

Riverside Neighborhood Planning Study Errata - May 21, 2003

The following changes should be applied to the Riverside Planning Study of April 2003.

- Change title to “Riverside Neighborhood Planning Study.”
- In section 1.9, “Parking,” page 9, change the sentence “Harvard undergraduates are not allowed to have cars in Cambridge,” to “Harvard undergraduates are discouraged from having cars in Cambridge.”
- In section 2.1.6, “Area 6” page 33, under “Alternatives Considered,” after the sentence “Harvard University...developed a schematic zoning proposal with some of the immediately affect neighbors of Banks Street area,” add the sentence “A consensus on this zoning proposal was not reached with the Banks Street residents.”
- In section 2.3.4, “Challenges and Opportunities,” page 43, change the sentence “Committee members, however, feel that it may be possible to distinguish between students and other residents in issuance of resident parking permits and feel that this is worth pursuing, through whatever channels necessary,” to “Committee members, however, feel that it may be possible to distinguish between dormitory residents and other residents in issuance of resident parking permits and feel that this is worth pursuing, through whatever channels necessary.”
- In Appendix A, page 2, after the sentence “...Harvard River Houses...replaced industrial uses,” add the sentence “Homes were also removed to develop the River Houses.”
- In Appendix E, page 1, add the sentence “These diagrams do not represent committee recommendations.”
- In Appendix G, page 12, “Alternatives Considered,” change the phrase “with building heights varying from 35 to 60 feet depending on existing building context,” to “with building heights varying from 35 to 65 feet depending on existing building context.”
- In Appendix I, page 1, add the following:

The following transportation memos analyze two future scenarios to evaluate the relative performance of traffic operations for the year 2022. The first scenario (the “existing zoning” scenario) envisioned a probable build out scenario under the existing zoning during that time frame. The second scenario reflected a zoning proposal under consideration by the Committee as of April 10, 2002 (the “April 10” scenario). This scenario included development which was considerably more dense and included more retail development than the zoning ultimately recommended by the committee. The Committee’s final zoning proposal would result in less traffic than either the existing zoning or the “April 10” zoning scenario. (See section 2.3.2 of the report for details on the various zoning scenarios).