

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

PLANNING BOARD  
FOR THE  
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

September 22, 2009

7:30 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room  
City Hall Annex -- McCusker Building  
344 Broadway  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

- William Tibbs, Chairman
- Pamela Winters, Vice Chair
- Hugh Russell, Member
- Charles Studen, Member
- Thomas Anninger, Member
- H. Theodore Cohen, Member
- Ahmed Nur, Member
- Patricia Singer, Member

Beth Rubenstein, Assistant City Manager  
for Community Development

---

REPORTERS, INC.  
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD  
23 MERRYMOUNT ROAD, QUINCY, MA 02169  
617.786.7783/FACSIMILE 617.786.7723  
www.reportersinc.com

## I N D E X

<u>CASE NO.</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Update by Beth Rubenstein	3
--	
<u>General Business</u>	
PB #239	10
Alexandria Zoning	116
<u>Board of Zoning Appeal Cases</u>	
BZA #9834	135
Other	168

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Welcome to the  
3 September 22nd meeting of the Cambridge  
4 Planning Board. We have -- we don't have any  
5 public hearing tonight, but we have -- we'll  
6 be making -- doing deliberation and a  
7 possible decision on the case No. 239, 2419  
8 Mass. Ave. the former Rounder Records Special  
9 Permit. We'll have an update by Beth  
10 Rubenstein, and then prior to our  
11 deliberation we'll need to determine which of  
12 our two alternates is going to be voting  
13 since we only need one tonight.

14 But Beth, could you give us an update?

15 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you, Bill.

16 Following up this fall our next  
17 meetings going to be October 6th. And right  
18 now we have one public hearing scheduled on  
19 an issue of a canopy that's going to be added  
20 to the Sonesta Hotel. And I believe that's a  
21 major amendment to an older Special Permit.  
22 That must go back some years because it's No.

1 52 and we're now on No. 239. It goes back a  
2 few years.

3 And we'll be meeting again on October  
4 20th. Right now the November dates will be  
5 determined. We don't meet on November 3rd  
6 because that's Election Day, and right now we  
7 are looking at the 10th, 17th and the 24th.  
8 And we'll probably meet one or two of those  
9 days. And we'll keep you posted. Liza will  
10 be consulting the Board on dates that work.  
11 And for the public, please check our website  
12 and always feel free to call Community  
13 Development to find out the dates that we're  
14 meeting. And it's always on our website.

15 I also just wanted to briefly update  
16 the public and the Planning Board that an  
17 item that was here for review changed to the  
18 City's Zoning Ordinance that would allow wind  
19 turbines or turbins (phonetic), depending on  
20 how you pronounce it, as a Special Permit  
21 matter was adopted by the City Council last  
22 night. And very briefly right now, well,

1 previous to the change, wind turbines were  
2 not a recognized use in the ordinance, so  
3 everybody needed to get a variance and go to  
4 the Board of Zoning Appeal. And based on the  
5 very good work of the Green Building Zoning  
6 Committee which Hugh Russell is a member, we  
7 came up with the proposal to say that  
8 throughout most of the city turbines would be  
9 allowed, but that it would require review by  
10 the Planning Board to get a closer look at  
11 issues such as how they would look visually,  
12 what the noise impacts might be, whether or  
13 not there was flicker, what color they are,  
14 etcetera. I think the Committee felt that  
15 the knowledge of how these things work in an  
16 urban context was still new enough that it  
17 was going to take a closer -- to have an  
18 opportunity to take a closer look at a Board  
19 such as the Planning Board. And then in a  
20 very limited number of cases, generally on  
21 university campuses and at museums such as  
22 the Museum of Science wind turbines would be

1 allowed as of right in limited circumstances.  
2 For example, they have to be at least 200  
3 feet away from any building that's in  
4 residential use. There are still height  
5 limits. They could be no higher than 40 feet  
6 above the height of the building. They can't  
7 be standing. They can only be on a building,  
8 etcetera. So there's a very limited class of  
9 right that in general folks think they might  
10 want to try a wind turbine for the Planning  
11 Board. So that was first thing of what we  
12 think will be several changes to the Zoning  
13 Ordinance to provide more incentives to adopt  
14 green building practices.

15 And I just wanted to ask the Board if  
16 we can take care of one housekeeping matter  
17 before we go on to the first order of  
18 business. At the last meeting there was a  
19 proposal before you for a housing project on  
20 Putnam Avenue by Homeowner's Rehab. And I  
21 actually misspoke. They were asking for a  
22 fee waiver, and it was a Planning Board fee.

1 I was thinking it was a city fee. It isn't.  
2 It's a Planning Board fee. Since it is a  
3 Planning Board fee, the Board really should  
4 give its opinion by vote of the Board as to  
5 whether or not they are comfortable with that  
6 fee being waived. So my apologies for mixing  
7 that up last time. And if the Board so  
8 wishes, you can take that up tonight and take  
9 a vote on that.

10 That's it. Thanks.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

12 I think I'd just like to get it out of  
13 the way is probably a good idea for us to do  
14 that before we start if that's all right with  
15 you all.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: That's fine.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Would anybody like  
18 to make a motion?

19 PAMELA WINTERS: So moved it.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Second?

21 CHARLES STUDEN: Second.

22 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I just ask --

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: Where does it say  
3 that we have the authority to do that?

4 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I believe it's in  
5 the Planning Board rules and regulations I  
6 believe.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, go ahead.

8 H. THEODORE COHEN: How much would  
9 the fee be and have we waived them before?

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: It's \$10 a foot  
11 and I'm afraid to tell you I don't remember  
12 -- I'm sorry.

13 LES BARBER: Ten cents.

14 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Ten cents a foot,  
15 and I don't remember how much square foot it  
16 was.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: It was between three  
18 to four thousand dollars was the fee. I  
19 think it was four thousand and something.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: And have we done  
21 that the in the past?

22 LES BARBER: Yes. Fairly routine

1 actual ly.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: When requested?

3 LES BARBER: For affordabl e housi ng.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Where the ci ty is  
5 actual ly ki cki ng money i nto the deal . So i f  
6 we di dn' t wai ve the fee, then si mply the ci ty  
7 woul d have to ki ck i n money to the fee whi ch  
8 woul d then come back, and i t seems l ike si nce  
9 -- that' s better to j ust --

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I t' s a hundred  
11 percent affordabl e housi ng. There' s no  
12 profi t or market rate porti on of i t.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any other questi ons?  
14 We have a seconded moti on. Al l those i n  
15 favor.

16 (Show of hands. )

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: I thi nk that was  
18 unani mous.

19 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you.

20 (Ti bbs, Wi nters, Russel l , Studen,  
21 Anni nger, Cohen, Nur, Si nger. )

22 \* \* \* \* \*

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: We're going to  
2 deliberate and possibly make a decision, as I  
3 said, about case No. 239, 2419 Mass. Ave.  
4 formerly Rounder Records. And relative to  
5 who can vote, I think Ahmed -- what we'll do  
6 is alternate between the two, and you can go  
7 first since you haven't done this before.

8 BETH RUBENSTEIN: So Ahmed is  
9 designated to be the voting member tonight.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. And then when  
11 we get into the situation again, we'll  
12 alternate and go to Charles.

13 And we asked for some additional and  
14 supplementary information. So why don't we  
15 let the proponent give that.

16 PAUL OGNI BEME: Thank you. I'm Paul  
17 Ogni beme of Urban Spaces. And I've brought  
18 with me tonight to address the points that  
19 were raised at the last meeting, my  
20 colleagues, Mr. Art Cliffelt (phonetic) of  
21 Oak Tree, Mr. Jeff Hirsch of Urban Spaces,  
22 and Mr. Peter Nangeroni of the Environmental

1           Consul tants Woodward and Curran.

2                     There were seven key points that you  
3           asked us to follow up on. I thought we can  
4           address those di rectly tonight if you like.

5                     The fi rst point really was to talk  
6           about who control s the park? Some of these  
7           will reference slides, some of them won' t.  
8           But the Li near Park, which is here, it turns  
9           out is a state-owned park owned and operated  
10          by the Department of Conservati on and  
11          Recreati on, the DCR. We made contact wi th  
12          Conrad Crawford of DCR and asked him if we  
13          could have a meeting wi th the state to  
14          di scuss our project plans, how it may effect  
15          the park, and even speci fi cally if we could  
16          engage in a publ ic/pri vate partnershi p, which  
17          is a fai rly new, but becomi ng more common  
18          practi ce, where pri vate land owners, such as  
19          oursel ves, woul d engage wi th the ci ty -- or  
20          in thi s case wi th the state to essenti ally  
21          create an operati ng agreement where the state  
22          recogni zes that its interests are not perhaps

1 as aligned as ours are in helping to maintain  
2 and keep the park nice. And, therefore, they  
3 sometimes engage in these public/private  
4 partnerships. So we're going to explore  
5 that. They're open to the exploration and  
6 looking forward to that. Unfortunately,  
7 they're moving at state time. And we asked  
8 for a meeting in maybe a week or so, and they  
9 said how about in a month or so we'll think  
10 about assigning a meeting. So, that is on  
11 their agenda, but we don't expect to have a  
12 meeting for sometime. But nonetheless, they  
13 indicated an interest in cooperating and  
14 working together and making it even better  
15 than it is today.

16 The next question was similarly about  
17 the park in the sense that Hugh was asking  
18 how do the bikes access the park currently  
19 and how will it change with our plan? So  
20 basically down here is the Linear bike path  
21 across the street, right now. It would sort  
22 of make sense to have a crossover somewhere

1 in here (indicating). But in fact there's a  
2 solid curb cut all through here (indicating),  
3 until about here where there is an open curb  
4 cut on our property or adjacent to our  
5 property. The thought is -- and we've worked  
6 with Adam Shulman of Traffic and Parking to  
7 understand the future plans that both the  
8 city and the state have for making bike  
9 access more accessible. The idea is that  
10 apparently the city has in its works a raised  
11 device about here (indicating), in order to  
12 help bikes get across more directly from  
13 across the street. And Adam has suggested  
14 that we leave our curb cut open, although  
15 it's not a perfect solution right now, we  
16 leave it open until the city solution which  
17 is better is in place. And then we close our  
18 curb cut up, the city opens its new one, and  
19 basically a nice transition is made. In  
20 addition, it's noteworthy although a little  
21 beyond the scope of our project, that the  
22 state, through Mass. Highway I believe --

1                   JEFF HIRSCH: We have a better shot.

2                   PAUL OGNI BEME: Maybe a better shot  
3 maybe. Is creating a pathway that connects  
4 the bike path across Mass. Ave, which is  
5 going to be a nice addition. And here we can  
6 see it. It's going to be somewhere in this  
7 vicinity (indicating). So basically whereas  
8 bikes right now kind of come across the  
9 street, over the curb cut and up, and then  
10 they sort of don't know where to go, there  
11 will be a nice, more direct path here  
12 (indicating), go across the park and then  
13 some kind of a new pathway will be created,  
14 the intersection will be re-jiggered and  
15 bikes will have a nice direct path onto the  
16 bike path. So it should be good  
17 improvements. Really, only our involvement  
18 will be keeping our curb cut open at the  
19 request of the city until it's time to close  
20 it.

21                   The third item on our list to discuss  
22 came from Bill. You asked that we address

1 the site plan in its entirety. Not just  
2 looking at our particular parcel, but in fact  
3 at the other parcel as well. We'll try to --

4 JEFF HIRSCH: Give me just a second.

5 PAUL OGNI BEME: Go through it.

6 Okay.

7 So, that's actually a -- we can go  
8 through a few of these. Basically as it  
9 stands now, this is our parcel which we had  
10 previously contemplated be divided by  
11 condominium (indicating). We'll discuss that  
12 issue. But this was the other condominium  
13 parcel, which we'll continue to be owned by  
14 the seller of this parcel to us. Maybe we  
15 can take a quick look at this, an aerial  
16 view, Jeff. There we are. So you can see  
17 that there's -- this is the existing office  
18 building (indicating). This is another  
19 office building (indicating). And this is  
20 the parking which the current owner recently  
21 renovated and improved (indicating). So this  
22 basically, we tried to give you an overview

1 look, hopefully that addresses what you were  
2 looking for when you asked that we kind of  
3 take a look at the overall site plan.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think you should  
5 keep going.

6 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: But I can't say -- I  
8 can see an overall look. That wasn't quite  
9 what I was looking for.

10 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay. Well we can  
11 address more specifically.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: I want to know what  
13 you're doing with the thing not what it looks  
14 like.

15 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay. This part of  
16 the site -- well, we're not really doing  
17 anything with. This is the current owner and  
18 he will retain ownership of it. Our piece of  
19 the site, what we will do, and maybe we can  
20 go back to the original plan where we show  
21 the street scape and the landscape plan, but  
22 really this site is what we were intending to

1 put street trees and to do some landscaping,  
2 which we presented -- which we can present  
3 again now. But really to answer your  
4 question, this piece will be really outside  
5 of our purview (indicating).

6 JEFF HIRSCH: Do you want the site  
7 plan?

8 PAUL OGNI BEME: Let's go back to the  
9 original site plan in one of the original  
10 slides to demonstrate -- there we are.

11 So, in terms of our own plan, you know,  
12 we're intending to put street trees  
13 throughout to setback the building off the  
14 property line to create a nicer transition  
15 between the state-owned park and our  
16 property. And then of course along the back  
17 side landscaping. And in particular, we'll  
18 have a little landscaping buffer here to  
19 create a nicer view when you're looking down  
20 the street instead of looking directly into  
21 what is to be parking right now, be looking  
22 into some landscaped area.

1 So, shall we keep moving on?

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure.

3 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay, thank you.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: You answered my  
5 questi on.

6 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay, great.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Not very well, but  
8 you answered it.

9 PAUL OGNI BEME: Fair enough. We'll  
10 try to answer it more specifically if you  
11 have follow-up questi ons.

12 So the next points was regarding soils.  
13 There was some questi on about what exactly  
14 are the soil condi ti ons here, and we di d  
15 menti on that there was some known  
16 envi ronmental contami nati on that was mi nor,  
17 but it was goi ng to be handl ed fai rly  
18 routi nely. We thought if there were any  
19 speci fi c fol low-up questi ons, we woul d have  
20 our envi ronmental consul tant Peter Nangeroni  
21 here toni ght to answer those questi ons. If  
22 there are no speci fi c questi ons from the

1 Board we can --

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think you should  
3 just give your presentation. We'll  
4 deliberate if people have follow up or  
5 questions you can answer. But right now  
6 you're just presenting, you're just  
7 presenting the issues.

8 PAUL OGNI BEME: Okay. Very well.

9 Another point that was asked was the  
10 stairs between the buildings, which is right  
11 about here (indicating). We can show you  
12 a --

13 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Right about where?

14 PATRICIA SINGER: Show that again.

15 JEFF HIRSCH: We actually have a  
16 slide for that a little bit out of order.  
17 Right here (indicating).

18 PAUL OGNI BEME: Right here. So to  
19 give you perspective, this is the start of  
20 the existing commercial structure. And then  
21 this is the start of our piece. So right in  
22 between -- we can move to the next slide

1 where there's a photo of that area. That's  
2 the specific buildings with the staircase.  
3 Now, what our intention is to provide new  
4 stair landing, new rails, some planting  
5 buffer and fencing. I think it will greatly  
6 improve this area, which will become open  
7 because this portion of the building, which  
8 is there today, will be demoed in lieu of  
9 parking structure.

10 CHARLES STUDEN: I'm sorry, that  
11 stairway provides access to the existing  
12 office building; is that right?

13 PAUL OGNI BEME: Yes. There is an  
14 egress for this door.

15 CHARLES STUDEN: Emergency? It  
16 doesn't look like a major --

17 PAUL OGNI BEME: It's not a major  
18 egress. They have a main entrance down the  
19 street. But it is a secondary egress and it  
20 will be maintained. And it will be improved  
21 in the sense that we'll be doing, you know,  
22 these improvements as described below.

1 Fencing along here and here (indicating).  
2 New platform and some landscaping in the  
3 area.

4 JEFF HIRSCH: The stair is part of  
5 the egress for the -- I'm sorry.

6 CHARLES STUDEN: I was going to ask  
7 was there any attempt made -- I don't know  
8 whether the building code would allow it to  
9 close that entrance so you didn't have to do  
10 that. It seems rather awkward.

11 JEFF HIRSCH: It is a rather strange  
12 one, but I think that's part of their  
13 two-egress system for the building, and so we  
14 need to maintain that staircase as part of  
15 that buildings' s egress. However, because of  
16 its location and because of its proximity to  
17 our site, we want to make it look as nice as  
18 we can. We want to be able to add some good  
19 boundary planting towards it, and be able to  
20 keep it more towards that building, redo the  
21 railings, add the plantings and make it a  
22 better visual impact as opposed to what it is

1 now which is not overly attractive.

2 PAUL OGNI BEME: So the sixth of  
3 seven points the Board asked that we discuss  
4 the neighbor's courtyard and visually address  
5 the situation there. So we put together a  
6 few slides to show this effect.

7 You want to speak to this Jeff?

8 JEFF HIRSCH: Sure, sure. The slide  
9 in the upper. Can you hear me with the  
10 microphone or without?

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: Maybe you can  
12 stand -- you have a laptop I see that's why.

13 JEFF HIRSCH: Yeah. And the cord is  
14 rather short. But maybe I can. The upper  
15 left-hand corner, that's the existing shot of  
16 what we have right now. And you can see our  
17 wall on the left-hand side, it's about 15 to  
18 18 feet tall. And you can see the  
19 approximate proximity to the other building  
20 is probably within, within 20 feet away.  
21 Now, what we're proposing is -- and you can  
22 see also the line of the existing building

1 right here (indicating). It's kind of faint  
2 red. We're proposing our new building is  
3 going to take back almost double the amount  
4 of space from this smaller area to a much  
5 grander area. And with the landscaping, we  
6 understand there's -- there is a privacy  
7 issue. So we've tried to include the proper  
8 landscaping, both the low bushes to -- shown  
9 down here (indicating), and of course the  
10 higher trees to give the people in the  
11 existing building privacy that they had  
12 before, but also to make this a courtyard  
13 that is inviting and that gives people a  
14 wonderful view as what they're seeing on the  
15 outside, and to make it a better space. A  
16 better, a better place to be so to speak.  
17 And I think we're accomplishing that. We've  
18 also set it up so that courtyard areas here  
19 (indicating) are below the existing grate  
20 here, and that it -- we want to give privacy  
21 to our own people of course, and that it's  
22 not directly into that area over here.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Is the existing  
2 building line the property line?

3 JEFF HIRSCH: The existing building  
4 line is the property line. The building does  
5 come smack down, and it's kind of interesting  
6 because the entire building does hit  
7 everywhere along the property line. In fact,  
8 when they built this, they maximized it as  
9 best as you could.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: Have you met with  
11 the neighbors to show them this?

12 JEFF HIRSCH: We have. We have  
13 discussed it with them. We've had numerous  
14 discussions, and they're ongoing and we're  
15 hoping to reach a consensus with them that  
16 everyone can walk away feeling like they've  
17 gotten something they want.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Excellent.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: And just so I'm  
20 clear, in this section the only land that you  
21 have control of is that little piece between  
22 where the existing land was -- where the

1 existing wall was and the back of the --

2 JEFF HIRSCH: Exactly.

3 PAUL OGNI BEME: So the last point  
4 that we wanted to follow up on from the last  
5 meeting is regarding the subdivision variance  
6 versus condominium separation.

7 As you know, we've initially intended  
8 to do the -- to separate the parcels via a  
9 condominium arrangement. The Board had  
10 suggested that we talk to the BZA about a  
11 subdivision variance that might be cleaner  
12 and administratively easier. So we are doing  
13 that. In fact, on November 5th there's a BZA  
14 meeting which we will be on the docket for.  
15 Actually the current seller will be on the  
16 docket on November 5th. He'll be taking up  
17 two points.

18 One is the fact that he needs to have  
19 his existing variance reaffirmed or re-looked  
20 at by the BZA because of this change, the  
21 warehouse was initially going to be retail  
22 and he got a variance under that direction

1 and now we're changing direction to have it  
2 residential. Which is allow use by right  
3 which will require no relief.

4 And, of course, the second component to  
5 that will be the add-on which will be --  
6 we'll request a formal subdivision variance  
7 so we can separate the property that way.

8 Now, it's noteworthy, we mentioned it  
9 last time, that under a subdivision variance,  
10 there were pluses and minuses. We talked  
11 about one reason we didn't get it, is just to  
12 expedite the process. We could accomplish  
13 the same goal through a condominium  
14 arrangement, we wouldn't have gone through  
15 the public hearing process. With your urging  
16 we are doing the public process and that will  
17 take some additional time. But if it does  
18 work out, it will have the benefit that we'll  
19 be able to actually put in about 3,000 more  
20 square feet in our project potentially than  
21 if we did not go through that process. So  
22 the rationale is that as one parcel, one

1 combined parcel, the owner's retail portion  
2 is slightly overbuilt. So he essentially had  
3 to borrow 3,000 square feet of allowable GFA  
4 from our side. If the separation occurs  
5 through another method, that 3,000 square  
6 feet may be retained by ours. So it may be a  
7 possibility that we put 3,000 square feet  
8 additional on. What we were hoping to  
9 request of the Board, is that because it's  
10 uncertain and really it's a process that will  
11 be on a separate track than the Planning  
12 Board process, that we consider an approval  
13 for this project both with or without the  
14 extra 3,000 square feet. So if the BZA says  
15 no subdivision variance allowed, then we can  
16 return to our original plan of having a  
17 condominium arrangement. If the BZA says  
18 yes, subdivision variance is allowed, and the  
19 result is an additional 3,000 square feet,  
20 then we can proceed ahead with adding 3,000  
21 square feet on to this section of the  
22 building.

1 CHARLES STUDEN: Excuse me. What  
2 would that additional 3,000 square feet look  
3 like?

4 PAUL OGNI BEME: It would really look  
5 like just an extension of the building. We  
6 would propose that it -- this is a  
7 three-story plus garage. I think this would  
8 be just a carry on of the three-story plus  
9 garage. There would still be a good portion  
10 of open air parking back here, but this  
11 basically 33-by-33-foot cube, instead of  
12 being just parking would actually be an  
13 extension of the building.

14 CHARLES STUDEN: So there would be  
15 parking both beneath that additional square  
16 footage as well as surface parking beyond it?

17 PAUL OGNI BEME: Exactly. So  
18 currently it's surface parking all in there  
19 (indicating), and underground parking all in  
20 here (indicating). What we would propose is  
21 that we put -- leave the parking here, but  
22 instead of it being open air, now there would

1 be three stories of building above it and the  
2 rest we'd leave to open air. And, again,  
3 this is -- because this is new and additional  
4 and maybe as a result of the BZA, we didn't  
5 want to muddy the waters of our original  
6 presentation, but did want to make you aware  
7 that that may be an outcome by us going to  
8 the BZAs, at your request, we would maybe  
9 have this outcome happen.

10 That covers the seven points that we  
11 jotted down that we needed to cover and we'll  
12 be happy to answer any following questions.

13 PATRICIA SINGER: Excuse me, can we  
14 go back to the 3,000 square feet again? And  
15 what would it be? Three studio units, a  
16 duplex, a triplex? What would it be exactly?

17 PAUL OGNI BEME: So, the floor plan  
18 would be approximately a thousand square  
19 feet. Three levels of it. A stack of three,  
20 1,000 square foot units more or less, that's  
21 gross. We'd have to add a little bit of  
22 circulation room and things that connect it

1 to the rest of the building. And probably  
2 add some hallway through. But it would  
3 essentially would be a unit just like this  
4 (indicating). And this is 734 square foot  
5 one bedroom. We'd probably have another 734  
6 square foot one bedroom approximately right  
7 there. And there would be three of them  
8 stacked up on top of each other.

9 Another possible use would be auxiliary  
10 property management space for the building.  
11 If we didn't put units in there because we  
12 found it was perhaps inconvenient to connect  
13 them, we haven't explored the architectural  
14 challenge of connecting it, perhaps 3,000  
15 square feet of auxiliary office space for the  
16 property management office or maybe storage  
17 for the building. Various allowed uses by  
18 right. We wouldn't be requesting anything  
19 that wouldn't be purely allowed as of right.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Questions?

21 Comments? Pam?

22 PAMELA WINTERS: Can you tell me,

1 and forgive if you've already answered this,  
2 what is the adjacent industrial building used  
3 for right now?

4 PAUL OGNI BEME: The adjacent  
5 building that is currently owned by the owner  
6 of this property is used for office. Light,  
7 light commercial office space. So it's  
8 people in cubicles doing work.

9 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

10 And my second question is: What  
11 happens if the BZA does not allow the  
12 subdivision and what would the relationship  
13 be then between that office building and the  
14 condos? Like, how does that work?

15 PAUL OGNI BEME: Sure it would be --

16 PAMELA WINTERS: Would there be a  
17 conflict of interest there or --

18 PAUL OGNI BEME: No, these situations  
19 are readily available all over town. There's  
20 precedent for it. So basically it would be  
21 in mixed condo association where it would be  
22 a portion residential and a portion

1           commercial. The condo association would have  
2           a set of legally binding by-laws and  
3           guidelines sharing responsibility for things  
4           like snowplowing and maintenance of the  
5           buildings. And it would purely be a matter  
6           between the two property owners on how to  
7           administer that. It would have no  
8           implication on anyone but the property  
9           owners. And it's fairly routine. We, for  
10          example, right now administer a condo  
11          association which is two separate buildings,  
12          and the one building has different  
13          self-interest than the other, and it's just  
14          addressed through this legal document,  
15          through carefully drafted condo association  
16          documents.

17                   PAMELA WINTERS: And then industrial  
18          building owner would have to comply with the  
19          condo association?

20                   PAUL OGNI BEME: Yes, there would be  
21          two condominium owners essentially. Our  
22          building would be one condominium which would

1 be split into 37 little condominiums,  
2 Condominium A. And then the other buildings  
3 would be Condominium B. And those would in  
4 fact would be split into two separate  
5 condominiums because it's two separate  
6 buildings. So it really would be a three  
7 building, two unit condo association.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Oh. All right.  
9 Thank you.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: So as I understand  
11 it, the master condominium essentially  
12 divides the land and then there's sub-  
13 condominiums under that; one for the housing  
14 and the other so the splitting of the land  
15 and the rates is a relatively straight  
16 forward thing. You're not trying to put all  
17 the different uses into a single condominium  
18 structure?

19 PAUL OGNI BEME: That's right. And  
20 really the biggest issue is how to manage the  
21 common area. And the only common area  
22 between the two Condominiums A and B is the

1 outside space. Really, it's the, it's the  
2 sidewalk, it's the area between here  
3 (indicating). It's the perspective parking  
4 areas. And it's actually quite convenient  
5 because we would probably, even if we were  
6 subdivided by variance, we would work very  
7 closely together. For example, when it comes  
8 time to snowplow, well, our snow plowers will  
9 come through here (indicating), and instead  
10 of stopping, will continue on. And we'll  
11 have an arrangement with the two owners to  
12 share the cost associated with that. Whether  
13 we own the parcel separately or condominium,  
14 the effect is really the same.

15 PAMELA WINTERS: Uh-huh.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for clarity,  
17 none of this stuff has happened yet. The  
18 condominium hasn't been established.

19 PAUL OGNI BEME: That's correct.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: And now -- yes,  
21 so --

22 PAUL OGNI BEME: On November 5th,

1 after the BZA meets and potentially decides  
2 that the direction they'd like to go in, we  
3 will either perform the legal paperwork to  
4 separate the parcels or to join the parcels  
5 through a condominium association, depending  
6 on the decision of the BZA.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I guess, either  
8 maybe my Board members or staff can help me  
9 out, but I guess I'm just a little confused  
10 because this is putting an awful lot before  
11 the -- anything's done. The cart -- there's  
12 a lot on this cart. And, again, I just -- I  
13 think I need some assistance maybe from -- as  
14 to just how I guess routine this is. Even in  
15 the sense of the entities, because you are  
16 obviously developing this. But currently you  
17 don't have ownership in it yet, but obviously  
18 -- yes, I'm just -- I'm just a little  
19 confused. But that's -- could be, you know,  
20 my confusion could be not for any  
21 particular --

22 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Why don't I

1 attempt to clarify, and others on the staff  
2 should feel free to jump in. The proponents  
3 before you under the North Mass. Ave. Overlay  
4 District, so they need a Special Permit over  
5 the overlay, and they're also here for an  
6 Article 19 project review, Special Permit.  
7 And it's not unusual for the Board to  
8 consider those permits, give its opinion and  
9 then have a project, you know, travel to the  
10 Board of Zoning Appeal for variances or other  
11 approvals might be needed there. That's not  
12 unusual.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: But it is unusual  
14 when it talks about either subdividing or  
15 condominiumizing, that's the thing that's  
16 confusing me. I know we've done stuff  
17 beforehand but this is confusing to me.

18 H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't see it  
19 as being any real difference. Currently  
20 they're not the owners. Presumably they will  
21 only acquire the property if they get all the  
22 permits they need to develop it. They could

1 own it in either of two ways. I think we've  
2 expressed a desire for it to be one way, but  
3 that requires the ZBA to act and approve it.  
4 And if they don't, I think they can still  
5 acquire it in a condominium form of  
6 ownership. And I agree that multi building  
7 condominiums and mixed use condominiums are  
8 quite common. It's not an unusual  
9 circumstance. I don't see it as being an  
10 issue.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Charles, you  
12 had a question?

13 CHARLES STUDEN: I did. Can you go  
14 back to the slide that shows the existing  
15 building on Mass. Ave. and the landscaped  
16 condition between those two buildings? The  
17 one you just showed us a few minutes ago.

18 PAUL OGNI BEME: With the staircase  
19 in between? Yes. Okay.

20 CHARLES STUDEN: No, not the  
21 staircase. The residential building on Mass.  
22 Ave.

1                   JEFF HIRSCH: This one?

2                   CHARLES STUDEN: That's it. Thank  
3 you very much. I just want to say that --  
4 actually, as I said, I think I said the last  
5 time I'm very enthusiastic about this  
6 project. What you're proposing here, the  
7 design of the building, it's a very difficult  
8 site. But at the same time I'm sympathetic  
9 to the owners of the building on Mass. Ave.  
10 And one of the things I wondered, and perhaps  
11 you spoke to this, but I missed it, I know  
12 you're proposing to do landscaping on your  
13 own property as it's shown in the section  
14 there. But I also see some trees behind the  
15 existing residential building on Mass. Ave.  
16 Have you considered -- had you discussed with  
17 the neighbors the possibility of providing  
18 additional landscaping in that area? Their  
19 property that's flowering trees, evergreens,  
20 and so on that could soften and help provide  
21 a screen between their units and the building  
22 that you're proposing to build.

1                   PAUL OGNI BEME: We would be willing  
2                   to work with the neighbors. We've had good  
3                   conversations and discussions about this. No  
4                   particular decisions have been made. I think  
5                   perhaps everyone, as you know, has been  
6                   waiting to move to the next step in the right  
7                   sequence. But certainly we would love to  
8                   talk about it. I think that we have mutual  
9                   self-interest to make this area look, for  
10                  both sides, as great as we can. So, you  
11                  know, certainly we would offer tonight --  
12                  we've discussed at the time in the past that  
13                  we would be happy to look at landscape  
14                  concepts together and try to come up with a  
15                  solution that is good for all of us. With,  
16                  you know, something like this being the  
17                  fallback of course.

18                  CHARLES STUDEN: I'm delighted to  
19                  hear you make that offer. I think it's  
20                  important. I also think it's going to be  
21                  important in terms of how you treat that  
22                  space at night and what kind of lighting you

1 provide there, because it has the potential  
2 to negatively impact either owners in your  
3 new building or the owners in the existing  
4 building. So I think that has to be handled  
5 with a certain degree of sensitivity.  
6 Everyone is going to want some lighting back  
7 there. You don't want it to be dark and  
8 dangerous. It could also be unattractive.  
9 That could be whole part of the scheme of  
10 looking at landscaping and lighting at night  
11 to try to make that as attractive as you can  
12 make it.

13 PAUL OGNI BEME: It could be a very  
14 special, interesting place. So obviously  
15 it's their property. For the most part,  
16 we'll have a little piece of ours. But happy  
17 to work together and we'll make that  
18 commitment.

19 CHARLES STUDEN: I think it could be  
20 a lot better than the condition now where the  
21 wall is so close to their property where  
22 you've got the distance is much shorter. So,

1 but again that depends on the kind of plan  
2 you come up with.

3 PATRICIA SINGER: Can you elaborate  
4 more on that point?

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure.

6 PATRICIA SINGER: The landscaping  
7 and so forth will address privacy for the  
8 first floor, and probably over the course of  
9 time for the second floor, but I don't  
10 understand how it will prevent an upper floor  
11 from looking directly in. And I, frankly I  
12 don't have a suggestion, but I think it's a  
13 concern on my part.

14 PAUL OGNI BEME: Yes. And it's a  
15 fair concern. Why don't we look to the --  
16 good the elevation site here. You know, it  
17 is true that the building is going to be  
18 instead of one story high, it will be four  
19 stories in places and three stories in  
20 others. And that will have an impact on the  
21 neighbors. And we're aware of that and  
22 sensitive to their new environment. But in

1 reality, you know, there's certain things we  
2 can mitigate and there are certain things  
3 that we really can't. So we'll do the best  
4 we can. We'll try to continue to be  
5 sensitive to those concerns and address them  
6 in mutually beneficial ways like the  
7 landscaping. And --

8 PATRICIA SINGER: For example, did  
9 you consider not putting such a big balcony  
10 on the floors? Maybe just a Juliette balcony  
11 or no balcony at all?

12 PAUL OGNI BEME: Well, let's see, can  
13 we go back to show where the balconies are on  
14 the original plan?

15 JEFF HIRSCH: Let me see.

16 PAUL OGNI BEME: So we have three  
17 balconies that are facing them and I guess  
18 the dimensions here, they're, you know,  
19 instead of spanning the entire unit, we tried  
20 to make them pretty modest. We wanted to  
21 give the people that live in the building an  
22 opportunity to have some outdoor space and

1 interact with the outdoors and with the  
2 courtyard that would be formed. It is three  
3 units, three floors high. But we think we  
4 were pretty sensitive to the size of the  
5 balcony, trying to make it just off the areas  
6 where it made the most sense, the living room  
7 instead of spanning it, you know, the entire,  
8 the entire side of the unit. So, could they  
9 be larger, could they be smaller? I suppose  
10 the answer would be yes to both. But we  
11 tried to sort of strike a balance. And,  
12 again, it's an allowable use we understand by  
13 right, so we're hoping to just maintain and  
14 not ask for any special relief.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Go ahead.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: The two issues  
17 that I was interested in you have answered  
18 adequately for my purpose. I was very  
19 interested in the landscaping. I think that  
20 the points have been covered both by Patricia  
21 and by Charles that looming 15 to 18 foot  
22 wall is going to disappear. I think that's a

1 big plus. I know that it seemed threatening  
2 at first, but I think as you -- as people  
3 will come to terms with the new building, I  
4 think they will come to see it once they get  
5 used to it and this will be a change as a  
6 major improvement. It is unrealistic to  
7 speak to the higher floors to think that this  
8 warehouse building will be -- will somehow  
9 remain at that same height in any development  
10 that comes. And so one has to think about  
11 what would go that high? And since putting  
12 trees that go that high would probably  
13 provide more shade than is even desirable, it  
14 probably would block things. My experience  
15 is that once you get over the initial idea  
16 that you're going to be viewing to a certain  
17 extent, other people's balconies, you come to  
18 terms with it and live with it and you  
19 actually find that it can be almost a plus.  
20 It depends a little bit on how it relates.  
21 They will have some terrific views to -- from  
22 those balconies. And it's hard for me to

1 think that we should deprive you of that  
2 because you're going to be a little bit  
3 higher than the building and you're going to  
4 be looking out over the rest -- all the way  
5 to the Charles if I'm not mistaken. So I  
6 think you have some very nice space there. I  
7 think it's going to work out fine. So I  
8 think, I think this is a plus, although it's  
9 going to require some adaptation by the  
10 present people. I'm happy the way you are  
11 going to the Zoning Board. As you know, I  
12 was arguing for that. I think Ted is  
13 absolutely right, it can go the other way. I  
14 think the questions, though, that have come  
15 up, the various clarifications and so on,  
16 shows that there is an elegance and a  
17 cleanness to it by eliminating this double  
18 condominium, this two-tier condominium  
19 structure. I think it's confusing and I  
20 think people will be much relieved not to  
21 have to deal with that. I do think it  
22 creates partners among people whom we don't

1 even know yet. The condominium owners don't  
2 exist yet. The owners of that building once  
3 it's sold, which it inevitably will be, don't  
4 exist yet. I think it's much better if you  
5 don't have to do anything. If you want to  
6 come to terms on a snowplow agreement, you  
7 don't need to be in a condominium association  
8 to do that. So I think that is a big plus.  
9 And I sense, if I dare say, that we are going  
10 to -- as I feel -- I agree with Charles that  
11 this is a good project and I plan to vote for  
12 it in its present form. I would like in our  
13 opinion that we somehow find a way to make a  
14 positive recommendation to the Zoning Board  
15 so that they at least know that we think this  
16 is -- this is a better way to structure the  
17 agreement for the people, the owners, for the  
18 neighbors and for the City of Cambridge. So  
19 I would like to help you with the Zoning  
20 Board and maybe that will make a difference.

21 PAUL OGNI BEME: Thank you.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ted.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: I too like the  
2 project quite a bit and I am very empathetic  
3 to the people who live in the existing  
4 building and have concerns about what the  
5 courtyard will be like. I do think it would  
6 be a major improvement. I'm also -- the  
7 alternative is to keep the height down or to  
8 have the no build, and I just don't see that  
9 as a valid alternative. And I also note  
10 walking around the neighborhood and looking  
11 at the aerial views. It is a neighborhood of  
12 a lot of very closely together triple  
13 deckers. So I think actually the space that  
14 people in the existing building and the  
15 people in the new building will be at least  
16 equal to if not far exceeding what a lot of  
17 existing buildings already have. So I, you  
18 know, I think it's an attractive building and  
19 an attractive project and with the  
20 understanding that people in the existing  
21 building make for some privacy, I think there  
22 will be as much privacy as many, many people

1 in Cambridge currently have and that the  
2 market will sort out, you know, people who  
3 want to live in this type of courtyard  
4 environment with a balcony or without a  
5 balcony. And I think it's a nice project.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ahmed.

7 AHMED NUR: I too like the project.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: You just cut your  
9 mic off.

10 AHMED NUR: Oh. I too like the  
11 project. And I have a little bit of concern  
12 for the residents. But I'll wait to make a  
13 comment. Are we having a public comment?  
14 No. Okay.

15 BETH RUBENSTEIN: That's been  
16 closed.

17 AHMED NUR: The one question that I  
18 had from our last meeting was the  
19 geotactically and what contaminants that was  
20 in the soil. You said there was someone here  
21 that could answer the questions.

22 PAUL OGNI BEME: Yes. Peter

1 Nangeroni .

2 PETER NANGERONI : Thank you. I can  
3 address questi ons related to the chemi cal s in  
4 the soi l. I'm not a geotacti cal l y engi neer.  
5 I'm an envi ronmental consul tant. So --

6 ROGER BOOTH: Can you speak i nto the  
7 mi crophone?

8 PETER NANGERONI : Sure.

9 I can address questi ons related to the  
10 chemi cal s in the soi l. I'm an envi ronmental  
11 consul tant, but I'm not qual i fi ed to answer  
12 geotacti cal l y questi ons.

13 AHMED NUR: In our last meeti ng we  
14 had resi dents concerned about certain  
15 chemi cal s found, and you menti oned i n the  
16 begi nni ng of the openi ng that there was some  
17 found. What i s found and what di d you test  
18 i t for?

19 PETER NANGERONI : Sure.

20 AHMED NUR: And I'll pass i t to  
21 probabl y Hugh to see what the procedures are  
22 i n terms of Ci ty of Cambri dge excavati on and

1           contami nati on.

2                   PETER NANGERONI: Well, as far as  
3           what's out there, I'm actually very familiar  
4           with the property. I worked on the property  
5           when it was occupied by Rounder Records,  
6           that's how I was originally involved with the  
7           property back in early in 2001, 2002 time  
8           frame. And actually there's a very small  
9           quantity of a chemical known as  
10          Perchloroethylene or PCE which is a very  
11          common cleaning solvent. It's actually the  
12          dry cleaning solvent that was used  
13          historically by dry cleaners. And the source  
14          of that is actually, there was a former  
15          supply company several blocks up on Elmwood  
16          Avenue, the Craig Supply Company that back in  
17          -- I believe in the late seventies it was  
18          determined that there was a leaking tank  
19          there. And most of the impacts from that  
20          tank, are in fact -- were in fact on that  
21          property. There was a soil excavation. What  
22          happens is the chemicals do dissolve into the

1 groundwater, and a small mass of that  
2 chemical has migrated in the groundwater to  
3 become located under that property. And in  
4 fact, several of the properties in the area  
5 actually. And any of the chemicals that are  
6 present on the soil or the chemical that's  
7 present on the soil, is actually a result of  
8 the migration from the groundwater and some  
9 low concentrations that have condensed into  
10 the vapor and then onto the soil. It's a  
11 fairly common circumstance in urban settings  
12 like this. You have to deal with some  
13 impacts to urban fill. The program would be  
14 managed under provisions set up by the state  
15 in addition to whatever the City of Cambridge  
16 excavation requirements and oversight is. We  
17 will need to manage the soil and make sure  
18 that it's handled appropriately. And there  
19 will be health and safety provisions put into  
20 place. But it's a fairly common situation  
21 for an urban setting.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Specifically when

1 you say handle the soil, specifically what do  
2 you mean?

3 PETER NANGERONI: There will be a  
4 written plan that will identify the  
5 appropriate method of handling the soil.  
6 There will be certain -- new chemical tests  
7 that will be performed on the soil so we can  
8 determine the appropriate way to manage the  
9 soil when it's sent off site. It will have  
10 to be disposed of as a remediation waste,  
11 possibly as a hazardous waste. We haven't  
12 completed that analysis yet based upon the  
13 presence of the PCE. And we would give  
14 guidance to the development team on that.  
15 And they would be required under the  
16 Massachusetts regulations to have an  
17 environmental professional involved to  
18 provide the oversight, to make sure that the  
19 paperwork was done properly and that the  
20 documentation is in place. So if the soil  
21 does have to go offsite it's disposed of  
22 properly.

1                   WILLIAM TIBBS: Just one other  
2 follow up. You said this chemical has kind  
3 of drifted down into the site. Is that  
4 something that will continue to happen in the  
5 future even after this is built or will that  
6 be something you're doing which will kind of  
7 get rid of the -- deal with the chemicals  
8 that are currently there and is there a --  
9 I'm just trying to get a sense of --

10                  PETER NANGERONI: The chemicals that  
11 are there are as I said are primarily present  
12 in the groundwater. The excavation that will  
13 be required to install the garage, won't  
14 reach the groundwater. There are some small  
15 quantities of the chemical present on the  
16 soil, so there would be some value that the  
17 soil gets excavated for the garage is going  
18 to be sent off site and disposed of. In the  
19 end there will be less chemicals present on  
20 the property than there are today.

21                  WILLIAM TIBBS: Patricia, any other  
22 questions?

1 PATRICIA SINGER: No. Thank you.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh? I was going  
3 to go to Patricia and then come back to you.  
4 Okay, Hugh.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: I agree with my  
6 colleagues with the project. I think it  
7 meets the criteria for granting permit, and  
8 in particular in terms of a bicycle question  
9 which is one I brought up. I'm satisfied by  
10 their response, and also the letter we  
11 received from the Traffic Department that  
12 there's going to be a significant improvement  
13 and that this property will be doing its  
14 share in that improvement process.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Relative to my  
16 question which was earlier just understanding  
17 the broader context. I think because  
18 currently the site is under one ownership, I  
19 just wanted to see how much the owner of the  
20 potential other condominium site if you were  
21 going to go that way was kind of contributing  
22 to the whole since you said the only common

1           thing you have is a common -- in given that  
2           you're going for the variance to separate the  
3           properties in that -- that's less of an issue  
4           because -- so an understanding of what I was  
5           after there. Particularly while on the  
6           street there and where the connecting there,  
7           just getting a sense of what that was. And  
8           then relative to the issue of the neighbors I  
9           know, I live in a -- I don't think my  
10          backyard is as big as this room in terms of  
11          distance. Once I counted 32 windows that are  
12          looking on me in one way or another. So, I  
13          think living in the city and living in  
14          Cambridge that's pretty common to have  
15          windows opposite that. And I do think it's  
16          -- I too think it's a vast improvement over  
17          what's there. So it's hard for me to not  
18          think positively about that.

19                        So, go ahead, Hugh.

20                        HUGH RUSSELL: I think none of this  
21                        addressed the question of what happens if the  
22                        Zoning Board should grant the subdivision and

1           that grant should result in additional floor  
2           area. I mean, it could well be that the  
3           Zoning Board might condition their grant of a  
4           subdivision on a particular maximum build out  
5           on the site. In other words, they might not  
6           give -- generate another 3,000 square feet.  
7           And so I think it's -- we don't know yet.

8                        THOMAS ANNINGER: Why would they do  
9           that?

10                      HUGH RUSSELL: Well, why would they  
11           -- I think the granting of the subdivision,  
12           if they're inadvertently increasing the  
13           development density, the argument might be  
14           made that's sort of contrary to public  
15           policy. It's okay if these people want to  
16           subdivide, but because the office parcel is  
17           then in violation of Zoning Ordinance, it can  
18           be rectified by making a corresponding  
19           reduction on the housing site essentially  
20           from an FAR position treating it as if it had  
21           been a single parcel. That's frankly how I  
22           would expect them to view this. So that

1           said, should the Zoning Board act so as to  
2           give another three apartments, it wouldn't  
3           bother me to have three more apartments in  
4           that general location following the same  
5           design of the building. I'm not -- I guess I  
6           don't, I don't like granting that -- a  
7           Special Permit for a building that's  
8           presented in a dotted line, that might  
9           happen.

10                       WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

11                       HUGH RUSSELL: You know, we could  
12           say that -- we could express our opinion  
13           about that issue if we had an opinion, but it  
14           might be better for them if we didn't.

15                       WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess we could  
16           also just stipulate that regardless of what  
17           happens at the BZA, that they at least work  
18           with staff, and obviously staff could bring  
19           it back to us if they feel that there's some  
20           significant issue there. But that's one  
21           approach, too. I too feel a little  
22           uncomfortable granting a permit with a dotted

1 box on it without really seeing what the  
2 implication of what that box is. But, like  
3 you, it's not an issue of whether there are  
4 additional units, it's just a dotted box.  
5 But I think staff could -- from my  
6 perspective, I think staff could work with  
7 them afterwards once we understand what the  
8 real issue is. And I think in light of the  
9 -- at least as the design, thought that  
10 they've put into the building so far, if they  
11 use that same logic and work with staff, I  
12 would feel totally comfortable with it.

13 How does the Board feel about that?

14 Tom?

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm struggling a  
16 little bit just to understand this FAR aspect  
17 to it. But going back to the original  
18 proposal of Condominium A and Condominium B,  
19 what happens to that space, if it's not  
20 yours?

21 PAUL OGNI BEME: So, the boxed out  
22 space?

1 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, the dotted  
2 line space as it's being called.

3 PAUL OGNI BEME: That would just  
4 remain open air parking area. So if we can  
5 get to the -- there. Maybe just one in the  
6 other direction.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: A photograph of  
8 the space would even be better if you had  
9 such.

10 PAUL OGNI BEME: The space right now,  
11 of course, is warehouse so the photograph  
12 might only show you a warehouse.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see.

14 JEFF HIRSCH: It's actually the  
15 space adjacent to the staircase.

16 PAUL OGNI BEME: Can you click one  
17 more slide so we show the parking lot? I  
18 don't know which direction. There we are.  
19 So right now this -- it's all open air  
20 parking lot here (indicating). And what  
21 would be potentially an addition, the dotted  
22 line space would be -- this would simply be

1 garaged area just like this is garaged area  
2 (indicating), with three stories above. Just  
3 essentially an extension of the building.  
4 And then open air space here (indicating).  
5 So the same amount of parking with just three  
6 decks above as opposed to pure open air if  
7 that helps explain.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: If -- it's a small  
9 point really. We're not talking about a lot  
10 of feet, you know. It's not going to make a  
11 big difference, but I think this dotted line  
12 area speaks to why the severance of the two  
13 parcels is an improvement over the existing  
14 condominium proposal. Because I think it's a  
15 better solution than an open air parking area  
16 to have it either used as any of the uses  
17 that you mentioned, be it storage or office  
18 or more units rather than open air parking  
19 space which is unneeded and it won't add any  
20 spaces. It's just kind of dead space. I'd  
21 rather see live space than dead space, all  
22 things being equal. So I think it just

1 speaks to why we ought to separate the two.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Comments? Go ahead.

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: I have no

4 problem with the additional space either.

5 But perhaps we could approve the plan as it

6 is and with some proviso that if they do get

7 the variance and they are allowed to expand

8 the building, then they should choose to do

9 that. That after working with staff they

10 have to bring the plan back to us, you know,

11 for final approval or just for us to review

12 it in some sort of, you know, site plan. I'm

13 not quite sure how to work it out. I don't

14 really see a need for another public hearing

15 on it. But just that let us see it before it

16 becomes final.

17 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Staff just noted

18 that there is one issue which is if the

19 number of units increase, than the parking is

20 the same, the parking ratio is changing.

21 That is something the Board should, you know,

22 be aware of.

1 PAUL OGNI BEME: May I note we do  
2 currently have 41 parking spaces for 37 units  
3 called for. And that is absolutely correct.  
4 But just to note, if we added three units,  
5 we'd have 40 units with 41 spaces. We would  
6 still be within the one-to-one requirement.  
7 Also, it's noteworthy that if we did go the  
8 route of three units, one of those would be  
9 inclusionary housing. So that 38 units is a  
10 trigger point. So, that may also be  
11 something worth noting.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

13 LES BARBER: There's also the issue  
14 that you're creating three stories of  
15 building in the back of adjacent property  
16 that had an open space before. I'm a little  
17 concerned that it's -- I mean, it's not a  
18 major change, but it's not insignificant  
19 either for those people who had been advised  
20 that there was a proposal. And if they chose  
21 to look at the plans submitted, they would  
22 have seen an open space and now there's a

1 potential for the building behind them for, I  
2 don't know, half of the width of the  
3 property. And I think quite frankly I think  
4 it would be better to come back and get an  
5 amendment to the permit if indeed they end up  
6 being allowed the additional 3,000 square  
7 feet. There's also the question of whether  
8 that covered parking that counts as floor  
9 area and how is that treated elsewhere in the  
10 project. There are a series of cascading  
11 implications that may not be terribly  
12 significant, but I think they're worthy of  
13 reviewing in some careful way before  
14 approval.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I would say  
16 if we go down that path, I hope that would  
17 not dissuade you with still pursuing with  
18 equal aggressiveness the Zoning Board route.  
19 I know coming to see us isn't something you  
20 want to do but nonetheless.

21 PAUL OGNI BEME: We will continue to  
22 pursue it and we're happy to do it.

1 CHARLES STUDEN: The fact that one  
2 of those three units would be inclusionary  
3 unit is very persuasive to me. I like that  
4 idea actually. So if you're able to go  
5 through route, I think it's a good thing.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: So, Les, were you  
7 saying that if the three units were built, it  
8 would be more crowded and cramped in that  
9 area?

10 LES BARBER: Well, it will be a  
11 three-story building in a portion of the area  
12 that is now open parking lot.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

14 LES BARBER: Adjacent property  
15 owners have been advised that there is a plan  
16 which provides an open parking lot behind  
17 them. And now we've potentially are  
18 approving the plan which has a three-story  
19 building on it.

20 PAMELA WINTERS: I see. Thank you.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh.

22 HUGH RUSSELL: I must say the more I

1 think about it that the fundamental principle  
2 of a subdivision of land shouldn't be  
3 creating additional floor ratio area. It's  
4 not the appropriate way to think about this.  
5 And that I think there shouldn't --  
6 subdivision -- I think that's the proper  
7 principle, there's a density on this parcel,  
8 you know, that's permitted and by subdividing  
9 they shouldn't get more density. It's a big  
10 -- it's a big building. It has significant  
11 impacts. It's a handsome building. It's a  
12 good use, you know. But at the same time why  
13 should it be bigger than -- why should they  
14 get the extra three units?

15 CHARLES STUDEN: I think that's  
16 mitigated by the fact that one of the units  
17 is being an affordable unit. That's a very  
18 -- to me very persuasive reason for doing it.

19 PAMELA WINTERS: I have to say I  
20 agree with Hugh in this issue, but....

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Comments? Go ahead.

22 H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't have any

1           problem with the concept of getting  
2           additional space if the BZA should choose to  
3           give them a variance and it does not prohibit  
4           them from using the additional space. But I  
5           think I am convinced by what Les has said, if  
6           they do choose to expand the building, it  
7           probably should be done as an amendment to an  
8           approved plan, and we should give the  
9           abutters an opportunity to see the plan and  
10          the proposal and to come back. And I think  
11          if they get the right to do it and they  
12          choose to do it, then they should come back  
13          before us and we'll take it up and discuss it  
14          at that time.

15                   WILLIAM TIBBS: So it sounds like a  
16                   motion is in order.

17                   HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm not entirely  
18                   clear, and I was trying to look it up of what  
19                   the permit under the North Mass. Avenue  
20                   Overlay District is and what are the criteria  
21                   for granting that permit. And I don't seem  
22                   to have a --

1 LES BARBER: It's a project review  
2 Special Permit only for the design review  
3 portion, not for the traffic portion which  
4 has a threshold of 50,000 square feet.

5 BETH RUBENSTEIN: What about the  
6 Mass. Ave. Overlay?

7 LES BARBER: What relief are you  
8 speaking for the Mass Ave. Overlay?

9 JEFF HIRSCH: 25,000.

10 LES BARBER: That's the design  
11 section.

12 PAUL OGNI BEME: I believe, Les, we  
13 had in the application two requests, and one  
14 of them was erroneous and unnecessary. That  
15 may be part of the confusion. It was just  
16 what I think you're saying.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So there's nothing --  
18 your criteria in the Mass. Avenue Overlay  
19 District which the project has to meet,  
20 you're not seeking any relief?

21 PAUL OGNI BEME: That's right.

22 LES BARBER: The urban design

1           portion of the Article 19 Special Permit  
2           which references city-wide objectives in  
3           Section 19.30.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And so those  
5           are -- the first one is being responsive to  
6           the existing and pattern and development.  
7           And I think you would say that meets that  
8           criteria and works with the existing  
9           conditions as best you can. That it's  
10          pedestrian and bicycle friendly, and they  
11          have considered those aspects in the design.  
12          Building and mitigate such adverse  
13          environmental impacts upon its neighbors.  
14          And I guess there the only impact is really  
15          the setback where the residential neighbors  
16          and they provide the significant setback, and  
17          that has from -- depending on where you're  
18          standing, either somewhat less or somewhat  
19          more impact than the present structure. But  
20          from the ground it will seem like less. When  
21          you're on the third floor, it will seem like  
22          more. There's no evidence the project will

1 overburden the city's infrastructure.

2 New construction shall reinforceably

3 enhance the complex urban aspects of

4 Cambridge as it has developed historically.

5 I'm not quite sure what that means with

6 respect to this project, but I think only in

7 the sense that the way in which they've

8 chosen to express the building, particularly

9 on the back side is a series of structures

10 and pavilions which addresses the two-family

11 houses that are on the back side of the

12 building in a way that which I think that

13 they're expanding the inventory of housing

14 and the enhancement or expansion of open

15 space amenities -- well, thereby adding some

16 of their lot space to the triangular park,

17 that should be an enhancement. It's a visual

18 expansion, but I think it's something that's

19 useful. So those are the criteria. So I

20 would say they meet those criteria and,

21 therefore, we should -- I move that we grant

22 the designer the permit.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do we have a second?

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: Second.

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Seconded the motion.

4 And, Ahmed, you are voting on this.

5 All those in favor.

6 (Show of hands.)

7 (Tibbs, Winters, Russell, Anninger,

8 Cohen, Nur, Singer.)

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: And those opposed?

10 That's all the voting members.

11 (Student Exempt.)

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess this is  
13 after the vote. But is it my understanding  
14 that in the process we will say something  
15 to the Zoning Board about our feeling that  
16 the separation is a good thing?

17 LES BARBER: You'll actually be  
18 getting the case to review at the October  
19 meeting.

20 BETH RUBENSTEIN: And add to the  
21 decision that should the project add FAR as a  
22 result of being successful in the

1 subdi vi si on, i t woul d come back here for an  
2 amendment.

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: But we're not  
5 real ly suggest ing to the Zoni ng Board one way  
6 or the other. We're leavi ng that to them.

7 LES BARBER: Well , you can  
8 separatel y make --

9 BETH RUBENSTEIN: You can support  
10 i t.

11 LES BARBER: -- make comment when  
12 you get to the BZA case.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right.

14 LES BARBER: The BZA wi ll not see  
15 your deci si on un less you ask us to forward  
16 i t. But that's not parti cul ar ly the venue.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thi s permi t you  
18 mean?

19 LES BARBER: Yes.

20 WIL LIAM TI BBS: We' ll take a qui ck  
21 break and be back. So we' ll take a ten  
22 mi nute break.

1 (A short recess was taken.)

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: We're ready to get  
3 started. We have two remaining items on the  
4 agenda, both of which do not require any  
5 action on our part. The first is a  
6 discussion about Discovery Park, and I think  
7 there are several Board members who weren't  
8 on the Board when this was approved. And  
9 after that we're going to have a briefing and  
10 an update by the Community Development  
11 Department on the Alexandria Zoning Ordinance  
12 that was approved by City Council. And we do  
13 have the BZA cases after that. So with that,  
14 why don't we get started with Discovery Park.

15 RICHARD MCKINNON: Mr. Chairman,  
16 I'll ask you my proverbial question: Would  
17 you like the long version or the short  
18 version?

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: The short.

20 RICHARD MCKINNON: That would be the  
21 one hour version. My name is Rich McKinnon.  
22 Live at One Leighton Street in North Point,

1 apartment 1905 here in Cambridge, Mass. I'm  
2 going to share a note I got from City  
3 Councilor Craig Kelley who I know wouldn't  
4 be upset at all if he knew that I was sharing  
5 it with you. It's from two weeks ago and it  
6 says: "Hi, Rich, saw a beautiful buck out  
7 there at Discovery Park yesterday." And  
8 that's the type of place it is. It's a  
9 really magical place. It's a place where  
10 they're -- and I encourage all of you to go  
11 out there before we come back for our public  
12 hearing on tonight's agenda item. It's a  
13 place where they're just amazing things,  
14 there are unusual things. There are bird  
15 sightings out there, the likes of which  
16 you've never seen. And we have tonight, the  
17 rarest and rarest of all possible sightings.  
18 It's called a tenant. It's been a long time.  
19 Eric and Robert bought the site a good seven  
20 or eight years ago. We were first up there  
21 in October of 2004 seeking to build the  
22 Smithsonian, the Harvard Smithsonian

1           Astrophysical Observatory which is up there.  
2           And that's not a shabby neighborhood to bring  
3           a tenant into, having the Harvard Smithsonian  
4           Astrophysical Observatory as a neighbor. In  
5           spite of all that, it has just been brutal.  
6           Robert as you know is a very aggressive  
7           builder, a very aggressive developer. He is  
8           just as aggressive when it comes to leasing.  
9           So, it's not as if he's been holding out for  
10          the very last time. It is a tough place to  
11          bring a tenant. You're competing with  
12          suburban office complexes, and it just makes  
13          it very difficult. It doesn't quite have the  
14          Cambridge sense that the rest of the city  
15          has. People feel like we're a bit out in the  
16          suburbs. So, it's been a long time getting  
17          to the place where we are tonight where we  
18          actually potentially have a tenant that's  
19          interested in coming up and sharing the park  
20          with the Harvard Smithsonian Astrophysical  
21          Observatory. I'm not at liberty to mention  
22          the tenant's name. We're in the last stages

1 of lease negotiations with them. So, with  
2 that said, let's -- go through the slides if  
3 we could.

4 This is the same tape that you've seen  
5 all before. All of us are still on board.  
6 And these are some of the projects that  
7 Robert and Eric have built here in Cambridge.  
8 There's the Harvard Square Post Office in  
9 Harvard Square. This is the former home for  
10 Ad, Inc. down at 210 Broadway. Again,  
11 another view of the post office and Harvard  
12 Square. Excuse me, Robert, this is your new  
13 building on the other side of Harvard Street.  
14 There's the Harvard Square Post Office. Here  
15 is the Harvard Smithsonian Astrophysical  
16 Observatory. And this is camp headquarters  
17 for those of you who like Portuguese food  
18 also known as the home of the Atasca  
19 Restaurant down there at the ground floor.

20 This is an image of what the project  
21 looked like without the -- the former Arthur  
22 D. Little site looked like when we took it

1 over. Most importantly you can see down  
2 there the 465 paid parking lot which had been  
3 a source of just total madness to the  
4 environmentalists that had been up there for  
5 many, many years. A whole series of  
6 buildings were built right along the banks of  
7 the Little River. Something you can never do  
8 again. And the old existing Arthur D. Little  
9 buildings with a fair amount of surface  
10 parking.

11 This, flash forward and you have a  
12 picture of what the site looks like now. And  
13 I think the thing I'd like you to notice is  
14 we had a master plan. We had a Special  
15 Permit that really required us to begin  
16 tearing down buildings and restoring the  
17 reservation as we got to build new buildings  
18 of our development. We are way, way, way  
19 ahead of schedule. The restoration of the  
20 former NBC parking lot simply did not have to  
21 happen now. It's happened. The tearing down  
22 of building 2020A did not have to happen.

1 All of it has happened. And so the only  
2 thing left along the Little River, everything  
3 having been cleared, all of it, are these  
4 small buildings, Buildings 46 and 48 which we  
5 intend to take down as a part of what we're  
6 going to explain to you tonight.

7           Again, this is another aerial shot  
8 showing you what this site looks like now.  
9 And, again, how far ahead of schedule we've  
10 gotten. This used to be a parking lot for  
11 465 cars. It is now restored. It's a  
12 beautiful meadow. But most importantly  
13 you've got that path and it becomes a walking  
14 path that takes you from Discovery Park over  
15 to the T station located just off camera here  
16 (indicating). It really helps us get at one  
17 the trickiest things we have up there is  
18 living with a very tight parking ratio. But  
19 it's a way of getting our tenants from the  
20 Discovery Park over to the T station, a way  
21 that wasn't there before until Robert went  
22 ahead and built this.

1           And, again, this is the pathway. For  
2 those of you who have been out there in the  
3 past it is a far cry from the way that  
4 parking lot looked when we took this site  
5 over. You know, I've done an awful lot of  
6 projects here in Cambridge. I've been doing  
7 this for 25 years. I was born here, went to  
8 school here. It's my hometown. And the  
9 extent to which Robert has exceeded, and Eric  
10 have exceeded their requirements, their  
11 obligations, their expectations here, I'm as  
12 proud of Discovery Park as I am of anything  
13 I've built.

14           This is the Smithsonian (indicating).  
15 The building itself, a lovely building.

16           This, we'll get back to that in a  
17 minute. That's a typical Robert. Very,  
18 very, very fast. Very demanding timeline.  
19 Don't worry, I'll get back to it, Robert.  
20 I've done this before.

21           These are the existing conditions  
22 (indicating). This is the final approved

1 master plan. And what you see is that if you  
2 take a look at Building 200, 300, 400, we're  
3 going to be asking for a slight change and  
4 it's going to show up on the next slide.

5 LARRY GROSSMAN: One slide after  
6 that?

7 RICHARD MCKINNON: One slide after  
8 that. This again shows the tremendous amount  
9 of work that's been done here. These are the  
10 site conditions that you find out there right  
11 now today if you go out to the lot with a  
12 series of interim parking lots that we  
13 received permission from the Planning Board  
14 to build back in February of 2005 I think.  
15 Okay, Robert, if I'm not mistaken. Okay.

16 This is the way the project is going to  
17 look after -- with the Board's permission,  
18 we've developed this new building which we're  
19 calling Buildings 200 and 300 (indicating).  
20 What you'll notice is that we have taken down  
21 every single building that was there on the  
22 former Arthur D. Little campus, having

1 cleared the entire area along the Little  
2 River. The last two buildings, which I  
3 pointed out to you, Buildings 46 and 48 over  
4 there are to be taken down. And the large  
5 original ADL building here to be taken down  
6 as well, as well as this one.

7 This again, is a view of the  
8 Smithsonian coming in (indicating). Another  
9 view of the Smithsonian as you come into  
10 Discovery Park from the drive (indicating).  
11 And I point this slide out to you, I think  
12 some of you may remember who were on the  
13 Board at the time, but a long time ago Vickie  
14 Allotly (phonetic) had taken a picture on top  
15 of a building up on Brattle Street that had a  
16 small retaining wall like that (indicating).  
17 It was a very nice sitting wall. And we told  
18 the Board we were going to try to replicate  
19 something like that. In fact, that wall has  
20 been replicated. And Robert continues to do  
21 a good job, and his brother Eric of keeping  
22 the promise that they've made to the Board.

1 It's a detail, but it's an important detail.

2 Keep going, Larry. I put them a little  
3 bit in different order. Go all the way down  
4 if you could to -- yeah.

5 I'm going to ask Larry Grossman, the  
6 architect to do what most appropriately his  
7 job is and that's to talk about the new  
8 building that we have. But, the Garage A  
9 which has been approved by the Planning  
10 Board, if you recall, we were up here earlier  
11 and we had asked for permission to postpone  
12 the development of Garage A and to use some  
13 interim parking solutions in the meantime.  
14 This is one of the interim parking solutions  
15 that we may have to use (indicating).  
16 Building a three-story garage rather than a  
17 six-story garage only because first off,  
18 we're not even sure we're gonna be able to  
19 finance right now a six-story garage. But  
20 certainly financing a garage that provides  
21 parking for tenants that simply don't exist  
22 yet is pretty unthinkable in this economic

1 climate. So one of the interim conditions we  
2 may be asking relief on is building only a  
3 portion of the garage rather than all of it  
4 at this time.

5 LARRY GROSSMAN: Where do you want  
6 to go, from here?

7 RICHARD MCKINNON: Right there.

8 On the left is the original notice of  
9 decision. On the right is the minor  
10 amendment that we sought. We're up here  
11 tonight really asking for two things:

12 One is for us to have a chance to do  
13 something that's taken us an enormous amount  
14 of time to do, and that's build another  
15 really first class building in a responsible  
16 way in the reservation for another great  
17 Cambridge tenant I might add.

18 The other thing we're asking is  
19 permission to do what the Board has given us  
20 permission to do before and that is make  
21 slight changes to the site plan, the original  
22 site plan and master plan, and to make slight

1 changes to the precise order of the provision  
2 of parking as the park unfolded. And we're  
3 going to be asking for some relief in both  
4 respects, to do a slightly different  
5 placement of the buildings and to provide  
6 interim parking solutions other than the ones  
7 that we were going to provide originally.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for clarity on  
9 that for the audience and the Board. You  
10 will be doing that at a public hearing at  
11 another time?

12 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's right.  
13 It's our intention.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: I didn't want  
15 anybody out there to think you were starting  
16 this process now or at least asking you  
17 formally.

18 RICHARD MCKINNON: Mr. Chairman, as  
19 I said in the beginning and it goes for  
20 everything I'm talking about here, with the  
21 permission of the Planning Board. That's the  
22 caveat that we're seeking permission to do.

1 And, in fact, we are looking to have a public  
2 hearing for the benefit of the audience  
3 members that are here, especially folks in  
4 North Cambridge, before the municipal  
5 election so it's starting to full glare of  
6 public awareness of what's going on in the  
7 city.

8 What we asked for before was permission  
9 to get ourselves into a slightly different  
10 alignment and configuration of the provision  
11 of parking, and also to make a slight change  
12 in the alignment of the buildings.

13 Just to wrap up, and again to restate  
14 a couple of points. With this building we  
15 will have developed -- if we're given  
16 permission to develop it, less than 400,000  
17 square feet of space out here at Discovery  
18 Park. Our Special Permit gives us permission  
19 to develop 1,280,000 square feet. It's been  
20 five years getting here. The Chairman had  
21 asked me a long time back, I remember, as did  
22 former Chairman Anninger, what was my best

1 guess as to how long this would take? I said  
2 it would be my hope ten years, but on the  
3 outside 20. At the rate we're going it's a  
4 25 year build out. It is a very permutable  
5 undertaking trying to develop Discovery Park.

6 The point I'd also like to make is a  
7 lot of the restoration of the reservation, a  
8 lot of the provision of open space, a lot of  
9 demolition of buildings, a lot along the  
10 Little River will also have to wait 25 years  
11 if Robert waited until he was forced to do  
12 things as he is entitled to wait underneath  
13 the Special Permit. He's gotten way ahead of  
14 himself. And so, he comes to you asking for  
15 some small provisions, some small amendments,  
16 but I hope you'll take a good look at them  
17 and look at them in light of the enormous  
18 amount that he's done on his side of the  
19 ledger and has done it really way, way, way  
20 ahead of schedule. We'd be waiting an awful  
21 long time to see that reservation the way it  
22 looks today. And I encourage all of you

1 before the public hearing to go up there.  
2 It's something I'm very proud of. It looks  
3 just beautiful up there.

4 And so at this point I'd like to  
5 introduce Larry Grossman and ask him just to  
6 talk a little bit about his plan.

7 Larry.

8 LARRY GROSSMAN: Thank you, Rich.

9 I'll be brief. And we'll be back to  
10 talk in more detail about the building's  
11 design and specifics. But what I wanted to  
12 review with you is just the basic planning  
13 concepts in a broad sense and then a little  
14 bit on some of the details of the building.  
15 We were the architects for Building 100. The  
16 team is still together and the intent that  
17 the same team executes Building 200 and 300.  
18 And really we've taken Building 100 as a  
19 departure point in terms of building details,  
20 building materials, overall height, would  
21 essentially be the same as Building 100. The  
22 material that we have up here, I think you

1 have in your packets, but to walk through the  
2 -- one of the intents was to break down the  
3 overall mass of the building. And we've  
4 broken it into two pods if you will. Here  
5 and here (indicating). This is the ground  
6 floor plan. Acorn Park Drive is on the  
7 bottom of the sheet. And connecting the two  
8 pods which are six stories in height is what  
9 we call the zipper, and that's essentially  
10 the entry to the building. The -- there's  
11 multiple entries into the building. They are  
12 entries that face toward Acorn Park Drive.  
13 There's entries that face toward the parking  
14 garage. And the site plan is located back in  
15 this location here (indicating). The uses on  
16 the ground floor are mainly communal uses.  
17 There's a fitness center. There's a  
18 cafeteria. We've taken -- because we have  
19 loading requirements and we really don't have  
20 a back door, it's really front door all the  
21 way around, we've tucked the loading off into  
22 the side between this building and what would

1 be the next potential building hopefully for  
2 the same tenant. And the idea is that we  
3 tuck away the loading docks and, in fact,  
4 some of the mechanical equipment, the switch  
5 gear transformers in between the building and  
6 screen them off with planting and fencing.

7 There's also a large terrace  
8 overlooking the park, at this location here  
9 (indicating). And the same detail that Rich  
10 showed earlier with the stone walls and the  
11 alignment along the sidewalk, is -- the  
12 intent is to carry that all the way through  
13 along the sidewalk with the same seating  
14 areas and the buried plantings. As you know,  
15 we're in a flood plain, and the building's  
16 finished floor if you will is up about three  
17 and a half to four feet above grade. And we  
18 have to maintain that same elevation so in  
19 order to set the building into the site and  
20 not see a lot of foundation wall, we're using  
21 the stone wall, and then planting which is  
22 wrapping all the way around the building.

1           A typical upper floor, again, is the  
2           two pods. This is fully glazed all the way  
3           through with lots of glass at the zipper, and  
4           we want to talk about the expansion? We'll  
5           do that at another time. Okay.

6           And then there's a number of views.  
7           And again we have a model for massing. We  
8           have a lot more of work to do. This was  
9           really our first, first study. But what  
10          we're trying to do is take some of the same  
11          precast materials, some of the same stone for  
12          base, articulate it, precast which has that  
13          sort of warmer tone, some metal panel, punch  
14          windows and ribbon windows. A combination,  
15          again, to break the mass of the building  
16          down, and the expression of glass in the  
17          zipper that comes up and around. Again,  
18          we're trying to break down the overall mass  
19          and create a base, a middle and a top to the  
20          building. This is the Acorn Park Drive face  
21          of the park (indicating). Here's Building  
22          100 (indicating). This is at eye level from

1 the park. You can see the terrace that I  
2 spoke of earlier here (indicating). This is  
3 at the terrace looking out across the park  
4 (indicating). We didn't put it in all the  
5 trees that are there.

6 And then on the opposite side, the side  
7 that faces the parking garage on Route 2 is a  
8 drop off, some handicap parking and handicap  
9 ramp that leads up to a terrace. And a  
10 canopy to the secured front door at this  
11 location. There's a one-story piece is the  
12 fitness area and the cafeteria. And eye  
13 level view from the same location  
14 (indicating). Our first concept for the  
15 canopy leading into the main lobby. Again,  
16 the stone walls that we have along Acorn Park  
17 will be brought also in leading into the  
18 front door. And then elevations. This is  
19 the Acorn Park elevation (indicating).  
20 Again, six stories. We're trying to  
21 articulate a base to the building and a top  
22 again to break down the massing. That was

1 really part of some of the criteria that was  
2 written in the original planning document.  
3 And then the north side, the Route 2 side,  
4 the entry the amenity spaces. And again the  
5 same kind of expression of base, middle and  
6 top (indicating).

7 The garage is really -- it carries the  
8 same, the same materials. A couple of  
9 characteristics are at the ground floor. The  
10 first floor of the garage, we've screened it  
11 visually entirely on all four sides. And you  
12 can see between each of the piers there's an  
13 articulated screen of metal that's used to  
14 visually screen. There will be -- as you've  
15 seen from the landscaping that's currently  
16 out there, a lot of landscaping will be used  
17 in addition. We also have brick that's  
18 applied on these concrete piers all the way  
19 around the building. We're trying to bring  
20 in some of the warmth of the materials that  
21 are on the buildings into this garage, too.  
22 The entry comes in this direction via car and

1           then the pedestrian connection is across this  
2           -- this is a glassed-in tower for elevator  
3           and stair. There's another stair around the  
4           back. But it's pretty -- it's a pretty  
5           simple straight forward, clean but very high  
6           quality garage.

7                     And the two schemes are showing what  
8           Rich talked about earlier is the first phase  
9           of three stories with then a full build out  
10          at six stories.

11                    RICHARD MCKINNON: That really  
12          concludes the presentation, Mr. Chairman.  
13          Just to reiterate the process. We're going  
14          to be working with your staff, Beth and her  
15          folks here, try to get some refinement on  
16          this plan. And it's our hope to come up here  
17          and appear in front of the Planning Board at  
18          a public hearing sometime in October. And if  
19          we were to pick a night, I think we're  
20          looking at October 20th.

21                    WILLIAM TIBBS: Any comments or  
22          questions from Board members? Yes, Tom.

1                   THOMAS ANNINGER: I am familiar with  
2                   Discovery Park. I have made a visit and it  
3                   is a nice place. What I guess I wanted to  
4                   talk about is some of the things that you'll  
5                   give some thought to when you come back to us  
6                   next time.

7                   RICHARD MCKINNON: Sure.

8                   THOMAS ANNINGER: I take Route 2 as  
9                   we all do out to wherever, Route 128 and  
10                  further west. So I've been looking at  
11                  Building 100 from Route 2 for sometime, and I  
12                  as opposed to perhaps the general public,  
13                  know that the original master plan was to  
14                  wrap around Building 100 and therefore  
15                  there's a reason why that facade looking at  
16                  Route 2 is such a blank wall because it was  
17                  going to be --

18                  RICHARD MCKINNON: A tower.

19                  THOMAS ANNINGER: -- filled in with  
20                  another building.

21                  RICHARD MCKINNON: A telescopic  
22                  tower, that's true.

1                   THOMAS ANNINGER: That is no longer  
2 true if you make a separate Building 200.  
3 That blank wall now needs to be addressed. I  
4 think if we're going to be looking at it from  
5 Route 2, among other things. And so I guess  
6 I wanted to ask you to focus on just that  
7 which is what are you going to do with that  
8 facade which now is a scaleless facade. It  
9 really has no dimensions to it at all. It's  
10 almost -- it's more than just a back of a  
11 building. It's really just a side waiting to  
12 be finished. And now that you're going to be  
13 doing something else, I think we have to  
14 finish it. That may mean new windows in the  
15 blank area. That may mean some  
16 dimensionality, some three dimensions. So  
17 real architecture on that side so that when  
18 we look at it from Route 2 which is really  
19 the gateway to Cambridge, we need to have a  
20 nice building to look at. I know we have a  
21 lot of first tier, first plain things to deal  
22 with, bowling alleys and so on. But you're

1 right behind them and you are actually very  
2 visible.

3 RICHARD MCKINNON: Right.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that whole  
5 north elevation if I'm not getting --

6 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes, that's  
7 right.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think the north  
9 elevation has to be dealt with. And I think  
10 there's more to it than just that building.  
11 The garage is also going to be very visible  
12 on the north side from Route 2 perhaps more  
13 so than even Building 100 because it's  
14 closer --

15 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's correct.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: -- to Route 2.  
17 And, therefore, I think we want to go beyond  
18 the usual plain concrete panels that one  
19 might expect from an inexpensive garage. And  
20 I know that financing and costs are an issue.  
21 I don't begrudge you that.

22 Hugh, when I asked him about this,

1 pointed out to me that perhaps you even had  
2 four years ago showed us some pictures of  
3 what -- how you plan to embellish that garage  
4 on the north side and the south side. I hope  
5 you'll come back and talk to us about that  
6 and make that as lively and interesting as  
7 you can from both sides, north side, even  
8 though that isn't your tenant side, and south  
9 side.

10 RICHARD MCKINNON: Point taken. And  
11 that will be done as part of the October  
12 presentation. It's a challenge as you know,  
13 Tom. But we will look at it.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: And I know it's  
15 only three stories at first, but we've got to  
16 contemplate a six-story building when you  
17 start from the ground floor up.

18 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's right.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: So that's sort of  
20 one dimension is the north side and those  
21 north elevations need to be addressed.

22 The next thing that I find interesting

1 in your reconfiguration is that it's a little  
2 bit confusing, which is the front and which  
3 is the back of these buildings. Building  
4 100, the facade that has the embellishment on  
5 it, the panels and the fins and so on is  
6 facing south.

7 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: The back, as I  
9 said, is kind of a plain unfinished side.  
10 And the entrance is actually on the side if  
11 I'm not mistaken.

12 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's correct.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: This next  
14 building, it's a little ambiguous just which  
15 side are both sides going to be  
16 architecturally inviting. It seemed as if  
17 you presented it to us as if a south side,  
18 the Acorn Drive side is the embellished side  
19 just like Building 100, and yet you have an  
20 entrance on the other side. And you now have  
21 some open space there that fits in the L.  
22 Maybe you can show that in the layout where

1 that entrance is? Yes, that will do. The  
2 part that relates to the garage. That  
3 actually works I think.

4 LARRY GROSSMAN: I can go all the  
5 way back to this.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, that's  
7 actually better.

8 Now, take a look at this. The garage  
9 is up there so that if you park at that  
10 garage, you would presumably want to come  
11 straight to what you're landscaping on in  
12 that -- I'll call it the L piece of the new  
13 building. Now take a look at the equivalent  
14 L piece on the other side of the -- the back  
15 side of Building 100, those are at the moment  
16 very unequal in their landscaping.

17 LARRY GROSSMAN: This is not  
18 reflective of the actual landscaping that's  
19 in place today. You're right, the  
20 connection, the pedestrian connection for  
21 people coming from -- we have the public  
22 connection from the T coming this way

1 (i ndi cati ng) and fol ks comi ng from the garage  
2 i n thi s l ocati on can come i n through --  
3 there' s an entrance to thi s bui l di ng ri ght  
4 here (i ndi cati ng).

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: That' s ri ght.

6 LARRY GROSSMAN: There' s an entrance  
7 to thi s bui l di ng ri ght here (i ndi cati ng).  
8 There' s al so an entrance ri ght here  
9 (i ndi cati ng). So i n addi ti on, so peopl e that  
10 are al ong Acorn Drive or comi ng from the T  
11 can wal k across and then up. There' s a  
12 stai rway and then i nto the central l obby i n  
13 addi ti on. But we coul dn' t have a drop off.  
14 The tenant wanted a drop off and we fel t that  
15 i t needed to be off of Acorn Park Drive. So  
16 we tucked i t back.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Acorn Park Drive  
18 i s north or south?

19 LARRY GROSSMAN: Ri ght there. Acorn  
20 Park Drive i s ri ght here (i ndi cati ng).

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Al l ri ght. What  
22 I' m sayi ng i s thi s: You have l andscape one

1 side of that large open space just south of  
2 the garage but north of the two building.

3 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: And the other side  
5 well, you say that doesn't represent it  
6 adequately. I think it does. It's a pretty  
7 -- it's just grass and a few trees. It is  
8 far from an inviting space. And I think you  
9 have a real opportunity to landscape that in  
10 a way that will make the entrance that now  
11 really faces Acorn Drive even though it's on  
12 the side. It draws you in from Acorn Drive.  
13 The other side doesn't do anything for you.  
14 You're gonna have to I think do a whole lot  
15 more on the rear of Building 100 than you  
16 have so far.

17 LARRY GROSSMAN: I would agree. We  
18 haven't even gotten to that.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's another  
20 thing I hope to see you address.

21 RICHARD MCKINNON: Well, just so I  
22 can restate. You're really -- to have a much

1 more inviting pedestrian connection from the  
2 garage to both buildings.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Exactly.

4 RICHARD MCKINNON: But especially  
5 Building 100.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Exactly. I'll  
7 pass on this with just a passing comment. I  
8 don't know how crazy I am about the one-story  
9 fitness cafeteria building. That seems a  
10 little pasted on to me and I don't find it so  
11 far very convincing, but maybe that will  
12 work.

13 RICHARD MCKINNON: There's a lot of  
14 design development yet to do seriously, Tom.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Maybe that will  
16 come together.

17 The only other two points I want to  
18 make are -- there is -- there are other open  
19 space areas to address. We've lost some open  
20 space by moving Building 200 to where it is  
21 now further to the east where you seem to  
22 have dotted out a building that has filled in

1 some space that was formerly to be open. So  
2 I think we need to think about that a little  
3 bit. There's some -- there's a price to pay  
4 for moving Building 200 in the direction that  
5 you did.

6 RICHARD MCKINNON: The price being  
7 that it shrinks the distance between  
8 Buildings 100 and 200. And therefore it  
9 creates less open space.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: No, it's more like  
11 Building 300 and 400. I don't even know what  
12 the numbers are. But I'm talking to the  
13 right where you have that rectangle there.  
14 That fills in where it was formerly not  
15 filled in.

16 RICHARD MCKINNON: I think, Tom,  
17 we're going to have a little bit more running  
18 room than we have to the left. I think  
19 you'll find it.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to -- I  
21 don't want this to be too much of a  
22 discourse. I think what Tom is doing is

1           telling you the things that he's going to be  
2           looking for when you come back.

3                   THOMAS ANNINGER: That's all I'm  
4           doing. I'm not --

5                   WILLIAM TIBBS: So, you know, I just  
6           think you can hear the comments and then  
7           address them. And, Hugh.

8                   THOMAS ANNINGER: And one more than  
9           then I'm done, Hugh.

10                  WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

11                  THOMAS ANNINGER: Just one more  
12           point. I remember Roger, I think it was  
13           Roger talking very eloquently about, you know  
14           -- you don't mind if I say eloquently, do  
15           you?

16                  WILLIAM TIBBS: Even if you did say  
17           it.

18                  THOMAS ANNINGER: Along Acorn Drive,  
19           I think he wanted something that tried to  
20           look urban and Cambridge and less executive  
21           office in its scale, in its relationship to  
22           the sidewalks, in its relationship to the

1 parking and so on. And I just want you not  
2 to forget that. Actually, on all sides of  
3 the building, as something to reach for. And  
4 I think it's in your own interest to try to  
5 make this feel as much Cambridge as it  
6 possibly can even though it is an outlier  
7 geographically. And that's just a touchstone  
8 I wanted to remind you. I have not forgotten  
9 that comment and I thought it was a good one.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: I just want to follow  
12 up a bit on the basic site plan issues. But  
13 before I say that, the idea of changing a  
14 master plan in order to put a new tenant in  
15 seems to me that's the way the world works,  
16 and I have no problem with the overall  
17 concept of moving, providing what people need  
18 and changing the plan accordingly so that it  
19 can be accomplished. In particular the city  
20 depends upon your development to fund our  
21 lifestyle, and it is a very challenging time.  
22 And the fact that you're able to come before

1 us is very heartening. And so, I don't want  
2 my comments to be interpreted in any way in  
3 opposition to what you're trying to  
4 accomplish, more about how, how things are  
5 accomplished and what has to be done.

6 So I went back to my stack of planning  
7 books that you've given us in 2004.

8 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: And I noticed they're  
10 -- and sort of reminded me of some of the  
11 important pieces of the site plan. There was  
12 an active use plaza that partially was in  
13 front of Building 200 when it was connected  
14 to 100. Partially in front of Building 300  
15 and then a sort of ceremonial in the street  
16 connecting in the two of them. And that's  
17 very different in this plan. There's a plaza  
18 smaller. It's now only in front of the new  
19 building 2/3. And the cut-through has now  
20 got very close to Building 1. In fact,  
21 you're going to have to tear out some of  
22 those beautiful stone seating walls that you

1 built in order to put that connection through  
2 and an access ramp. I wonder if that plaza  
3 was in part put in that location because  
4 there are half a dozen really big honey  
5 locust trees out there that might be saved if  
6 the plaza was there, but now are going to not  
7 be saved because the building's going to be  
8 there. So there is a level of thinking and  
9 detail that although it happened very quickly  
10 before --

11 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: -- still needs to  
13 happen very quickly this time.

14 The thing that was between the  
15 Buildings 600 and 400 and 500 is labelled  
16 here courtyard. And that courtyard is now  
17 got a big projection into it. And so, I  
18 think -- and the street alignment has changed  
19 significantly, and to my mind in a way that I  
20 don't like. On the other hand, you're not  
21 proposing to build that building now.

22 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's right.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: So, I guess I'd like  
2                   to see that the concept for that end of the  
3                   site of buildings around a courtyard that has  
4                   a certain scale is not foreclosed by this,  
5                   but without having you to say well, design  
6                   the whole thing now because who knows what  
7                   tenant's going to come forward for the next  
8                   building. And, you know, maybe the solution  
9                   is something as simple as that building  
10                  becomes a story or two higher so as to get  
11                  more ground space. And that will depend on  
12                  what kind of a tenant it is. Whether that's  
13                  the solution.

14                 RICHARD MCKINNON: Right.

15                 HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe somebody wants  
16                 a little bigger floor plate across the way.  
17                 I mean the -- so those are the pieces that I  
18                 really want you to look at.

19                 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

20                 HUGH RUSSELL: Now, the big  
21                 difference here there is a lot more open  
22                 space on the north side than there is with

1 the opportunity of pulling all those spaces  
2 together which I don't really think that plan  
3 shows. Part of that, there's a temporary  
4 parking lot that I'm mentally erasing, but  
5 there's still -- you know, you need to work  
6 that out some more, because there are three  
7 roadways. The garage roadway, the main  
8 roadway, the turn around. And if it's, you  
9 know, 12 layer, whatever it is, seven lanes  
10 of blacktop that's one thing. If it's --  
11 when it's designed, it may have a completely  
12 different impact. So, that to me is homework  
13 that I really want to see done.

14 RICHARD MCKINNON: Okay.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And I think you  
16 might, in thinking about the elevations of  
17 the building, kind of walk around Building  
18 100 and say to yourself what are the parts I  
19 really think worked well? I would say the  
20 concrete base worked really well, you know.  
21 The different textures creating a variety and  
22 color, their scale of that. I'm not as happy

1 with the curtain wall facing south on that  
2 building myself, you know. There are some  
3 things that were tried that maybe aren't as  
4 successful that maybe you want -- don't want  
5 to try on the next building. So I do -- I  
6 would just put that as a challenge. You  
7 don't often have the opportunity to improve  
8 upon yourself each time. Building 100 is a  
9 fine building. Can Building 200 be finer?

10 RICHARD MCKINNON: Understood.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, Charles.

12 CHARLES STUDEN: I actually -- I  
13 wasn't on the Planning Board in 2004 --

14 RICHARD MCKINNON: I recall.

15 CHARLES STUDEN: -- when the  
16 original master plan was approved.

17 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

18 CHARLES STUDEN: But I think the  
19 points that both Tom and Hugh have made  
20 resonate with me as I look at the approved  
21 master plan. And maybe I missed it, but I'm  
22 not sure why is it that you have chose not to

1 attach Building 100 when it was clearly  
2 designed to have a building attached to it?  
3 Because I think if you did do that, it begins  
4 to solve a lot of the problems that have been  
5 already brought up here. In particular, it  
6 brings the parking garage much closer to both  
7 buildings than in the revised scheme. And  
8 there's something about the scale of the  
9 proposed interim site plan that puzzles me.  
10 Because the Building 200, 300 says six  
11 stories, 210,000 square feet. And in the  
12 original master plan, Building 200 alone  
13 attached to 100 is going to have 100,000 --  
14 190,000 square feet. And only 20,000 square  
15 feet less, and yet it looks smaller. And the  
16 difficulty I'm having is, again, in this  
17 proposed interim site plan, I think that the  
18 experience of the pedestrian who parks in  
19 that parking garage and tries to get to  
20 Building 100 or to Building 200 or 300 is not  
21 going to be a particularly pleasant one as  
22 they struggle to get across over all these

1 over scaled driveways and so on. So, could  
2 you just explain why you're not -- why did  
3 you choose not to attach to the existing  
4 building?

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: And again, without,  
6 I prefer not to have too much discourse here  
7 because, you know, I think that's something  
8 you should explain when you come.

9 RICHARD MCKINNON: There was going  
10 to be a telescopic tower built on the  
11 Smithsonian.

12 CHARLES STUDEN: I see.

13 RICHARD MCKINNON: But their grant  
14 did not come through that year and we're  
15 still waiting.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: So that might happen  
17 sometime in the future?

18 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's a  
19 discussion that we're going to have to have  
20 with Smithsonian and our potential new  
21 tenant.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: And yes, the issue

1 at scale when you add the two buildings  
2 together, you have 300 and 400 combined but  
3 it is a smaller scale.

4 RICHARD MCKINNON: It's a -- just a  
5 question of scale and perspective. They did  
6 not mean to create the -- not try to pull a  
7 fast one. Okay.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, yes.

9 WAYNE KOCH: In the original plan  
10 there was an anticipation of certain needs  
11 that haven't arisen yet.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, I think I'd  
13 like to comment. That's a good point for me  
14 to follow up on because I actually agree with  
15 my colleagues. And I think for me it's going  
16 to be very helpful for me, because I'm like  
17 Hugh, I don't have a big stack of plans. So  
18 I think you'll just need to remind us and  
19 remind the new Board members what you're kind  
20 of -- what was overall important when you did  
21 the master plan and what your concept was.  
22 And I agree with Hugh that plans do change,

1 but in terms of roadways and pedestrian and  
2 vehicular access and open space and flows,  
3 what was important then and how has any  
4 changes you have made address those things  
5 that we can really get at. So I think being  
6 well grounded and what the plan was so that  
7 we can understand how the plan is changing  
8 and what your thoughts are is going to be  
9 important to me. And more importantly I  
10 would like to see in light of whatever  
11 changes you make in assuming that we agree or  
12 we agree with what they might be, just like  
13 you did in the regular plan, we'd like to see  
14 what the build out could be. So I did find  
15 the -- and I agree with Hugh that even that  
16 will change and we know, but what has changed  
17 is -- the equivalent the build out plan has  
18 changed because you've made some changes to  
19 those conceptual things, so we'd like to see  
20 those. And I found that the sort of the  
21 dotting in on the buildings on the vast  
22 parking lots is very -- it didn't help me

1 understand where this is moving to. So I  
2 don't mind seeing an interim plan which shows  
3 those, but you really do have to show us in  
4 light of what we're dealing with now, in  
5 light of the issues we think we have. Here's  
6 where it is we'll all get a better  
7 understanding of what we're trying to  
8 accomplish and it gives us a base point of  
9 what's coming into the other buildings.

10 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's fair.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: The real key is the  
12 plan is still important, even though you're  
13 coming here to talk to us about the next  
14 building, we spent a lot of time talking  
15 about the existing buildings and how it fit  
16 into the plan. So don't over emphasize just  
17 focus and view of that -- I found one of the  
18 things interesting is it's -- the first plan,  
19 when you started talking about it, was very  
20 small focussed in, you know, area around the  
21 building and we need to get an understanding  
22 of that context before you start talking

1 about how the building works.

2 RICHARD MCKINNON: Okay.

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any other comments?

4 AHMED NUR: I just had a quick  
5 question actually. It looks like the back of  
6 Building 600 has some sort of walkway into  
7 the Town of Arlington.

8 RICHARD MCKINNON: Thirty years ago.

9 AHMED NUR: I see.

10 RICHARD MCKINNON: It's been there  
11 for some time.

12 AHMED NUR: All right. That's all.

13 RICHARD MCKINNON: I hope in my  
14 lifetime I'm not talking to you about  
15 Building 600.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Well, thank  
17 you very much. And we do have another item,  
18 so if you can kind of clear out relatively  
19 quickly, we'd like that. Maybe get home  
20 before midnight.

21 (A short recess was taken.)

22 \* \* \* \* \*

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: You want to start  
2 us off?

3 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I will start us  
4 off. Thank you, Bill. We -- this was a  
5 short briefing tonight on the Alexandria  
6 Rezoning and community benefits was really  
7 the staff's idea. We thought it would be  
8 useful just to refresh everybody's memory as  
9 to what happened actually less than a year  
10 ago now. Last February of this year when the  
11 Council adopted some zoning changes in East  
12 Cambridge in anticipation of the folks from  
13 Alexandria coming back to the Planning Board  
14 which we think will be fairly soon at the end  
15 of the calendar year to begin getting the PUD  
16 permits for their first buildings.

17 So this is territory the Board has seen  
18 before so I'm not going to take a long time.  
19 I'm really just going to go through the  
20 handouts and describe what has happened and  
21 where we are right now. As I'm talking, I  
22 think it will be helpful to look at the plan

1 behind me. And again, just to refresh  
2 everyone's memory, I believe it was about a  
3 year ago in the fall of 2008 that the folks  
4 from Alexandria Real Estate began to express  
5 an interest in making some changes to what  
6 was the then current East Cambridge Zoning to  
7 accommodate plans that they had for a major  
8 investment in East Cambridge and for the  
9 building of a major R&D presence along the  
10 Binney Street corridor, roughly between First  
11 Street and extending all the way down to  
12 Sixth Street.

13 So from the River Court area and all  
14 the way down to the border with 301 Binney, a  
15 project that also has been before the Board.

16 There was a review period of many  
17 months of -- some of that review taking place  
18 here at the Planning Board, at the City  
19 Council. There were a number of meetings  
20 with larger community groups, and then as I  
21 recall the cold days of last winter there  
22 were a series of meetings with the smaller

1 group of folks in the neighborhood, some of  
2 who are actually here tonight to begin to  
3 discuss some of the finer points of what was  
4 important to the neighborhood, what the  
5 developer was looking for and how that might  
6 all be meshed together. Briefly what was  
7 accomplished in the zoning, and I didn't  
8 bring a zoning map, but essentially the PUD-3  
9 District which covers most of Cambridge  
10 Research Park was extended northward all the  
11 way up to Binney Street. And then the PUD-4C  
12 District which was located north of Binney  
13 was extended more or less to the west to take  
14 in the area all the way down to Sixth Street.

15 And what I thought I would do is just  
16 rely on some tools that we've used before  
17 since they tell the story fairly briefly, and  
18 just take you through probably first through  
19 the -- what's called the Alexandria Rezoning  
20 Summary and if the folks in the audience  
21 would like copies, we have a few more.

22 Again, Alexandria has told us that they

1 are looking to build approximately five R&D  
2 laboratory type buildings in this part of the  
3 city which more or less now is the site of  
4 under utilized generally one-story small  
5 scale buildings. The FARs they were looking  
6 for were generally up to about three. And in  
7 total the building program is about 1.5  
8 million square feet of commercial and  
9 laboratory space. The heights -- and, again,  
10 the small map that you have in front of you  
11 and the same as the larger one here describes  
12 the presumed heights of those buildings.  
13 Again, these are, these are rough. Some of  
14 these things may change, but the heights  
15 generally extend from 65 to 75 feet generally  
16 north of Binney. And on the south side of  
17 Binney the taller buildings are proposed to  
18 be located roughly up to 140 feet, again give  
19 or take.

20 As we looked at the traffic and  
21 analyzing the zoning of the zoning  
22 establishes a parking ratio that won't be any

1 greater than .9 per thousand, with the  
2 understanding that as we get into a more fine  
3 grade traffic analysis, that ratio may even  
4 go down. It's our practice generally to have  
5 them go down and not go up.

6           Again, just to emphasize that when  
7 Alexandria wants to come back and permit  
8 individual buildings, those buildings will  
9 still be expected to be consistent with the  
10 East Cambridge design guidelines that were  
11 part of the E-cap study in 2001. And as a  
12 general theme, it was a goal of the city, and  
13 I think it was something that the developers  
14 felt comfortable with, that key historic  
15 buildings in Cambridge be maintained.

16           It was really important to the city and  
17 to the neighborhood -- I really should maybe  
18 put it the other way, to the neighborhood and  
19 to the city that the area that begins to  
20 emerge here along Binney Street not be like a  
21 suburban office park that's sort of put in a  
22 city context, but in fact even though it

1 encompasses fairly large buildings, really  
2 have an urban feel and have a mixed use feel.  
3 So part of what we spent a lot of time  
4 discussing here and with the City Council and  
5 with the neighborhood was the importance of  
6 both residential -- and very important to  
7 have retail use in the area. This is, you  
8 know, not different from the conversation we  
9 had when we looked at the zoning and then the  
10 permitting for North Point and Cambridge  
11 Research Park for that matter. So what you  
12 find in the zoning is that there's a minimum  
13 requirement of 20,000 square feet of retail  
14 space. And there are all sorts of finer  
15 points which, again, I would say the  
16 developer was really glad to accommodate  
17 about the importance of having a marketing  
18 and merchandising plan, assigning someone to  
19 take special care with the retail build out  
20 and there are some ongoing recording  
21 requirements back to the Community  
22 Development Department regarding how the

1 details are going and we'll talk about that  
2 too.

3 The developer has made a commitment and  
4 it is in the zoning that the buildings will  
5 be sustainable with a minimum of silver lead  
6 rating anticipated.

7 So, that's kind of the rough that we  
8 expect about 1.5 commercial, about 220,000  
9 square feet of residential generally in two  
10 buildings, and about 20,000 square feet in  
11 retail.

12 Now, just switching over to the  
13 community benefits pages, and I think the  
14 Board has actually seen the community  
15 benefits chart. I think we've brought it  
16 right to the zoning this past February, and  
17 again I think it's useful to have and useful  
18 to go over, especially since it gets at some  
19 of the important timing issues. I think one  
20 of the things that's challenging for, you  
21 know, to us as planners and the City Council  
22 in making sure that we're not only getting a

1 mix of uses and getting the benefits but that  
2 we're getting them in an interwoven way. So  
3 things aren't too front loaded or too back  
4 loaded.

5 So looking at community benefits, I  
6 think the open space provision is obviously  
7 extremely important. You see here on the  
8 plan something that we've -- we get to  
9 identify as the Roger Street Park.

10 Alexandria has agreed to give to the city the  
11 block that extends from Rogers to Bent and  
12 from Second to Third Street, which is an area  
13 of about two acres that will be given to the  
14 city for the construction of a city park that  
15 will be designed through a city process,  
16 obviously a neighborhood-based process. In  
17 addition the area that's designated here as  
18 the Triangle Park, some of which is actually  
19 owned by the city now, but in large part is  
20 opened by the developer. All of that will  
21 come to the city and again a second, I think  
22 really important piece of green space will be

1 build there, too.

2           Again, looking at the little chart  
3 here, talking a little bit about the phasing.  
4 Again, like the project we just looked at and  
5 like North Point, like Cambridge Research  
6 Park, this is anticipated to be a project  
7 that builds out over a period of years. So  
8 we all worked hard to be creative about how  
9 the benefits would come in, and I think it's  
10 worth noting that at the time that Alexandria  
11 obtains their first building permit, the  
12 city's going to get the first million dollars  
13 donation to the city, which is specifically  
14 earmarked for the city to begin thinking  
15 about the design of the open space. So that  
16 really helps us get going on our work and not  
17 having to rely on the city budget to do that.

18           By the time the first certificate of  
19 occupancy is obtained by the developer, a  
20 second payment of 8.5 million to the city  
21 will be made specifically earmarked toward  
22 construction of the parks. And at that time

1 the Roger Street parcel will be deeded to the  
2 city. So no opening of the first building  
3 until the city has in place nine and a half  
4 million dollars in the Roger Street parcel.

5 Just keeping in the open space area, by  
6 the time the C of O hits the 700,000 square  
7 foot mark, which will be, you know, something  
8 in the neighborhood of perhaps three  
9 buildings, give or take, depending on how  
10 that works out, Triangle will then be deeded  
11 to the city.

12 And then finally, and this was  
13 something that was really important to the  
14 City Council, the developers also made an  
15 agreement that when they hit the one million  
16 square foot mark, which is about two-thirds  
17 of what they're planning to build out, a  
18 contribution will be made to a newly created  
19 open space acquisition fund targeted  
20 specifically at East Cambridge on the basis  
21 of \$12 a foot of commercial space over a  
22 million. So, again, that's about 500,000

1 square feet. And if the project is  
2 eventually completely built out, that will be  
3 the \$6 million of additional funds that will  
4 come to the city acquisition of additional  
5 open space in East Cambridge.

6 Again, as I noted in the area of  
7 housing, it's anticipated that there will be  
8 about 220,000 gross square feet of housing to  
9 be built out over the course of the PUD.

10 And, again, if it's a little hard to  
11 understand, but on the first 70,000 square  
12 feet of housing -- so you know, roughly 70 or  
13 80 units will be due to begin or to commence  
14 when the building permit that triggers  
15 750,000 square feet of commercial development  
16 has been hit. So when they hit that 757  
17 building permit, whatever building that is,  
18 they also have to be commencing the first  
19 70,000 square feet of housing. And then when  
20 they hit the one million square feet of  
21 commercial development stage or eight years  
22 from the date of getting the Special Permit,

1           whichever date is later, the additional  
2           150,000 square feet will be built. And right  
3           now I think in the conversations that we've  
4           had, it's been anticipated that the 70,000  
5           square feet will be along Third Street, which  
6           we're going to spend a lot of time talking  
7           about, where the housing would go. And I  
8           think there was the sense that would be a  
9           terrific location that would add to the  
10          animation of Third Street and really the  
11          growing retail -- I mean, the growing  
12          residential corridor that's building up along  
13          Third Street. And then the larger 150,000  
14          square feet was envisioned to be in a  
15          separate building here out east next to LDS  
16          Church that's under construction now.

17                 Provision was made that 3,000 square  
18          feet of the 220 will be set aside for what we  
19          call low-income. That's folks with  
20          income 80 percent of area medium and below.  
21          That's our typical threshold for affordable  
22          housing. An additional 40,000 square feet

1 will be made -- will be priced for middle  
2 income housing which we generally trigger at  
3 120 percent at very medium income and below.

4 Moving on to retail, again, I mentioned  
5 the marketing and merchandising plan, and we  
6 spent a lot of time talking about how we can  
7 make sure that that's a conversation that  
8 just doesn't happen at the beginning, but  
9 continues to happen throughout the build out.  
10 And I think we all agreed that it made sense  
11 for there to be an annual report to come into  
12 the city, which I'm sure we'll be sharing  
13 here at the Planning Board and anywhere else  
14 folks are interested, to take place every  
15 year until three years passed the full  
16 completion of the active uses or the retail  
17 uses.

18 We've spent a fair amount of time  
19 talking about some of the details of might go  
20 into retail plan. And without anticipating  
21 too much exactly what that would look like, I  
22 think it's fair to say that the folks from

1 Alexandria were very open to things such as  
2 subsidies for the fit out of the space. And  
3 we even talked about the possibility,  
4 depending on what the retail climate is like  
5 in the future, that there might even be rent  
6 subsidies itself. Again, this is something  
7 to be determined in the future, but I think  
8 we were all trying to get our heads around  
9 what are some of the things that are barriers  
10 for folks to be successful in retail. And  
11 one of those barriers can be the cost of fit  
12 out, and so that's an area of potential help.

13 Under community active uses we talked  
14 about the minimum number of retail. And then  
15 I would also note that the building note is  
16 the Foundry Building, which is the purple  
17 building -- thanks, Roger, right next to  
18 Verizon which is an historic building of  
19 about 152,000 square feet in East Cambridge,  
20 is going to be deeded to the city. The city  
21 is committing to make that building for  
22 municipal and community uses and some

1 combination to be determined with the  
2 commitment that at least a minimum of 10,000  
3 square feet for community use for folks in  
4 the neighborhood. And that's to happen by  
5 2012.

6           Again, we talked about sustainability.  
7 And then I just want to spend a minute or two  
8 talking about traffic, parking and urban  
9 design. Obviously when the project comes in  
10 to be permitted, it will undergo the normal  
11 traffic study analysis, PTDM plan, additional  
12 mitigation if there are traffic impacts,  
13 etcetera. We spent a lot of time talking  
14 about Binney Street and how important the  
15 ultimate design of Binney Street was going to  
16 be to the success of this kind of urban image  
17 we have for this area. So, we actually spent  
18 a little time thinking about the buildings  
19 and trying to do as much forward thinking as  
20 we could knowing this was all going to be  
21 happening very much in the future, to think  
22 about how we might do things such as

1 facilitate on street parking on Binney which  
2 is something folks have been interested in  
3 for a long time. On the back side of the two  
4 buildings just north of Binney, the two  
5 buildings that are going to be adjacent to  
6 the Roger Street park. You'll see that the  
7 building footprint shows some setback there.  
8 That was specifically so that there's some  
9 feeling of openness next to the park. We've  
10 expressed a preference that the loading zone  
11 not be on Roger Street, so that the loading  
12 zone for those two are indeed again, not  
13 harmful, don't derogate the park. And I will  
14 note that we've actually begun the  
15 conversation about Binney Street already. We  
16 had a meeting with probably 10 or 15 of our  
17 planning and transportation staff with Sue  
18 and Adam and others and just with the  
19 development team just to begin kicking around  
20 various ideas for Binney and how it's going  
21 to be activated. So I can assure you that  
22 those are really very serious conversations.

1 An then we're also coordinating with the DPW  
2 who obviously has to worry about things like  
3 drainage and underground infrastructure in  
4 the area. And again we're working on the  
5 zoning, those conversations were already in  
6 play so we're not putting anything in here  
7 that DPW couldn't agree. Excuse me.

8 Again, I noted that the parking maximum  
9 has been set at .9 with the understanding  
10 that it might be lowered in the future as we  
11 look more closely at specific buildings.  
12 Obviously all of the parking -- well, most of  
13 the parking is going to be underground. A  
14 small portion, five percent upgrade if  
15 needed. I know that the importance of the  
16 consistency with E-cast sign guidelines and  
17 the commitment to the preservation of the  
18 historic buildings.

19 Noise is something that comes up a lot  
20 and something we talked about a fair amount  
21 when the zoning was being discussed, and  
22 Alexandria did make a commitment to file

1 compliance reports with field measurements  
2 which is something I think folks in the  
3 neighborhood really wanted to see at the  
4 point of the first -- to see what's  
5 anticipated in terms of noise impact, and  
6 they made a commitment that any rooftop  
7 mechanical noise coming from their buildings  
8 will not be perceptible a hundred feet from  
9 the source's lot line. So that's something  
10 that they felt they could, they could commit  
11 to. Obviously the existing noise ordinance  
12 still obtains as well.

13           And I think that's really the overview.  
14 Again, I think we understand that hopefully  
15 by the end of the year developer will come  
16 back to begin to seek the Special Permit.  
17 What we have now is this zoning envelope.  
18 There is no Special Permit. That will always  
19 be here as it's always here. And, again, we  
20 just sort of wanted to get everybody back in  
21 the mood.

22           Thanks.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: What is the dark  
3 orange on the plan?

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Potential retail  
5 sites.

6 BETH RUBENSTEIN: That's right.  
7 Those are all anticipated retail sites.  
8 That's ground floor retail. Ground floor  
9 retail. And, again, we're going to be  
10 talking a lot about, you know, the importance  
11 of the Second Street and Binney and, you  
12 know, what's going on there. And, again, the  
13 importance of Binney.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thanks.

15 Thank you, Beth.

16 Okay, I think we can move on to our --

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: All these people  
18 came here just to hear that?

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

20 So we are done with that and we are  
21 going to move to our next order of business  
22 which is our look at the BZA cases. If you

1 are leaving, please do so quietly so we can  
2 carry on our next item.

3 And who's going to be doing that, Beth?

4 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Less I believe.  
5 Are you going to do BZA?

6 LES BARBER: I'm going to stand up  
7 the packages.

8 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Okay.

9 LES BARBER: We do have  
10 representatives here, is it AT&T?

11 ARTHUR KREIGER: Yes.

12 LES BARBER: The third case down,  
13 9834, which is proposing a set of antennas on  
14 the Hill's Library site. And we're going to  
15 -- unfortunately they didn't bring packages  
16 for everybody, but we do have two or three  
17 packages to distribute and look at and be  
18 able to describe to you --

19 ARTHUR KREIGER: If we can connect,  
20 there are parts that will be shown up there.

21 LES BARBER: I'm absolutely no help  
22 with that.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: I almost want to say  
2 why don't you show us and then if you -- we  
3 tend to do these rather quickly. So if you  
4 just show us what you have, we'll circulate  
5 and then you can connect if we feel we need  
6 to we can see things a little bit more for  
7 clarity.

8 ARTHUR KREIGER: Okay.

9 LES BARBER: You can stand at the  
10 podium there.

11 ARTHUR KREIGER: Good evening,  
12 members of the Board. Thank you. My name is  
13 Arthur Kreiger from Anderson and Kreiger here  
14 in Cambridge representing New England  
15 Wireless PCS known as AT&T. And what we have  
16 is a proposal for a rooftop telecommunication  
17 facility on the Hillis Library off of Garden  
18 and Shepard. Will we be able to show  
19 something?

20 MARIA APSE: I think if this --

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: I ask you to  
22 circulate the stuff. We see a lot of these

1 so we're pretty good at quickly getting to  
2 the gist of the issues.

3 ARTHUR KREIGER: I'm sure you are  
4 and I'm sorry I don't have enough.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: That's okay. We can  
6 pass them around.

7 ARTHUR KREIGER: I'll explain what  
8 we have there.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: How many do you  
10 have?

11 ARTHUR KREIGER: Here is a second  
12 set. This is Mr. Barber's copy. I was under  
13 the misimpression, and it's my fault I  
14 thought that the Board would have access to  
15 these before. And this is a third set. Tab  
16 6. Tab 6 is what each of you should be  
17 looking at.

18 PATRICIA SINGER: Thank you.

19 ARTHUR KREIGER: I'll walk you  
20 through it.

21 The first page is just more or less --  
22 that tab is just a cover sheet of the Hill's

1 Library looking from the -- I'll call it the  
2 southeast. Second page is an aerial shot  
3 showing the Hillies Library there at the  
4 corner of Radcliff -- of Shepard and Garden  
5 with the five vantage points with the photo  
6 sims that follow. Then you have pairs of  
7 photo simulations from those vantage points  
8 existing and proposed.

9 On the north side, across the north end  
10 of the library is a penthouse. There will be  
11 a pair of antennas, one on each corner of the  
12 penthouse, on two of the corners. The  
13 equipment cabinet from the penthouse on the  
14 building screen to match the penthouse, and  
15 then the south end of the building on the  
16 Shepard Street end is a pair of antennas on  
17 the southeast corner of building facing the  
18 quad as well as Shepard Street. I don't want  
19 to talk while you're looking at the pictures,  
20 so I'll give you a moment.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: As I said, we see a  
22 lot of these.

1                   ARTHUR KREIGER: I know, I know.

2                   CHARLES STUDEN: I have a question.

3                   Why is it necessary to have these  
4                   installations on the very edge of the roof?  
5                   It has to do with the technology? For  
6                   example, having to be setback more toward the  
7                   center of the building you don't get the same  
8                   distribution of the signals, is that the  
9                   problem?

10                  ARTHUR KREIGER: The answer is  
11                  shading of the building itself. Shadowing of  
12                  the signals.

13                  CHARLES STUDEN: I see. So if you  
14                  put it in the middle of the building, it  
15                  would have to be much higher presumably?

16                  ARTHUR KREIGER: Correct. It's  
17                  roughly six feet back from the edge and six  
18                  feet high.

19                  MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: One-to-one  
20                  ratio.

21                  ARTHUR KREIGER: So basically a  
22                  one-to-one ratio. If we went back 15 feet,

1 it would have to be 15 feet height to get the  
2 same angle.

3 CHARLES STUDEN: I see. Because as  
4 I looked at the first proposed condition with  
5 the installation right on the edge of the  
6 roof there at the corner, it seems so  
7 prominent and obvious. You know, it's not  
8 integrated in any way with the building  
9 itself. If it were set back or even not so  
10 much on the corner, I'm not sure maybe that  
11 would be a little bit better. I struggle  
12 with this myself, I don't know.

13 ARTHUR KREIGER: We had it in the  
14 middle of that south end and then it was  
15 moved to the corner because it was felt that  
16 was better coverage and really less obtrusive  
17 for the Shepard Street neighbors.

18 CHARLES STUDEN: Which side is  
19 Shepard Street in this view?

20 ARTHUR KREIGER: The left-hand face  
21 of the building -- if I can just show you.  
22 Shepard Street is off here (indicating), off

1 this way and the quad is facing that way.

2 CHARLES STUDEN: Okay.

3 ARTHUR KREIGER: Bear in mind that  
4 these panels they're antennas, they're not  
5 cylindrical. So the few you're getting is  
6 the diagonal view from the front, maybe a  
7 little more obvious than if you were looking  
8 at it from the side from the quad angle  
9 itself. And they were -- it was discussed  
10 how to integrate this into the building. And  
11 some buildings can be false chimneys. Some  
12 buildings you do --

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: There's not much up  
14 there.

15 ARTHUR KREIGER: Excuse me?

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: I was saying there's  
17 not much up there.

18 ARTHUR KREIGER: Well, that's the  
19 problem. I mean, it's unlike the traditional  
20 buildings in the quad, it is flat roof, and  
21 there's nothing up there.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

1                   ARTHUR KREIGER: And a chimney would  
2 look more of place than this does. This at  
3 least will be painted a neutral color and  
4 really you won't see it much it's obviously  
5 visible on the top.

6                   WILLIAM TIBBS: Tom.

7                   THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm going to say  
8 something that you should not take  
9 personally. This is a very handsome if not  
10 beautiful building in the middle of a  
11 residential section in Western Cambridge. I  
12 am outraged that Harvard University would  
13 even think of commercializing Hilles Library  
14 in this way. I think it is totally  
15 unnecessary. I think it portends some  
16 serious problems with all of their buildings.  
17 If this is the path they're going to go down,  
18 we're going to be dealing with this with each  
19 and every building. Harvard Square and all  
20 around, all the laboratories and so on, my  
21 view is that we need to tell Harvard to stop  
22 this now. I am inalterably opposed to

1 anything on top of Hilles Library. I think  
2 it's a big mistake, and I would like at least  
3 my opinion to be reflected in whatever we  
4 send to the Zoning Board. I'm very upset  
5 about this.

6 ARTHUR KREIGER: Okay. Can I  
7 respond? Because I understand the concern.  
8 A couple of points.

9 This is not the commercialization of  
10 Hilles, at least it's not altogether that.  
11 It is in part to serve the Harvard Community,  
12 including for security issues such as one  
13 that was raised by an incident about six  
14 months ago. This is to serve students,  
15 professors within the buildings as new  
16 technologies are rolled out, with intra  
17 campus communication. It's clearly part of  
18 the general network and it will serve -- it  
19 will fill a coverage gap or improve coverage  
20 in the surrounding neighborhood. But it is  
21 also to serve the Harvard community.  
22 Harvard's not looking to make a few bucks

1 here. Harvard is looking to get something on  
2 a building that makes sense coverage wise  
3 that will fill a campus communication need as  
4 well. This is not the shrinkage of the  
5 Harvard endowment when they look to AT&T --

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's what it  
7 seemed like to me. Maybe I misinterpreted  
8 it. That's what was screaming at me.

9 ARTHUR KREIGER: I don't think  
10 that's a fair characterization of it. The  
11 money is not that much -- there are  
12 representatives --

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Tom, as I understand  
14 your point, it's not a commercialization,  
15 it's the fact that the installation's  
16 aesthetically inappropriate for the building  
17 that sets you off.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, that's, you  
19 can slice it in horizontally or vertically.  
20 I come to the same point. I do think that  
21 this building deserves the utmost of respect  
22 and I don't think this does that.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: Have you looked at  
2                   the adjacent dormitory building which has a  
3                   number of high brick planes that could, you  
4                   could inconspicuously put antennas on?

5                   ARTHUR KREIGER: I think we did look  
6                   there and we did look off campus pursuant to  
7                   the directive of the ordinance. We looked at  
8                   things over towards Mass. Ave. because the  
9                   ordinance says tell us about alternatives  
10                  that are not in a residentially owned area.  
11                  So we went beyond the campus and those sites  
12                  don't fill the coverage need. Let me ask  
13                  Dan, Dan can you talk about other buildings  
14                  on the campus that were looked at, do you  
15                  know, other dorms?

16                  MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is the  
17                  only building in the vicinity that has a flat  
18                  roof that would accommodate the equipment.  
19                  All the other dormitories have pitched roofs.

20                  HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think that's  
21                  correct. I believe Pforzheimer's house has a  
22                  flat roof which is the building I was

1 referring to. It's pictured in your --

2 ARTHUR KREIGER: That's the one just  
3 north to the one, right?

4 CHARLES STUDEN: Location 3.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: You have the  
6 disadvantage that you are coming for one  
7 installation and most of the people who do,  
8 do. But we have the disadvantage of seeing  
9 all of them. And I think that at least my  
10 sense is that if indeed, and this goes to my  
11 sense of -- that particularly on a building  
12 like this at Harvard that maybe between the  
13 two of you you have a much more coordinated  
14 effort as to what you're doing and how the  
15 aesthetics is going to be so that we don't  
16 have this proliferation of just individual  
17 buildings popping up here and there with  
18 stuff on them. And again, I get a sense that  
19 that's how I feel and that maybe there's a  
20 little bit more aesthetically complex way of  
21 doing them on a building of this stature as  
22 opposed to just doing this surface of

1 applications and sticking things on flat  
2 roofs that you typically see.

3 ARTHUR KREIGER: This design was not  
4 lightly arrived at. It wasn't just the flat  
5 roof was the easiest place to stick some  
6 stuff.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: I didn't say it was  
8 more likely. But I think it needs to be more  
9 -- in my mind it needs to be just a little  
10 bit more -- Harvard can work with you and the  
11 other carriers and say listen this is our  
12 campus. We feel very -- we definitely need  
13 the service, but here as some approach that  
14 we can do that -- and here's some aesthetic  
15 ways of doing it that just makes some sense.

16 ARTHUR KREIGER: Let me go back if I  
17 may go back to respond to both Mr. Anninger's  
18 and the Chairman's points. These things are  
19 not going to be popping up on every building.  
20 Whether one is needed at Harvard --

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Believe me, we see  
22 it. We just see it popping up all over.

1                   ARTHUR KREIGER: Well, I guess --

2                   WILLIAM TIBBS: Particularly as the  
3                   technology changes. There's all these  
4                   requirements, so that you know, so that's not  
5                   a -- you know. We've heard that one before.

6                   ARTHUR KREIGER: Okay. I'm not just  
7                   making a prediction. I guess the point is  
8                   Tab 7, the last two pages of Tab 7 are the  
9                   radio frequency coverage charts. There's a  
10                  before and after. There is a current and a  
11                  proposed. And you will see that the site  
12                  today is right on the edge of the blue and  
13                  the green. You don't have -- you only have  
14                  that one, I apologize. Whereas, with this  
15                  coverage, the entire area becomes green which  
16                  is the highest level of coverage. As new  
17                  technologies come out, I can't obviously make  
18                  any predictions or commitments, but this  
19                  fills the entire coverage needs for the  
20                  entire area on campus and off that is on the  
21                  Radcliff campus and off.

22                  THOMAS ANNINGER: You're talking

1 about cell phone coverage?

2 ARTHUR KREIGER: Right. Cell phone  
3 coverage, data, right. The new network.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: I think we ought to  
5 recommend to the Zoning Board that it's not  
6 to be granted because of the incompatibility  
7 with the general standards for mounting on  
8 buildings, and since it does seem like there  
9 are other options, including the adjacent  
10 Pforzheimer building that might allow them to  
11 get similar coverage with installation that  
12 would not be as incompatible with the  
13 building.

14 ARTHUR KREIGER: May I?

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Wait a minute. Go  
16 ahead, Tom.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: I couldn't agree  
18 more of course with that. I think we can  
19 make a stronger -- I think we ought to  
20 express some concerns about precedent here on  
21 Harvard buildings that are architecturally  
22 significant so that we are not starting down

1 a path that we are going to have to just deal  
2 with on a repeated basis. And I have not  
3 seen also a convincing case of need here.  
4 Just to throw the word coverage up is not  
5 adequate for me to really counter-balance the  
6 detriments that we're talking about here or  
7 in any other significant buildings. So I'm  
8 -- I did not find a persuasive coverage  
9 argument. I think it's a bad precedent, and  
10 I agree with Hugh that there are less  
11 burdensome alternatives.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, Ted.

13 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I agree  
14 wholeheartedly. I think they're incredibly  
15 ugly and inappropriate on this building. And  
16 generally I don't care all that much, but I  
17 think we already do have the precedent. I  
18 mean it galls me to no end to drive by Lesley  
19 University Hall and see the incredibly  
20 inappropriate antennas they've put up there.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: You're talking  
22 about the Sears building?

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, the Sears  
2 building. It's not just Harvard. I think  
3 all the institutions have to be more  
4 sensitive to what they're doing to their  
5 buildings. And I think we have seen some  
6 other proposals that have come before us  
7 where we've said no, we don't like this and  
8 people have come back with much more  
9 appropriate and sensitive proposals. And I  
10 think this is one that should not fly. And I  
11 believe that Harvard, with all its  
12 properties, can't come up with a better  
13 proposal to give them the coverage and  
14 whatever else they need?

15 ARTHUR KREIGER: May I ask --

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Wait.

17 Patricia, do you have anything to add?  
18 Ahmed.

19 AHMED NUR: Yes. Well I sympathize  
20 for your presentation, I appreciate you  
21 coming in for it. I definitely have seen,  
22 even though it's a new technology, it would

1 probably help the cell phones and the PCs,  
2 it's an old technology. We see abandoned  
3 antennas destroying the architectural facade  
4 in the town, the City of Cambridge, as well  
5 as we see the changes that they're bringing  
6 to our neighborhoods, so on and so forth.  
7 So, my advice, go find some other technology  
8 that you can put somewhere else as opposed to  
9 six-foot sticks on top of architecturally and  
10 well-appreciated structures. Thank you.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: So --

12 CHARLES STUDEN: I actually do. I  
13 have a slightly different perspective.  
14 Because these towers are driven by our  
15 insatiable desire to use cell phones and to  
16 have absolutely perfect reception 24 hours a  
17 day everywhere we go, and this installation  
18 is just one, because this is new Cingular,  
19 but believe me Sprint is going to want to put  
20 their cell towers up there and so is Verizon  
21 at some point. And this Board, I've been on  
22 this Board now for a year and a half, a

1 little more than that, and I find these  
2 discussions every time we have them very,  
3 very troubling because there doesn't seem to  
4 be any coherency to any of these discussions.  
5 Sometimes we like it, sometimes we don't.  
6 Sometimes we say push it to one edge, push it  
7 to another if it's -- you know. I -- you  
8 know, I don't know. I'm not crazy about  
9 this, but I feel that there are other things  
10 that are going on in the city from a design  
11 perspective that are more disturbing, and I  
12 said it before, one is overhead wires. We  
13 don't put our wires underground. I'm very  
14 frustrated by the Cambridgeport Roadways  
15 Project that tore up all the streets in that  
16 area and we didn't put the wires underground.  
17 It's going to be another 50 years we have to  
18 look at all of that ugliness. I never  
19 understood why these cell phone towers cannot  
20 be incorporated into that kind of  
21 infrastructure, maybe I don't know enough  
22 about the technology. So I'm a little less

1 -- I'm unhappy about it because again, I  
2 mean, everybody loves their cell phone. And  
3 I don't know, people will start calling and  
4 complaining when they can't get the cell  
5 phone service they want. And you're saying  
6 this is partly what's driving Harvard to come  
7 forward with this particular proposal, for  
8 security on their own campus.

9 ARTHUR KREIGER: It's security.  
10 Academic needs. It's communication within  
11 the buildings. The coverage that's lacking  
12 now is coverage within the buildings. That's  
13 the difference between the blue and the green  
14 on those coverage maps on page -- on the back  
15 of Tab 7. So there is, there is some  
16 coverage, it's not terrible coverage, but  
17 within the buildings, within the Radcliff  
18 campus there's inadequate coverage.

19 CHARLES STUDEN: So am I to assume  
20 you've looked at other locations in this area  
21 for this kind of installation and this is the  
22 best location?

1           ARTHUR KREIGER: I mean, not just an  
2 argument. Harvard approved this location.  
3 We had extensive discussions long before we  
4 filed an application about where Harvard was  
5 happy with it. Including where the equipment  
6 needs to go, where the cabling needs to run.  
7 They didn't want equipment sheds sitting on  
8 the ground next to a building. Some of the  
9 older buildings are not easy to work with.  
10 So, the system as a whole, it's an equipment  
11 cabinet and then several antennas wherever  
12 they go. This is where Harvard was satisfied  
13 with.

14           CHARLES STUDEN: Well, interestingly  
15 enough I used to work at Harvard in the  
16 university planning office and so, Harvard's  
17 decided this is the best location for their  
18 antennas? You know. It's kind of --

19           ARTHUR KREIGER: If I may, I think  
20 our representative from Harvard would like to  
21 speak for a moment.

22           MARIA APSE: Hello. My name is

1        Maria Apse, I'm the project manager on this  
2        team.  Basically I've been running with  
3        looking at cell phone projects for about a  
4        year and a half now.  And about a year ago  
5        the residents of the quad actually came to us  
6        looking for some relief in coverage for that  
7        area because in general the way the buildings  
8        are configured, it limits the amount of cell  
9        phone coverage that is not only within the  
10       buildings but within the quad area itself.  
11       And what Art had eluded to earlier was an  
12       incident that had happened in May where there  
13       was a shooting on campus over, I think it was  
14       Kirkland, Kirkland Street.  And we have a  
15       messaging system that alerts members of our  
16       community of emergencies in progress and what  
17       to do.  And it's a text message based  
18       service.  And many of the students that live  
19       within the Radcliff quad did not receive the  
20       text messages in a timely manner mainly  
21       because they were unable to receive signal,  
22       adequate cell signals to their cell phones.

1 We began a very extensive project looking at  
2 and evaluating areas in which we can augment  
3 cell signals within the quad area, including  
4 in-building solutions as well as exterior  
5 solutions. And the solution that became less  
6 obtrusive both from a construction  
7 standpoint, from a disruption to the  
8 residents and the students as well as the  
9 aesthetics of the building, became having a  
10 single antenna placed at the top of Hill es.  
11 The reason Hill es was chosen is because it  
12 can provide the broadest coverage for the  
13 quad area and not getting onto the building  
14 tops that were difficult to build on. Many  
15 of rooftops are slate and pitched and we  
16 cannot place antennas on those roofs. Other  
17 roofs do not provide adequate coverage for  
18 the residents.

19 In addition, we were able to mount this  
20 antenna on the inside portion of the quad so  
21 that the view from the street would be as  
22 unobtrusive as possible. So unfortunately we

1 don't have a projector set up and I can show  
2 you better what the view of the street is.  
3 And essentially you only see an existing  
4 small chimney or some sort of a pipe extended  
5 from the rooftop of Hill es. You don't  
6 actually see that antenna that's protruding  
7 in the front of the building. It's only when  
8 you're walking within the quad and above  
9 Hill es. In addition, our team that evaluated  
10 the design, we have a Harvard planner who is  
11 very attached to this building, who is part  
12 of the design for this building at one time,  
13 and she weighed in on the location of the  
14 antenna and was the one that had decided that  
15 to place an antenna on the roof it would be  
16 best served by not enclosing it in a flew,  
17 and that because of the type of building that  
18 it is, any sort of structure that enclosed  
19 the antenna would make it more obtrusive. So  
20 we did go through several months of planning,  
21 negotiations and discussion about what we  
22 felt to be the most appropriate means of

1        establishing some service for the residents  
2        in the quad. And Harvard Crimson has  
3        published several articles written by the  
4        students with their concern for safety, and  
5        it's a matter of public record. We have  
6        copies of those articles. And we have had  
7        several meetings with student government as  
8        it relates to the community within the quad.  
9        So as a university we are trying to respond  
10        appropriately to students who are concerned  
11        about public safety. And it's really not  
12        about downloading i-Tunes. It's really more  
13        about being able to take advantage of the  
14        safety services that we have throughout the  
15        university, and that the students within the  
16        quad only want to achieve the same level of  
17        service that their fellow students are  
18        getting within Harvard Square.

19                There is no intention to put an antenna  
20        on every roof. There's no intention of, you  
21        know, trying to make a fortune putting up  
22        cell towers. In fact, it is quite costly to

1 do so and it is not something that we intend  
2 to do. We intend to serve the small  
3 population and, you know, basically help them  
4 with their sort of feeling of personal safety  
5 by giving them the same sort of coverage that  
6 they have, that their fellow students have.

7 In addition, Verizon Wireless has  
8 recently installed a cell tower on Mass. Ave.  
9 which basically fills in the quad area for  
10 Verizon service. By adding an AT&T tower to  
11 the site or an antenna to the site, we're  
12 simply adding one more carrier. So now that  
13 there are two carriers which happen to be the  
14 most predominant service providers on campus.  
15 And we feel that this will adequately serve  
16 our students in their need to feel safe with  
17 their cell phones.

18 CHARLES STUDEN: I'm sorry, did you  
19 say Verizon has an installation on Mass. Ave.  
20 that serves the quad?

21 MARIA APSE: Yes.

22 CHARLES STUDEN: Why couldn't theirs

1 be put it in the same location?

2 MARI A APSE: Verizon was able to  
3 negotiate the space. It's up to the building  
4 owner to provide space for the service  
5 providers. And without the opportunity for  
6 AT&T to have space on the building, we were  
7 able to find adequate space on our buildings.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: This is the  
9 frustration I was talking about earlier.  
10 This Board -- we -- I don't know. We always  
11 do this late at night. These cell phone  
12 installations, somehow the company should be  
13 coordinating in some capacity with the cities  
14 and municipalities because this can't be the  
15 only town that they struggle with around  
16 these issues. I know I worked in California  
17 for 11 years in the planning arena, and oh,  
18 my God we had the same discussions exactly  
19 that we're having here. I don't know.  
20 There's no way to do this comprehensively?  
21 You guys with other providers so that these  
22 things get located more comprehensively and

1 the municipalities can look at them  
2 intelligently?

3 ARTHUR KREIGER: There's been a  
4 tremendous movement over the 12, 13 years  
5 since the Federal Telecommunications Act was  
6 passed for carriers to co-locate. And in  
7 many towns, towns have rezoned, towns across  
8 the Commonwealth have rezoned so that for  
9 particular areas a tall tower is allowed.  
10 Because they thought, all right, let's get  
11 all five carriers, all three carriers on one  
12 tower rather than have them proliferating --  
13 this goes on everywhere. But there was not  
14 an opportunity to do it here. As I said, we  
15 looked at Mass. Ave. locations ourselves and  
16 it doesn't provide the coverage for our  
17 network and as Maria described --

18 CHARLES STUDEN: Another technical  
19 but silly question, do these things have to  
20 be vertical they can't be horizontal?

21 ARTHUR KREIGER: It's not a silly  
22 question. And the answer is yes, they do.

1 And the reason, and I'm not a radio frequency  
2 guy, but the reasons as I understand it, is  
3 the propagation of signal is in a certain  
4 cone and it's in a much -- when they're  
5 vertical, it's in a much wider horizontal  
6 cone and only a little bit of a vertical  
7 cone. If you turn them sideways, now you've  
8 got a much wider cone going down to the  
9 ground and very little horizontal coverage.  
10 16 degrees horizontal as opposed to about 65  
11 degrees when they're turned upright. It  
12 means you would need four antennas in a  
13 curved array to get your 65 degrees of  
14 coverage that one vertical antenna would give  
15 you. So, is it possible? Yes. It's not --  
16 no, our guys at AT&T has seen it done that  
17 way and it's not favored.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: It seems to me at  
19 least what I'm hearing is that we need just  
20 -- and particularly from someone like Harvard  
21 we need a more comprehensive look of what  
22 your coverage issues and how you go about

1 doing that. And we can't do it on this kind  
2 of individual basis. And you said you did a  
3 lot of planning and that's great. But you've  
4 now heard what the Planning Board feels about  
5 that. So that -- and I think if you had a  
6 more comprehensive look at the campus, this  
7 is a very valuable and critical piece of  
8 infrastructure that we need and, you know,  
9 let's look at ways of doing that in a  
10 comprehensive way. And in terms of which  
11 carriers you use and which carriers you don't  
12 use and which carriers actually provide the  
13 kind of coverage that you feel you need for  
14 security, too, so that there's this  
15 proliferation of carriers is another issue.  
16 And that's what you were saying about there  
17 is some conference where you can think about  
18 that. And I think we're just getting to a  
19 point here on the Planning Board where these  
20 come to us all the time, that we're kind of  
21 getting to that tipping point where we either  
22 -- with the city's help and whatever we

1 really need you to think about this in a  
2 comprehensive way. But in particularly in  
3 Harvard's case we just need to do that. And  
4 I think you can make many arguments, but I  
5 don't think you're going to change our  
6 thoughts on this, you know, tonight at least.

7 ARTHUR KREIGER: Well, I hope I at  
8 least --

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: Twenty minutes to  
10 eleven.

11 ARTHUR KREIGER: I hope I at least  
12 presented the other side so you can begin to  
13 see the other side of some of these issues.  
14 I sit on the Zoning Board myself. I  
15 understand the frustration with multiple  
16 applications, multiple applications.  
17 Municipalities have their own public safety  
18 needs and they get factored. I don't want to  
19 overplay the security angle. We're not  
20 trying to scare anyone to approving these.  
21 But even before the Harvard incident, of  
22 course, Virginia Tech terrified institutions

1 across the country. And after that there's a  
2 push, you may see it here in Cambridge or  
3 Massachusetts, it's everywhere. We're  
4 institutions. You know, the various  
5 institutions that have these historic  
6 buildings many times and have the planning  
7 concerns and the proliferation of site  
8 concerns that you're articulating, those are  
9 the institutions that want to get the utmost  
10 security for these students because there's a  
11 huge pressure on them to avoid another  
12 situation like that.

13 CHARLES STUDEN: Did you look, and  
14 this is a question for Harvard actually, did  
15 you look at the observatory as a possible  
16 location for these antennas? It's not that  
17 far away and it's higher and, I don't know,  
18 sort of looks like some kind of a cell  
19 installation already.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm not sure I  
21 like that a whole lot better.

22 CHARLES STUDEN: No. But you might

1 be able to mount these vertical elements on a  
2 building like that.

3 ARTHUR KREIGER: It's not far away  
4 for the neighborhood, but I think the answer,  
5 and I didn't, I don't know the searching that  
6 was conducted, it doesn't serve the needs of  
7 the quad.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: I see.

9 ARTHUR KREIGER: Well, if --

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: An advisory  
11 opinion to the BZA.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: You're just getting  
13 -- it's their decision to make.

14 ARTHUR KREIGER: I understand that.  
15 That's okay. It's my opportunity to talk to  
16 you. Any other questions on this?

17 CHARLES STUDEN: No, thank you.

18 ARTHUR KREIGER: I appreciate your  
19 time.

20 THE STENOGRAPHER: May I get your  
21 name, please?

22 MARIA APSE: Maria Apse, A-p-s-e.

1                   ARTHUR KREIGER: And I'd like to  
2                   take back the submissions I handed out. I  
3                   can submit a set tomorrow. Let me pull back  
4                   people's copies.

5                   LES BARBER: That's mine.

6                   WILLIAM TIBBS: And you got the gist  
7                   of our comments?

8                   BETH RUBENSTEIN: I think we did.

9                   Are there any other cases on the BZA  
10                  list for people to comment on?

11                  CHARLES STUDEN: Beth, I had  
12                  mentioned it to you earlier, I don't know if  
13                  any of my colleagues on the Board were  
14                  interested in why -- we had this Hamilton  
15                  Street conversion going to the Board of  
16                  Zoning Appeal reducing -- well, yeah, I guess  
17                  it would be reducing the number of affordable  
18                  units. I read this and I was puzzled by it.  
19                  Maybe you can explain it to me.

20                  BETH RUBENSTEIN: I'll try and shed  
21                  a little light if I can. They have the  
22                  street project, it's a conversion of a

1           previously non-residential building to  
2           residential use. It was -- it was 5.28 kind  
3           of situation, that is the minimum lot area  
4           calculated as per zoning square footage  
5           dividing it by 900. Essentially the city's  
6           interpretation is that when a project -- when  
7           the number of units in a project exceeds the  
8           as of right amount, we calculate the  
9           inclusionary on the total number of units,  
10          not on the base before the bonus. So by our  
11          calculation, it should have been two units of  
12          inclusionary. I think the proponent has a  
13          somewhat different view and they have set  
14          aside one unit. We have agreed that if they  
15          want to go down to one unit, that would have  
16          to be done by variance. So they are seeking  
17          to do that.

18                   WILLIAM TIBBS: So they are in a  
19                   sense going through the process they would go  
20                   through if they have a disagreement in the  
21                   way the --

22                   BETH RUBENSTEIN: That's right.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Would you like the  
3 Planning Board to weigh in on this?

4 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I don't think it's  
5 necessary.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any other cases?

7 PATRICIA SINGER: The sign on  
8 Cambridge Street. We seem to be seeing a lot  
9 of sign variances. I don't know if we care  
10 about this one particularly, but it would  
11 seem to be in keeping with what we've been  
12 doing in the past few -- things we've been  
13 discussing.

14 LES BARBER: This is a proposal,  
15 actually the Enterprise has relocated. They  
16 want to move their sign to the new location  
17 and they added some words to the sign because  
18 of the identification of the company has  
19 changed. And they're moving the existing  
20 sign to the new location. It's -- well, it  
21 was conforming at the old location and it's  
22 not conforming in the new location. Which

1 case is that, Tricia?

2 PATRICIA SINGER: It is 9838.

3 CHARLES STUDEN: 9838.

4 LES BARBER: Maybe they have it --  
5 maybe it's just that they've changed --  
6 they've merged and changed the name of the  
7 company.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: They had too much.

9 PATRICIA SINGER: We might as well  
10 just have another Citgo sign.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: I can't wait to see  
12 it, looking at your reaction.

13 H. THEODORE COHEN: That's there.

14 PATRICIA SINGER: That's there?

15 H. THEODORE COHEN: It's the little  
16 blue one.

17 PATRICIA SINGER: Well, then in that  
18 case.

19 H. THEODORE COHEN: You haven't seen  
20 that one?

21 PATRICIA SINGER: No, truthfully.  
22 And they've been our insurance broker when we

1 first moved here, but we went to Mass. Ave.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: So these are two  
3 different companies?

4 LES BARBER: My understanding is  
5 they merged, maybe so that they're now a  
6 single company.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: They could do  
8 better.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: They sure could.

10 LES BARBER: They don't want to  
11 change the existing sign.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: They could do  
13 better.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: I agree.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think there's  
16 real room for -- I guess -- if they don't  
17 want it, there's a lot of room for  
18 improvement. I don't know what the others  
19 think.

20 CHARLES STUDEN: What's been  
21 proposed?

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: The comment is they

1 could do better.

2 LES BARBER: The blue one is being  
3 added.

4 CHARLES STUDEN: This blue thing is  
5 not there now?

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Correct.

7 LES BARBER: I think on another page  
8 there is a picture of the existing.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: It seems a little  
10 small and out of scale with the rest of the  
11 signage.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: If we started  
13 with an existing and then saw a proposed.

14 LES BARBER: There is one on a  
15 smaller scale.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do we want to say  
17 anything about this?

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: See what the  
19 others say.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do you think they  
21 could do better? Do you care?

22 CHARLES STUDEN: Is the existing

1 sign adequate?

2 LES BARBER: Oh, I see, they sort of  
3 moving things around.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So we might ask them  
5 to explore options that are more compliant.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right.

7 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Okay, sounds good.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess we are  
9 adjourned.

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thank you all very  
11 much.

12 (Whereupon, at 10:50 p.m., the  
13 meeting adjourned.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

## C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BRISTOL, SS.

I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned  
Notary Public, certify that:

I am not related to any of the parties  
in this matter by blood or marriage and that  
I am in no way interested in the outcome of  
this matter.

I further certify that the testimony  
hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate  
transcription of my stenographic notes to the  
best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
my hand this 2nd day of October 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Catherine L. Zelinski  
Notary Public  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License No. 147703

My Commission Expires:  
April 23, 2015

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS  
TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION  
OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE  
DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE  
CERTIFYING REPORTER.