an intriguing idea to try to do something along that New Street facade but you may be pushing something that doesn't actually represent the desire.

So I'm thinking that we don't want to act tonight on this.

PAMELA WINTERS: Roger has something to say.

ROGER BOOTHE: Can I add a footnote to what you were saying, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ROGER BOOTHE: And Ted had raised
the question before about these ground level
entries. And we shared the blame for that
because we've really promoted it through the plan here and all throughout the city. I agree sometimes it's frustrating because people put furniture up, but I'm very convinced that in the long term as an area gets more successful, like in North Point, it's -- they're still sort of pioneers out there. As you get more people and activity, you want to have those doors there so that there's that potential because it will never come again. The units are not designed for it. And I think here, you know, that's very important as -- even if somebody does have furniture there, there's a doorway there, it signals occupied, and so I think it's very important. And I think it probably will help with --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Roger, my
concern was not at the entry level. It was
the doors on the upper floors that open onto the little Juliet balconies.

ROGER BOOTHE: Oh, those. I'm
sorry.
H. THEODORE COHEN: No, the doors on the ground level are great because they do enliven everything.

ROGER BOOTHE: Okay, I just wanted to reinforce that point.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, I'm thinking that it would be good to ask them to provide some more detail on some of the questions that we've brought up.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And the things I have arrows against are sort of the close up of the street level entries, the -- your thinking on the parking management plan.

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sort of, again, maybe more of close ups that show -- address Pam's question about domesticity or points of view that illustrate what, you know, what's -- a -- I think we're all sort of wanting to think more about the garage fabric and is it -- you know, the question's are like how is it actually done? How long is it gonna last? What's the color? What's the rhythm? All those -- some more thinking or telling us more about what your thoughts have been. I think you select out of all of the thinking you've done one -- a bunch of stuff to show us in supposedly 20 minutes. So I think there's a lot more thinking that you've done that you can bring back to us.

RICHARD McKINNON: Mr. Chairman, on that one subject, have you suggested that we think of perhaps not all perfectly uniform
color and not a perfectly uniform shape?
HUGH RUSSELL: I was thinking of
shape because there are some shape
differences.
RICHARD McKINNON: Okay, good.
HUGH RUSSELL: But, you know, you
know, the abstract trees on the other garage are a completely different approach. Here it's being done -- I mean -- I mean, I'd send
-- I think of these fabric shades as sort of abstract trees on New Street. I think that's part of the reason they're green or maybe that's just my projecting to it.

RICHARD McKINNON: They're in shade
all the time which is one thing if it's helpful in terms of keeping their color and lasting longer.

PAMELA WINTERS: Have you thought about a mural by any chance? Or is that not
-- I know you did a fabulous mural behind the Faces building. I thought that was great. Just a thought.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean it's -- the garages are very -- if you do the garage economically and reasonably and why wouldn't you want to try to use the system efficiently so that you can put your money, in other places where it counts? But, you know, the openings, the spacings, the columns, all those things are kind of come out of the engineering and then we as architects have this sort of decorate those.

RICHARD McKINNON: Right. HUGH RUSSELL: You can decorate it with a half an inch of brick. It probably would be cheaper to put brick than the fabric, but I don't think it would do the job as well as you know in this case.

I'm getting back to my list. There was a question about open space. And one thing we don't have very well is a large scale open space plan of all of CambridgePark Drive. It's sort of like a, is it green or is it black? Is it building? Sort of a figure ground study that would help us understand is there a network like the -- there's a lot of open space around some of the buildings. So, you know, facing this building is -- has a fairly hard edge along the northern side but there's a soft edge on the other side. RICHARD McKINNON: There really is, yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: And that's a soft edge that isn't going to change for a very long time we think. And it's a, it's very large.

RICHARD McKINNON: Yeah, actual1y
that's the abutter that we're having quite a bit of success with in terms of doing the most enhanced landscaping plan on the 100 CambridgePark Drive side of the street.

HUGH RUSSELL: If you've taken that plan and colored everything that was green all the way up to CambridgePark Drive -RICHARD McKINNON: Okay. HUGH RUSSELL: -- you might think very differently about open space. RICHARD McKINNON: Right. HUGH RUSSELL: It's not usable by the tenants in this building, but it's visible on sort of understanding that -- and you're putting together what Hanover is doing, people are doing across the street, and the pathways, I think that would help us understand that question.

RICHARD McKINNON: Right.

## HUGH RUSSELL: And I didn't hear a

 response to the three-bedroom question. I think I'd like you to consider a response to that. Is it possible? Why wouldn't you put, like Ted said, a smattering of three-bedroom units in? I mean I'm -- I've been in this business for a long time and I've been very surprised that my clients are now calling for a smattering of three-bedroom units which used to be all one and twos. Why? Because people come and ask do you have any three-bedroom apartments? And I'm not sure they're families with kids. They may be families that need two studies and a bedroom. But it doesn't say that you couldn't have kids and couldn't do that.RICHARD McKINNON: We'11 address
that, sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Now, does anyone else
feel that I left out their favorite question? STEVEN COHEN: I have one more. I keep saying I have random comments. I have one more random comment.

You know, we've talked about this being a flood zone. I take that to mean it's a place where it could flood. And in as much as it could flood, I'm just curious if you're putting the electric room on the first floor is necessarily the most advisable thing. Again, more your issue than ours. But it did cross my mind.

I do want to support that Hugh's request, you know, I don't know if it's from the applicant or from staff, for a better sense of the way, you know, what the whole district really looks like. You know, I keep saying I'm not sure how to evaluate it because I'm not sure what the context is, but
it would be really good to get a better sense of what this burgeoning neighborhood really is and what we'd like it to be in the years to come. So we can be better able to evaluate the proposal in context.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I agree with the other developments and with Google maps you can get a lot of data. Not terribly difficult to get that data in terms of what's green and what's not green.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: I wanted to touch
again on the fabric and the garage. I -please tell me if I'm off base with this, my colleagues, but I feel like what we're saying to the proponent is, yeah, we do want something on that poured concrete. I mean, yes, we do want something there. But it's up
to the designers to figure out what that is. Frankly I don't have a problem with the fabric. Frankly I don't have a problem with the colors or the shapes. I count on the designer to bring it forward in the right way. So we're not saying that -- we're not saying no fabric. We're not saying no this, no that. I think what we're saying is put your design sense together in the best way possible and bring that forward.

STEVEN COHEN: And I agree with that, Steve. I like it. I think it looks cool and it does certainly liven it up. But I hadn't thought about reflective trees. Yeah, I was just curious about how as grey as it looks in renderings, life and reality doesn't always look as good as renderings. And life and reality five years down the road really doesn't always look like the
renderings. So we just want to know, you know, what they are and how you anticipate them aging and weathering and so forth.

HUGH RUSSELL: I have assume that people who make the fabric have been doing this for a while and there are pictures of what they've done, and maybe that could get a sense of what happens.

STEVEN WINTER: We need to be
informed decision makers when we're making decisions about this. And I think we're going to count on you to tell us about these things; the duration, the wear and tear, the durability, the color fade, and all those things.

PAMELA WINTERS: Maybe even a sample of the fabric.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Maybe. I don't
know.
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 right, sure.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: One other thing,
Mr. Chair. Given that it's the environmentally sensitive part of our city, and I know that the submitted materials referenced are a LEED Silver standard, I would appreciate a little bit more of the description for the record on the approaches to sustainability and especially as it relates to site and drainage and the approaches that the proponent is doing to make sure that they tread lightly on this environmentally sensitive district.

HUGH RUSSELL: Almost always now we're getting LEED checklists and I guess this project didn't.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: It's there.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So I wanted to explain the hydrology of the (inaudible).

So the Alewife base elevation is around 20 plus 20 and mean high tide in Boston Harbor is plus 12. And I don't know, it's five or six miles down the Alewife Brook, down the Mystic River to get to Boston Harbor. And it's a rain area that is, well, it's several some square miles. You know, the hills in Arlington and over to Watertown. And so the problem is you don't have much gradient and you don't have a lot of width and particularly in the Alewife Brook. And so what happens when it rains a lot, is you've got to develop ahead and you've got to get that water down. Now, there's a further problem which is that if the harbor's at high tide, you can't actually get the water into it because the water is higher than the
river. There's an Amelia Earhart dam which like the Charles River dam, has pumps in it and pumps the Mystic River up into the harbor at some rate. And so what it means is in this area you get very shallow flooding over a very wide area while the water's waiting to drain down this slow channel. And so it's not like well, you're planning that the level is going to be a foot deep, but it really could be three feet. It doesn't -- that doesn't -- that's not the way it works here. It certainly works that way other places. So you can -- it's a different -- because of the nature of the problem. There's a tremendous area out there that flood elevation, your storage is extensive rather than intensive. STEVEN COHEN: So the FEMA mapped the hundred year storm or the one percent storm is only what, you know, a foot above
grade or something?
HUGH RUSSELL: I don't know on this
site what -- how much water is, but I don't know where the -- it's first floor is like one foot above the flood elevation or is it 18 inches?

JIM BACHELOR: More like 18 now.
RICHARD McKINNON: Actually we spoke to Owen who said let's be on the safe side. Let's -- we'11 do it beyond what's required and so we're now in the higher elevation for that first floor.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so the first
floor elevation is how far above the curb line along CambridgePark Drive?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: A couple of feet.

> HUGH RUSSELL: It's a couple of
feet.
STEVEN COHEN: So if you have had -you're saying the first floor the parking level?
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, the parking level.
STEVEN COHEN: Okay, I had assumed the parking level was designed to flood. But that's not the case then. The flood storage is all below that?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STEVEN COHEN: Gotcha.
HUGH RUSSELL: So it's a -- all
flood situations are unique, but we've been through this a few times on the Board and I've come to understand it. I hope I'm not misrepresenting the facts, but I think that's why they can put something only, you know, a short distance out of the flood area because of the nature of the topography. And, of
course, if sea level rises seven and a half feet, then Alewife wil1 be at sea level.

PAMELA WINTERS: We'11 be dead by then.

RICHARD McKINNON: Those worries are what's causing Owen to ask us to be more aggressive.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And, right, there's a map out there that says how much of Cambridge gets flooded and when the sea level rises that much and it's -- my house, my house is at 20 also. Because once you over top the Charles River dam which happens somewhere between plus five and plus seven feet, Back Bay, anything in Cambridge that was filled wasn't filled enough to withstand that event --

STUART DASH: And you just want to mention for Planning Board members the city
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is engaged in a study of that at this point adaptation of possible sea level rise and we're looking ahead to make sure we're engaged in the right activities to prepare for that.


HUGH RUSSELL: A flood barrier across the outer island and stuff like that. What if somebody wanted to build a bridge, remember, across the outer islands?

Connecting the North Shore and the South Shore as if anybody particularly wanted to make that trip.

STEVEN COHEN: By the way, subject
to all the comments that we've offered tonight, it looks like a pretty good project.

RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I think that's
what we haven't said. I think that's what
we're --

RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you, appreciate it.

HUGH RUSSELL: So anybody want to add anything more or shall we go home? PAMELA WINTERS: Let's go home. STEVEN WINTER: Let's go home. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we're adjourned.

Thank you very much. (Whereupon, at 9:50 p.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)
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