

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

Tuesday, October 20, 2009

7:30 p.m.

in

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

- William Tibbs, Chair
- Thomas Anninger, Acting Vice Chair
- Hugh Russell, Member
- H. Theodore Cohen, Member
- Patricia Singer, Member
- Steven Winter, Member
- Ahmed Nur, Member

Beth Rubenstein,
Assistant City Manager
for Community Development

Liza Paden
Les Barber
Roger Booth



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

| | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | <u>GENERAL BUSINESS</u> | Page |
| 4 | Update by Beth Rubenstein | 3 |
| 5 | <u>PUBLIC HEARINGS</u> | |
| 6 | PUD Special Permit #52 | |
| 7 | Sonesta Hotel | 5 |
| 8 | PB#241, 1991 and 2013 Massachusetts Avenue | 27 |
| 9 | <u>GENERAL BUSINESS</u> | |
| 10 | 1. PB#198, Discovery Park | 197 |
| 11 | a. Review of Changes | |
| 12 | b. Buildings 200 & 300 | 208 |
| 13 | 2. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases | 11 |
| 14 | 3. Other | 222 |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Welcome to the
3 October 20th meeting of the Cambridge
4 Planning Board. We have two public hearings
5 tonight. One is a major amendment to a PUD
6 for the Sonesta Hotel, and the other is our
7 case No. 241, 1991 and 2013 Mass. Ave. for a
8 46-unit residential development and
9 demolition and redevelopment of an existing
10 Saint James parish hall.

11 Before we get into all that business,
12 do we have any updates from Beth?

13 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thanks, Bill.
14 Just anticipating the Planning Board schedule
15 for the coming month. Generally we meet the
16 first and third Tuesday of the month, but we
17 don't meet on Election Day. So this November
18 the Board will be meeting twice, on November
19 10th and 17th.

20 Right now on the 10th we don't have the
21 agenda firmed up. If any of the items from
22 tonight are not completed, they might spill

1 over onto the 10th. And we do know that on
2 November 17th we schedule -- we had scheduled
3 a public hearing for a citizen petition,
4 zoning petition, the so-called Fanning
5 Petition, that is in effect in the vicinity
6 of Finney Street and Cardinal Medeiros.

7 In December the Board will be meeting
8 on December 1st and December 15th. And,
9 again, those agendas are still to be
10 determined.

11 And actually, just for those who follow
12 the Planning Board's business, every year the
13 universities present their annual town down
14 reports to the Planning Board, and those
15 meetings have been scheduled, and they're
16 going to take place on February 2, 2010.

17 And while we're just talking about
18 upcoming events, for folks who are interested
19 in Central Square, there's going to be a
20 Central Square charette this coming Thursday
21 night at six p.m., and I believe it's at the
22 Senior Center. On Bishop Allen Drive at

1 Saint Paul ' s A and B Church.

2 And I think that is it.

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Thank you,
4 Beth.

5 As I said, the first public hearing is
6 a major amendment to the PUD. It's the
7 second public hearing in a PUD process. We
8 had one the last time we met, then we made a
9 preliminary determination, and now we need to
10 make our final determination on the project.

11 Well, for the public, in terms of the
12 rules of public hearings, typically we first
13 have the proponent give their case in the
14 public hearings. And then after that the
15 Planning Board will ask any clarifying
16 questions they have. And typically those
17 questions are primarily just clarifying
18 issues in the proponent's presentation. Then
19 we open the floor up for public comment.
20 During the public comment period there is a
21 sign-up sheet, and we like you to sign up for
22 that. And we ask people to speak for

1 approxim atel y three mi nutes. And I'II repeat
2 all thi s before we do the next publ ic
3 heari ng, too. But as I sai d, we ask peopl e
4 to speak for approxi matel y three mi nutes.
5 And we do have a timer to do that so we can
6 warn peopl e when they' re getti ng close. If
7 peopl e had not -- ei ther were late or were
8 not abl e to sign up or change thei r mi nd
9 after si tti ng and heari ng the testi mony, we
10 do ask, before we close the publ ic heari ng
11 for publ ic comment, if there' s anybody el se
12 who wants to speak. So you' II al ways have an
13 opportuni ty to speak regardl ess of whether or
14 not you si gned up. And after that, dependi ng
15 on the amount of time we have, the Pl anni ng
16 Board wi ll then ask addi ti onal questi ons and
17 cl ari fi ca ti ons. And if i t' s an eas y i ssue,
18 we wi ll del i berate and act. But we typi cal l y
19 don' t do that on the same ni ght. So, I j ust
20 want to gi ve you fai r warni ng.

21 So wi th that, I wi ll start the fi rst
22 publ ic heari ng wi th the Sonesta Hotel . And I

1 guess I should ask you, as I said, we do have
2 a preliminary finding. And has there been or
3 are you desiring any change in your
4 preliminary hearing?

5 JOSEPH O'TOOLE: It will be as
6 presented originally.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I think because
8 of the fact there may be people here who are
9 interested, who are -- who weren't here for
10 the first public hearing, if you can give
11 maybe a brief overview of what you're doing.

12 JOSEPH O'TOOLE: Excellent.

13 Good evening. My name is Joe O'Toole.
14 I represent the Royal Sonesta Hotel. What
15 we're proposing is a major amendment to the
16 PUD in order to allow for the construction of
17 a fixed canopy structure on an existing
18 restaurant patio approximately 1100 square
19 feet at the Royal Sonesta Hotel. We'll be
20 covering approximately half of that space
21 with this canopy. It will be a steel
22 construction awning fabric covered, year

1 round structure.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

3 One thing I didn't mention, we have one
4 member who is not here tonight and so we have
5 to appoint one of our two associate members
6 as a voting member tonight. And I do
7 believe, and based on the way we did it
8 before, you were next, Charles.

9 CHARLES STUDEN: I'm not sure I can
10 do it. I wasn't here at the last --

11 LIZA PADEN: This is a whole new
12 hearing.

13 CHARLES STUDEN: Oh.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are you familiar
15 with the --

16 CHARLES STUDEN: Good.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: As I said, we did a
18 preliminary finding last time and there are
19 no changes to that. So I guess I'll open the
20 floor for public comment.

21 So is there anybody here who would like
22 to have any public comments on this

1 particular issue?

2 (No response).

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Let the record show
4 that no one wanted to avail themselves of that
5 opportunity. So we will close the public
6 hearing, which we typically do for verbal
7 comment at this point in time. We usually
8 leave the hearing open for written comment.
9 But in this case, I think we are -- since we
10 have -- we made a preliminary determination
11 and there's no change, we'll probably make
12 our vote right now. So, there won't be too
13 much written comment I guess. So we are
14 closing the public hearing for verbal
15 comment.

16 Any other comments or questions from
17 the Planning Board?

18 So would someone like to make a motion?

19 STEVEN WINTER: I will,
20 Mr. Chairman.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Steve.

22 STEVEN WINTER: I move that we

1 accept the recommendations in the preliminary
2 determination and use this as our basis to
3 approve this major amendment -- final
4 development proposal. Thank you.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: All right. We have
6 a motion.

7 Do we have a second?

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Second.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: We do have a second
10 from Tom.

11 All those in favor?

12 (Show of hands.)

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

14 JOE O'TOOLE: Thank you.

15 (Tibbs, Singer, Winter, Cohen,
16 Anninger, Studen, Russell.)

17

18 * * * *

19

20

21

22

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: We can't start the
2 next public hearing until eight o'clock which
3 is the official time that it's published for.
4 So I think that if it's all right with Liza,
5 we might see if we can do some of the BZA
6 cases. Liza, we'd like to do some BZA cases
7 for 15 minutes if that's all right.

8 LIZA PADEN: The BZA agenda I have
9 is for November and I'll go get my cases and
10 be back.

11 (Whereupon, a discussion was
12 held off the record.)

13 LIZA PADEN: One of the cases I
14 wanted to bring to the Board's attention is
15 the telecommunications antenna that's on Main
16 Street. It's case No. 9861, 400 Main Street.
17 And this is another case of an antenna
18 installation which was permitted by the Board
19 of Zoning Appeal but not constructed. I did
20 some research on this, and the Planning Board
21 objected to some of the installation that was
22 proposed. And unfortunately I don't have the

1 full decision from the Board of Zoning Appeal
2 so I'm not sure exactly what was granted.
3 But my suggestion to the Board is that they
4 resubmit the original -- and I'll show it to
5 you in a second, the original comments.
6 Because of the three antenna installations,
7 one is a sled mount which shows up vividly on
8 Main Street. This is an MIT building. So I
9 would suggest that you put that suggestion
10 back out there.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you remind me
12 when we -- when that last --

13 LIZA PADEN: You saw it in July --
14 I'm sorry, November of 2006. And it was
15 decided in January of 2007. In the decision,
16 they for some reason, the Board of Zoning
17 Appeal did not support the Planning Board's
18 comments as strongly. I think that what they
19 felt was it was Kendall Square, so I don't
20 know. I can't make the assumption. So you
21 have a chance to say to them no, we don't
22 like it still.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Or change our mind.

2 LIZA PADEN: Or change your mind and
3 say you do like it.

4 These are the photo simulations, pass
5 it down.

6 (Looking over documents.)

7 LIZA PADEN: That's the site. This
8 is the sled that they're proposing to mount
9 one of the sets of antenna on (indicating).
10 And the complication with the sled mounts is
11 that they're mounted on a frame that sits at
12 the edge of the building roof. And so you
13 have -- they're very visible from Main Street
14 and Galileo Way.

15 Now, one of the installations is a
16 stealth installation which is a fiberglass
17 tube. It's supposed to mimic the existing
18 stacks that are on the roof. But what I'm
19 objecting to is this free-standing mount here
20 (indicating). Oh, I'm sorry, it's on this
21 edge of the building, so that's the profile.

22 AHMED NUR: (Inaudible.)

1 LIZA PADEN: These are being added
2 to existing brick (indicating). So that's
3 the same. And then on this one, these are
4 the faux stacks which are looking like the
5 existing -- some of the existing features.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see.

7 LIZA PADEN: This is the sled mount
8 over here, which sits in front. It sits at
9 the edge of the roof. So that's what my
10 objection was. These are all -- except for
11 these four. 1, 2, 3, 4, those are the four.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: How do you feel
13 about the stacks?

14 LIZA PADEN: The stacks don't bother
15 me so much, because in character they're like
16 the existing features on the roof. And while
17 they're new features, they look like existing
18 ones.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't understand
20 why they didn't alter this, given the
21 principles that we've developed and the
22 comments that we've made. Because this is --

1 LIZA PADEN: I can't answer that
2 questi on.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thi s devi ates
4 dramati call y from what we' ve been doi ng for
5 the last several years.

6 LIZA PADEN: I don' t know why they
7 di d that.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: It' s above the
9 corneous line, it' s everything that we' ve
10 been trying to come to terms wi th.

11 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Di d you say you have
13 our last comments or the Board' s last
14 comment?

15 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Some members weren' t
17 here.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thi s j ust doesn' t
19 fi t wi th what we' ve been aski ng peopl e to do
20 for the last several years.

21 LIZA PADEN: No.

22 THOMAS ANNINGER: Not even cl ose.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: There are either two
2 approaches. It does fit, it's just one
3 that....

4 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

5 I don't know where those pieces of
6 paper are. I have every other piece of paper
7 but those two.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Do they want it
9 down there?

10 LIZA PADEN: Yes. The photo sims --
11 we can pass them down. What I can do is I
12 can forward to the Board tomorrow
13 electronically the comments I sent
14 previously, and then if you agree, I can send
15 those again. Okay.

16 Were there any other comments on the
17 other cases since I have two more minutes?

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: All I would say is
19 that we were feeling our way a little bit
20 more in 2006 than in 2009. And so I think
21 you would be able to see if we have clearer
22 advice today than we used to back then.

1 Perhaps not. Perhaps it was just as clear
2 back then, but I'm not sure.

3 LIZA PADEN: On this installation it
4 was pretty clear in my opinion.

5 Are there any other questions.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I'd like to
7 send a support for the subdivision at 2419
8 Mass. Avenue, case --

9 LIZA PADEN: Oh, yes.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: -- 9859. Saying that
11 we granted the permit and feel that
12 subdividing the property is better than a
13 condominium.

14 LIZA PADEN: Granted the permit and
15 support the subdivision.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I add
17 something to that? Hugh pointed out, and I
18 think Les did, too, that because of the
19 separation, there is a fallout in terms of
20 floor area ratio -- an increased permitted
21 floor area ratio. And I thought at least
22 some of us agreed that that was an unintended

1 consequence, and we were thinking it back
2 when we approved this that we would make a
3 recommendation that the condition would be to
4 not allow any increased floor area as a
5 result of this separation. I don't know how
6 others feel about that, but that made sense
7 to me.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: My recollection was
9 that we were not going to not allow it, but
10 that we wanted to see what they proposed if
11 that additional FAR was granted. Is that
12 right?

13 LIZA PADEN: I unfortunately was not
14 there.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. We
16 were going to see if something happened to
17 it. But I think on the question of whether
18 we would make a recommendation whether or not
19 to allow it, I think we left that open for
20 further discussion. So we could still decide
21 how to handle that I think.

22 BETH RUBENSTEIN: My recollection

1 was that you were going to support the
2 subdivi si on, but if the subdivi si on resul ted
3 in seri ous changes to the proj ect, you woul d
4 want to see those changes. It wasn' t clear
5 whether or not the subdivi si on was going to
6 change the proj ect.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: That' s correct.
8 All that is right. What I' m saying is do we
9 want to say anything about whether this is an
10 advi sabl e change?

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Another way of
12 putting it is that we woul d support the
13 subdivi si on so that the proj ect as presented
14 to us coul d go forward appropri ately.
15 Because they might wel l condi ti on the
16 subdivi si on on those pl ans, too, j ust as we
17 frequentl y make condi ti ons that aren' t
18 deci si ons.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Ri ght. I' m not
20 sure they' re going to get the poi nt if we say
21 it -- I thi nk that' s a l i t t l e ob l i q u e don' t
22 you thi nk?

1 LES BARBER: The consequence of the
2 subdi vi si on i s that there woul d be 30,000
3 square feet of devel opment on the housi ng
4 site that i s not otherwi se avai l a bl e i f i t' s
5 on the subdi vi ded.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: I t' s 3,000. I sn' t i t
7 3,000?

8 LES BARBER: Oh, that coul d be. I
9 mi ght be addi ng a zero there.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: I t' s about three
11 uni ts.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: But my
13 recol l ection was that we had di scussed
14 whether we coul d l et i t go forward on the
15 exi sti ng appl i cati on, we concl uded that we
16 coul d not. And that i f they wanted to change
17 what was i n thei r pl ans, they woul d have to
18 come back to us wi th revi sed pl ans. And I --
19 we can then determi ne whether we l i ke i t or
20 don' t l i ke i t. I don' t thi nk, you know,
21 specul ati ng on what they mi ght do wi th the
22 l and i f they get the vari ance i s of any

1 particular virtue right now. We ought to
2 wait to see what they propose.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, we're
4 talking about two different things almost.
5 We're not speculating. We're talking about
6 whether this is an intended consequence or
7 not, and whether we want to speak to it or
8 whether we just let the Board figure it out
9 for themselves. As I understood it, the way
10 Les explained it to me -- maybe, Les, you can
11 explain it again. When you separate these
12 things and somehow the numbers change by
13 dividing the lots, you get different results,
14 and the original allowed FAR was based on the
15 combined lots. And to separate them later
16 and allow for greater square footage, greater
17 FAR is an unintended consequence.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think that's true,
19 but I guess the real question is what are our
20 comments on this particular item on their
21 agenda which is nothing more than the
22 separation of the property? If we understand

1 the unintended consequence, we also
2 understood that if they made a change, they'd
3 have to come back to us for that. So Hugh
4 suggested that we -- we thought that if the
5 separation was a good thing when we reviewed
6 it, we can either comment or not comment.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Enough said.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: I'm not quite sure
9 if this is the -- if we can -- how much we
10 can say at this point about this item that
11 gets to our point. I'm hoping that our point
12 was made when we made it so that we have the
13 opportunity to see it if they want to make a
14 change to that. But I'm not quite -- and is
15 that the case? If it is an unintended
16 consequence, will they still have to come
17 back before us? Or the fact that they got
18 that consequence mean they don't have to come
19 back?

20 LES BARBER: Our permit as it is
21 written says that they must come back and get
22 an amendment to the permit to use any

1 additional floor area. It may not be obvious
2 to the Board unless the applicant makes it
3 explicit that the subdivision does result in
4 granting an additional 3,000 square feet that
5 isn't there now. You can just indicate to
6 the Board that that's the case and not
7 comment on whether that's (inaudible) or not.
8 Just to make them aware that that is one of
9 the results of the subdivision.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: How do you feel
11 about that?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, my personal
13 view is that we should -- we should say to
14 the Zoning Board that they should condition
15 the subdivision so that doesn't happen.
16 That's my personal point of view. But I
17 think that's maybe beyond where the rest of
18 the Board is. So I think we should at least
19 make them aware that they should address that
20 issue in their decision. This is the
21 consequence of the subdivision, is that
22 unless they -- is that there would be more

1 floor area unless they address it somehow.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Comments? Go
3 ahead, Ted.

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: I personally
5 don't know that I am opposed to them getting
6 the additional space and their ability to use
7 it based upon what they showed us. But I
8 think we were all in agreement that we
9 preferred the variance route to doing it as a
10 condominium. So I think we all ought to
11 support the variance proposal. And I have no
12 problem with pointing out to the ZBA what one
13 consequence may be, but I feel comfortable if
14 they want to change what we already
15 authorized, they have to come back to us and
16 make a presentation at which time we can
17 decide whether it's a good idea or not.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any other comments?

19 So how does the Board feel, with our
20 BZA comments, based on our past history, I
21 want to make sure we're all in agreement with
22 what's being said prior to us saying it even

1 though we don't have to vote on these kinds
2 of things. My feeling is that we're not all
3 in agreement, we can't say it. Or we can
4 just indicate that there was a divided
5 opinion and here were the two opinions.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, maybe one
7 way of saying it is that we support the
8 separation. And one consequence of that
9 separation is an increased square footage
10 FAR. And we leave it to the Zoning Board to
11 decide whether they think it's appropriate or
12 not. We leave it to the Zoning Board for
13 them to decide that question.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, we always
15 leave it to them. That's what they're there
16 for. We're bringing up those issues.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I think you
18 can say, though, that there's an issue
19 whether or not that's an intended
20 consequence.

21 CHARLES STUDEN: I think we need to
22 further add that if additional square footage

1 is granted, that the Planning Board would be
2 -- have an opportunity to review that and
3 certainly say yes. Because otherwise it's --
4 I'm not sure that the BZA is going to be
5 comfortable in granting it if they don't know
6 what they're going to do with it. I think we
7 need to make it clear that they have to come
8 back to us if it were granted for us to
9 approve it. I know it would be helpful to me
10 if I was on the BZA in making that decision.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I think that
12 lays out the facts which I think is -- which
13 I think I'm uncomfortable with. It appears
14 we are all uncomfortable with that.

15 LIZA PADEN: Okay. And I'll send a
16 copy of the decision to the BZA as well.

17
18 * * * *
19
20
21
22

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay, great. All
2 right, it is after eight so we can start the
3 second public hearing.

4 For those people who have arrived late,
5 I'll just go over the process of the public
6 hearing one more time. There is a sign-up
7 sheet and we ask people to sign up on the
8 sign-up sheet. It helps me -- it helps us
9 manage the flow of people. If for whatever
10 reason you did not have an opportunity to
11 sign up or you change your mind in the course
12 of the hearing, we do give an opportunity for
13 folks to speak at the end if they haven't
14 signed up. So I just want to let you know
15 that. This clearly is -- there are a lot of
16 people here who wish to talk on this issue.
17 Typically we start the hearing with the
18 proponent giving their case. They will do
19 that. The Planning Board will ask clarifying
20 questions to get a better understanding.
21 Then we open up the hearing for public
22 comments. We ask people to speak for no more

1 than about three minutes. And our member
2 Charles has a timer and will remind people
3 when they get close to that. We'd ask you to
4 come up and speak at the podium if you can
5 and speak in the mic. And the recorder asks
6 that you give your name and address and spell
7 your name when you speak.

8 My understanding is that the -- several
9 of the people who would like to speak at
10 public hearing have decided to combine their
11 efforts and do a PowerPoint presentation. So
12 it's our choice as to whether or not we can
13 do that. I think my -- I personally feel
14 it's okay if it's brief and it's not going to
15 go on forever and ever. And I just wondered
16 if the Board is okay with that. Then we'll
17 probably -- once we get to that point, we'll
18 probably start the public comment with that
19 presentation. And in that case, I just want
20 to let people know that because it's a lot of
21 you, you don't have to repeat the same things
22 over and over. Hopefully you have made a

1 good case so people can say you agree with
2 it. But you don't have to state it over and
3 over again. It doesn't improve our sense of
4 comprehension to have six people say the
5 exact same thing over and over again. But it
6 is good for us to know that six people are
7 very much in an agreement with what is being
8 said.

9 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Chair,
10 may I ask a procedural question just to get
11 it on the record?

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

13 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: The question
14 was raised as to whether this public hearing
15 was advertised in accordance with Chapter
16 40A, the full two weeks before the hearing
17 date.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

19 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I'm
20 wondering if staff can address that?

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Can staff address
22 that?

1 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I believe it was.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. The staff
3 feels it was for the record.

4 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I guess what
5 appeared in the Chronicle was something
6 listed as a correction notice?

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, I don't know
8 those details. So I can only go by -- as far
9 as we're concerned, I can only go by what the
10 staff has said it is. And if there's a
11 differential there, you can talk to the staff
12 about that.

13 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: And just for
14 the record, my understanding is the first
15 publication was on the 8th of the month which
16 would fall short of the necessary 14 days,
17 and that's all. Thank you.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: All right.

19 So as I said -- yes, Beth?

20 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I was just asking
21 her something.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. So as I said,

1 housing company. And we care very much about
2 how buildings can do their part to minimize
3 minimal, minimize the global warming. And
4 this is something that we've been doing for
5 over 35 years primarily in this town. And we
6 have -- we were doing smart growth before
7 there was a term smart growth. We've been
8 building residential communities throughout
9 the city, some of which you're familiar.
10 This is actually where I live, which is only
11 a few blocks from the subject site.
12 Cambridge Co-housing, we also recently
13 completed a building on the corner right
14 beside where we live called Richdale Place.
15 And one of the bigger projects that we have
16 done over the years, many years ago, was
17 Thomas Graves Landing. But we've done a lot
18 of other ones, smaller conversions, and
19 maybe, maybe up to a thousand. I haven't
20 done a recent count. But we've -- these are
21 all projects that are transit-oriented and
22 they are communities that we firmly believe

1 contribute to the vitality and the safety of
2 Cambridge, to animate the local streets with
3 pedestrians, and they support local shops and
4 institutions, the culture of politics and the
5 economy of the city. And they, as
6 multi-family housing communities, we have
7 found that the statistics are that the CO2
8 emissions from a multi-family resident is
9 about half of what it is for a normal
10 single-family home. And when you add that to
11 the diminution of CO2 emissions that happens
12 when people live close to where they can take
13 public transportation or work, then it
14 reduces the CO emissions even more. So
15 transit-oriented housing is very much what
16 we're about. And as I've said, we've
17 dedicated our life for 35 years as architects
18 and developers to do this.

19 When we found the car wash site, it
20 fitted into our development model very well.
21 At the time that we found it, we didn't think
22 that we'd be having the serious conversation

1 with the Saint James Church, but we thought
2 that maybe it could be 20 or more housing
3 units. And as I said, it would be a smart
4 growth site and we would be building green
5 housing that would be qualified for a lead
6 certification. And as you can see, it's
7 right on Mass. Avenue. Right on a bike way.
8 There's good public transportation by bus or
9 by the T. And it's a walk to Harvard Square
10 -- I mean, to Porter Square and Davis Square.
11 And importantly that 60-foot curb cut there
12 that you can see along Mass. Avenue would be
13 greatly diminished and maybe even go away.
14 This is a way of restoring the street scape,
15 which on Mass. Avenue, particularly on the
16 other side of the street there are many,
17 three- and four-story, even five, down the
18 street, Henderson Carriage I think that's
19 seven stories. This particular site is a
20 missing tooth in the fabric of Mass. Avenue.

21 As we thought about the garden space at
22 Saint James, it was evident that it was an

1 underused asset that the church had. It was
2 a hangout for homeless people. And it was
3 something that we thought, well, we might be
4 able to work with the church in making it be
5 a place that could work for both the housing
6 next-door and the church. So we entered into
7 a conversation with the church about it, and
8 quite to our surprise the conversation
9 evolved over a period of weeks into something
10 more serious. And pretty soon it was clear
11 that we needed to talk to the neighborhood
12 about the possibility of our working
13 together. And very soon it became a quite
14 engaging conversation. And over the year --
15 I don't know, year and a half that it's been
16 going on, this has been something where
17 there's been a lot of e-mails, a lot of
18 meetings, probably a dozen meetings that
19 we've had and the church has had with
20 neighbors, and there's been a lot of dialogue
21 about this. One of the things that has been
22 particularly central to the dialogue has been

1 the amount of open space and the importance
2 of the open space that is at the church. And
3 the green oval there represents the usable
4 space of the garden today. And we have,
5 working with the preservation of that garden
6 and the usable part of it, and we've also
7 been -- we just did some calculations about
8 what the garden space is today and what it
9 will be if we complete the project. And it
10 turns out that the number is 38 percent in
11 both cases. It's 38 percent in this
12 rendering which you see of the two sites put
13 together as being green and landscaped space,
14 and 38 percent as the church stands today.
15 It's just the open space has been rearranged.
16 As a site on Mass. Avenue there isn't a
17 requirement for open space, but obviously
18 it's something we care about. And over the
19 course of our doing the planning, we have --
20 we've provided many small changes to the
21 plans that give greater views down the
22 street, making the setbacks greater, thinking

1 about the materials that could work with the
2 neighbors, and how the landscape would be,
3 how the buffer zones between the buildings
4 and the neighbors would be planted, etcetera.

5 As the notes that you've been given
6 say, we actually could have built by the
7 allowable zoning another 17,000 square feet
8 on the project. But we feel that the choices
9 we've made to preserve the usable garden were
10 important, and it was certainly important to
11 the church. And I should also say that very
12 important to the church was the fact that we
13 are -- as I earlier said, are green
14 developers. And this is a very high priority
15 for them. So, one of the good things about
16 the whole process that we've gone through,
17 which has had its rough times, has been that
18 the association of the church and Oaktree has
19 been a most congenial one. I've appreciated
20 that a lot.

21 Talking about the traffic briefly,
22 there's been a lot of discussion about

1 traffic. And I'm not going to go into any
2 detail, but just to say we have done a
3 traffic study, a very complete traffic study.
4 And Scott Thornton is here if there are
5 specific questions that come up about it.
6 But I'd like to say that the results of the
7 traffic study, as well as the review of it
8 that was made by the Cambridge Traffic
9 Department, was that there would be no
10 significant change in the level of traffic
11 that this project would be causing
12 specifically. I mean, as the notes in the
13 narrative explain, the current traffic
14 demands for the church have been put between
15 the two aspects of the church on Mass. Ave.
16 And Beach Street and with most of the
17 functions moving to Mass. Avenue with the car
18 traffic. And the residential portion using
19 the Beach Street access.

20 Going back to the traffic, the traffic
21 study said the impact on the local streets --
22 on Beach Street, which is where the primary

1 concern has been, would be one car every five
2 minutes during the afternoon peak hour and
3 morning peak hour, and one car every three
4 minutes in the evening peak hour. And the
5 city has made various recommendations as to
6 traffic mitigation, things that we can do,
7 which include T passes and encouraging people
8 to use public transportation. As well as we
9 have very accessible bike spaces and more
10 that are required by the zoning.

11 So, in sum I think in our mind this is
12 going to be an asset to the community for
13 many reasons. One, primarily, I think not
14 just the new addition of housing that's
15 transit-oriented, green and so on and so
16 forth, but also the fact that the church is
17 going to have a new lease on life. And to
18 speak to that, Holly Antolini who is the
19 director of the church is going to give the
20 next portion of our presentation.

21 HOLLY ANTOLINI: Thank you, Gwen.
22 I'm Holly Antolini, the director of Saint

1 James' s. And as Gwen says, thi s has been a
2 remarkabl y congeni al worki ng rel ati onshi p
3 between Oaktree and Sai nt Jameses, and of
4 course the di ocese, the Epi scopal Di ocese of
5 Massachusetts who are the actual owners of
6 our property.

7 For the better part of a generati on our
8 vi tal mi ni stry at Sai nt Jameses has been
9 burdened and di stracted by the i ncreasi ng
10 possi bi li ty of mai ntai ni ng our hi stori c
11 church, or urban garden and our sprawl i ng
12 11-level pari sh house. We are a 300 person
13 pari sh, yet we have not been abl e to fi nd the
14 resources to keep up wi th the decay of our
15 bui l di ngs and grounds. Even the huge effort
16 of our \$600,000 capi tal campai gn compl eted
17 l ast year wi th grant hel p from the ci ty and
18 state onl y managed to shore up the masonry of
19 the church' s west bel l tower. So when Gwen
20 Noyes of Oaktree Devel opment vi si ted Sai nt
21 Jameses a year and a hal f ago and proposed a
22 resi denti al condomini um on the nei ghbori ng

1 car wash, we saw in her interest a truly
2 grace-filled answer to our all of our
3 fruitless blue ribbon commissions trying to
4 solve our property problems. By partnering
5 with Oaktree to make a larger condominium
6 complex, we plan to replace a rambling,
7 decrepit, non-ADA compliant, energy leaking,
8 inefficient, money gobbling parish house with
9 a new ADA compliant, green-certified,
10 efficiently designed, maintainable parish
11 house that completely embraces and connects
12 with our publicly accessible garden and
13 brings our church face and our missionary
14 activity up to Massachusetts Avenue, making
15 it a visible encouragement to Massachusetts
16 Avenue foot traffic as well as connecting our
17 parish house to our church's main west door
18 for the first time in our history.

19 The development not only enhances our
20 community ministry and makes our garden a
21 community amenity, instead of a community
22 liability; it also stands to give us the

1 basis for a reasonable endowment to repair
2 and maintain our historic landmark church.
3 This is truly the jump start that moves the
4 Saint James' s congregation out of its near
5 desperate energy drain to new energy and new
6 life directed outward in the vital ministry
7 to its surrounding community and abroad;
8 including our three day a week food pantry,
9 our weekly dinner for vulnerable women, the
10 prison ministry, the ministry of hospitality
11 to African and South Asian scholars at the
12 Episcopal Divinity School as well as three
13 missionaries serving abroad in Burundi ,
14 Ecuador and San Jose, Costa Rica.

15 Saint James has not only brought land
16 to the agreement with Oaktree, it also
17 brought really significant architectural
18 talent and vision. As it looked to provide a
19 development that despite its size would serve
20 as an innovative, environmentally sensitive,
21 world class aesthetic foil to our beautiful
22 historic jewel of the a church and the open

1 green space of our garden. Out of a team of
2 architect congregation members working on
3 this project, Saint James' s own friend Rick
4 Dumont has brought the firm of Sasaki
5 Associates where he is a principal for the
6 design work with Oaktree, and so I invite
7 Rick to come speak to us about that.

8 Thank you.

9 RICARDO DUMONT: Thank you, Holly.
10 Board. Again my name is Ricardo
11 Dumont. I'm both a member of the
12 congregation. I'm also an architect and
13 urban designer representing Oaktree,
14 obviously and the church, and then a partner
15 at the firm of Sasaki in Watertown.

16 So I'm going to speak about the facts
17 which underscore what these two women have
18 put forth. So what is the major idea here?

19 The idea is that we take an urban
20 regeneration idea, that is certainly part of
21 our charter as a city but also a charter of
22 an urban development idea. So there's a

1 mission from the redevelopment idea. Then
2 there is the church as a community idea. So
3 the idea is highly combine the redevelopment
4 regeneration idea with the church community
5 both inward and outreach idea to form a true
6 win/win solution for both church,
7 redevelopment, city and city neighborhood
8 which the partner was in.

9 So there are two big issues. I'm going
10 to start at the large scale and look at some
11 maps here, and then to the smaller scale. So
12 two big issues.

13 One is geography. And of course the
14 site-- I'm going to go through a couple
15 clips here. The site is shown as you see,
16 the word "site". Mass. Avenue is the large
17 street, we'll identify those in a second.
18 Two key locations. Why is the site that Gwen
19 has spoken about and Holly as well are so
20 important?

21 First of all, it sits between the two
22 major transit stops in this area of Cambridge

1 and Somerville. So tremendous locational
2 advantages as an urban idea. So the whole
3 urban idea that Gwen put forth is this -- you
4 couldn't ask for a better site.

5 Second. From a walkability it's really
6 within 2,000 feet from the T stop at Porter
7 Square and 3,000 feet from the Davis Square T
8 stop. And their associated retail
9 components. So truly, it is truly a walkable
10 site. So, that has tremendous advantages.

11 A street network. Obviously a thicker
12 white line is showing Mass. Ave. which is as
13 you know, a median street which has of course
14 multiple T stops along it for transit for the
15 bus system. Elm Street is the street you see
16 from the other side, the Somerville side of
17 the site which is a major connector in
18 Somerville. And between them is the sort of
19 ladder approach of streets which are both two
20 way and our corner here next to our site is
21 of course which is Beach which is a two way
22 street. Davenport further closer to Porter

1 Square is another two way street. And then a
2 system of one way pair of streets that link
3 as you get closer to Davis Square.

4 So that is sort of the urban context.
5 And if you are looking for an urban
6 regeneration idea, you couldn't ask for a
7 better site.

8 So, your current overlay district of
9 course says that this is a site, because of
10 these advantages, that we look at the zoning
11 differently. We have an overlay that looks
12 it and encouraging a mixed use idea which
13 we're going to talk about. And hence again
14 everything is conforming to the wishes of the
15 city in the neighborhood. Okay, thank you.

16 So let's now talk about the
17 neighborhood, because this is a hugely
18 important thing to Saint James. The
19 neighborhood, if you look at this map, one of
20 the most striking things you see in this map
21 is there is no designed or designated civic
22 open space here. There are no parks in this

1 area part of Cambridge and Somerville.
2 Basically the open space are the city
3 streets, good or bad. The clusters of
4 private space in the neighborhoods
5 themselves, which is wonderful in this area.
6 And the one significant open space in this
7 entire area is of course the Saint James
8 garden. So, the church wouldn't even
9 conceive of any development idea that would
10 not entertain in keeping that garden moving
11 forward, and actually using -- it utilizing
12 it as a better asset for the city and the
13 neighborhood and for the church itself.
14 Obviously there are advantages from
15 development.

16 The current composition on the two
17 sites -- so you have just go back one, Phil.
18 So on the left of the green -- or the upper
19 side of the green is the current car wash
20 site which is basically 100 percent
21 impervious site. You have the garden idea.
22 And then you have the church in two pieces,

1 the historic building we all know and love
2 and then of course the parish hall which
3 Holly says is full of 11 levels (inaudible)
4 anyhow. I never knew that. But the total of
5 11 levels of grade changes in there level
6 within that, a building that was added over
7 time. There used to be another chapel here
8 at one time.

9 So on the left of course, in the upper
10 side of course is the car wash site which is
11 a zero lot line on the Blake Street side of
12 that. And then surrounded by asphalt for the
13 entire site, and as Gwen pointed out a
14 60-foot curb cut. Then you have the garden
15 site, the stunning garden about 55 feet by
16 112. The historic church building on the
17 corner, and then the parish hall, and then
18 another parking lot on -- about 18 cars, it
19 serves the church and associated uses around
20 there in the neighborhood. So there's a
21 parking lot, the asphalt lot, the car wash,
22 the garden and the church buildings. So

1 that's what it is today.

2 And as we go deeper into the idea, one
3 of the goals as Gwen said, is to maintain the
4 same amount of open space. So here we are at
5 a Massachusetts Avenue site maintaining the
6 open space that really isn't dictated in the
7 zoning. So not only are we reaching for the
8 full FAR, we're actually maintaining a highly
9 viable open space. And then because of the
10 restrictions in the zone, we now of course
11 have buffers to Blake Street. So there's a
12 20-foot plus setback on that side for a
13 garden setback, and then also a 20-foot plus
14 setbacks to the Orchard Street neighborhoods
15 beyond.

16 The grey area you see there we'll talk
17 about in more detail, is of course the egress
18 into all the parking on the site under the
19 zoning demanded 61 cars will be underground
20 under the building, and then there will be
21 four surface spaces and additional parallel
22 parking on Mass. Ave. we'll show you. So

1 that's the composition.

2 So now in more detail, let's go into
3 the idea of how this all plays out. So
4 again, if you don't mind, I'll go up here.
5 Can you all hear my voice? So Massachusetts
6 Avenue, Blake Street, the firehouse right
7 here, Orchard Street neighborhood and Beach
8 right here. Remember Beach is a two way
9 street. So the goal for the church and of
10 course for development's advantage would be
11 to maintain their lovely garden space. So
12 that was part of the idea. So -- and again
13 here's the car wash site. Go ahead, Phil.

14 So the next goal is because of the
15 setbacks, it gives us the advantage to
16 protect the perimeter and actually increase
17 the perimeter. Right now the build is a zero
18 lot line here, so we have a 20 foot to 10
19 foot at the fire station and a 20 foot plus
20 as we go forward behind the neighbors on
21 Blake. Maintaining of course major trees.
22 There's two major trees along The Orchard

1 Street frontage, a 20-foot setback there.
2 And then of course a minimum setback next to
3 your neighbors, The Kingdom Hall which is
4 where the ramp would be inboard from that.
5 And of course one of the most stunning
6 features of the site are five major pin oaks
7 along Beach Street right here. So they will
8 all be -- possibly to be preserved along that
9 frontage and enhanced as we go forward.

10 Go ahead.

11 So the idea of that site now working
12 with that open space idea, so the pink is
13 showing the new parish hall. The parish hall
14 that was once there and one- or two-story
15 building, is going to be laid out and
16 basically occupying the entire ground floor
17 of the site surrounding the garden. So all
18 the uses that Holly mentioned would actually
19 come out and surround the gardens looking
20 southward towards Mass. Avenue. In this
21 corner here, wait a minute, Phil. Very quick
22 there, Phil. Can you go back one?

1 Okay, so this corner here is an ideal
2 of retail space, about 20,000 square feet of
3 retail space adjoining the library and ground
4 floor of the parish hall of the church. And
5 in the rear would be both ground floor units
6 associated with the residential part of
7 thing, and over here the entry to the
8 residential and to the secondary egress to
9 the church, to the parish hall.

10 So the pink here is showing the layout
11 of the parish hall. So the goal is to have
12 the parish hall embrace at the ground floor,
13 very open and permeable and really surround
14 the garden space and in fact protect it which
15 it never had before. There were always uses
16 that we didn't want in the garden. The goal
17 is really wrap the ground floor -- so
18 essentially a mixed use ground floor all the
19 way around the garden. Again, this would be
20 the retail space. The church actually comes
21 out and actually touches the Mass. Ave.
22 frontage out here along the sidewalk. And

1 the goal here for the church is to take as we
2 come, like many of our American homes, the
3 back door has become the front door. So this
4 way by shifting this around, the front door
5 of the parish hall would be here opposite the
6 historic front door of the church and really
7 shift the focus of the church back to the
8 Mass. Ave. to the front.

9 Okay, Phil.

10 Underneath all of this structure will
11 be 61 cars, and we'll talk later about four
12 cars and service parking handicaps spaces on
13 the surface off the drive down. We'll talk
14 about that later. Okay?

15 We want to show now, what we did is
16 take a model version of this and mocked up a
17 three-dimensional prospectus on each of site
18 locations. So, Phil, if you can tune into
19 those.

20 So, again, we're now walking down Mass.
21 Ave. Again, very accurate perspectives drawn
22 on all the information we have. Obviously

1 the historic church still the dominant
2 character. The goal of the building is to be
3 a fairly simple building using sort of
4 typical regional and neighborhood features as
5 bays, and materials to wrap the church gently
6 on the back side, enhancing and embracing the
7 garden. And then of course eventually
8 filling the gap with what is now the car wash
9 with retail and public parish hall space on
10 Mass. Ave. So here you're looking at the
11 garden space. Residential units are three
12 stories. All the densities of the
13 residential units are on the garden. Three
14 stories here. And you'll see later on the
15 neighborhood side that's actually two stories
16 residential. So the building steps down to
17 the neighborhood all around the perimeter,
18 which is per current zoning.

19 So here you have both the parish hall
20 library and the retail space. And an
21 alleyway, courtyard entry to the garden on
22 the side. And of course the fire station are

1 restored in this past decade.

2 On Beach Street -- so we're coming from
3 Elm Street, and we just passed the corner
4 here, Kingdom Hall. And here you see the
5 two-story elevation and the three-story
6 elevation here by zoning setback. Four
7 parked cars shielded from the sidewalk.
8 That's the ramp down into the site. This is
9 the sort of condo living area for some of the
10 entry units. And then the secondary entrance
11 to the parish hall there. And, again, the
12 idea is bays in compatible materials to both
13 neighborhood which is essentially clapboard,
14 shingles and vinyl siding. Of course we
15 won't be talking vinyl siding, but some
16 natural materials to match the historic
17 character of the neighborhood.

18 On Orchard Street, again, we're looking
19 at -- here's the corner of Orchard and Beach.
20 So now we're looking at -- you can see the
21 stepped building, three stories toward the
22 neighbors and then step back 30 feet to a

1 four-story that overlooks the garden. This
2 is between all the existing homes here. And
3 there's a step back in the building
4 configuration to go further back. Again,
5 fairly -- these are accurately drawn
6 according to all the information both in the
7 new and the proposed and the existing
8 conditions.

9 So it is an urban project, you know.
10 There is no doubt about it. It's adding 46
11 to 47 residential units. About 11,000 square
12 feet of parish hall facilities at the ground
13 floor with some condo and residential units.
14 And then of course the parking below.

15 So this is on Blake, turning the
16 corner. And again between the residences
17 here -- one of the things we're looking at as
18 a unit, is making sure -- we're trying not to
19 have living room windows look in the back of
20 houses or putting the bays or the balconies
21 in between where the existing homes are. And
22 so again you can see this here.

1 So again this is the fire station at
2 the corner of Mass. Ave. and Blake.

3 So, we want to go into the details of
4 some of the conditions of the site. Here you
5 can see the Mass. Ave. front. Okay?

6 Sorry for the switch over. Okay. So,
7 here is the simple site plans of the
8 conditions that we're proposing.

9 The main congregation of the church,
10 firehouse, and now what used to be the car
11 wash site is both a retail condition with the
12 parish hall surrounding the garden. And the
13 garden basically opening and embracing the
14 south, and embracing and allowing public
15 access into it. And again active daytime and
16 nighttime uses around the perimeter. Very
17 important for the church community. Play
18 spaced gardens here. We'll talk about each
19 one in a second. And again the ramp down the
20 Beach Street which is five great, six great
21 trees that will be reserved.

22 Okay, Phil.

1 So, again this is the all important of
2 the Massachusetts Avenue site with the mixed
3 fire station, the retail, the parish hall
4 library on the corner. And then you can see
5 also here per zoning the two stories of
6 residential, and then a third floor setback.
7 So that's again per the overlay district
8 regulation.

9 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's three
10 stories and then a fourth story.

11 RICARDO DUMONT: Pardon?

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Excuse me. I just
13 want to say we would like them to give their
14 presentation, and any comments people have,
15 they can do it during the public hearing.
16 But we haven't opened it to public comments
17 yet.

18 RICARDO DUMONT: So clarifying,
19 ground floor public, civic uses. Two floors
20 are residential, and then a third floor
21 residential but setback according to zoning.
22 So around the courtyard is full four stories

1 of residential -- three stories of
2 residential with the ground floor being all
3 the parish hall and then of course the
4 church.

5 Okay, Phil.

6 So again the garden, the main entrance
7 for the parish hall will be off Massachusetts
8 Avenue opposite the historic entry of the
9 church here. And then the garden essentially
10 50-by-60 in width extending back about 112
11 feet to the face of the parish hall there.

12 There will be a new smaller chapel
13 here, 30 to 35 seats with an enclosed
14 contemplative garden here. So again, there
15 will be a main entrance on Mass. Ave.

16 This is of course showing the side
17 garden, so this is the accessible alleyway.
18 One of the things the church does is run its
19 largest food pantry in the city. That will
20 be accessed from both sides here. One of the
21 access for service will be here. There's a
22 small kitchen facility enclosed and covered

1 trash facility is there. Beyond that will be
2 a children's play area that relates to three
3 classrooms, four classrooms inside here. And
4 then you go back to private gardens for the
5 lower residential units. Again, on that
6 particular side, that's where the building
7 was sitting right on the property line.

8 This is the Beach Street side. Again,
9 this is a secondary entry into this -- the
10 church, into the parish hall. Primary entry
11 from residential from a pedestrian
12 standpoint. And again this idea of a
13 courtyard garden there. The setback is
14 actually 10 feet from back of brick sidewalk
15 which is present now, which is just a little
16 bit behind the setback of the present Kingdom
17 Hall to our north of the page here. Then
18 there will be the screened handicap parking
19 spaces again at the surface level. The level
20 driveway, and then it goes -- ramps down into
21 the lower level basement for most of the
22 cars.

1 Again, that's showing that entry of the
2 access of the church facing Beach eastward.
3 And then the secondary entry into the parish
4 hall, and the primary entry into the
5 residential use right here. And again this
6 other sidewalk landscape, and I idea the five
7 major Beach trees are on this elevation as
8 well. The goal is to have masonry that
9 starts picking up the masonry of the church
10 here, and then wood clad and bays that echo
11 the Italian houses across the street.

12 Okay, Phil.

13 This is the more sensitive side as
14 we've all recognize with all the folks here
15 tonight. This will be the egress into the
16 basement parking to preserve both trees.
17 We've curved the driveway around a little bit
18 this tree, and there would be the four
19 covered spaces at the level side. And then
20 that line at 29.5 we ramp down into the
21 garage entrance. In the garage will be the
22 cars, the trash for the residence hall that

1 will be taken out on sort of Monday or
2 Tuesday, pick up days. And then the required
3 landscape setbacks there.

4 And then along Mass. Ave, what we've
5 done is the church has moved its doors around
6 the parish hall, and the uses, various uses
7 of food pantry, women's shelter, daily summer
8 -- and services during winter and summer, and
9 of course in the chapel itself. Is -- the
10 goal would be -- we've indented work to the
11 city, to indent an idea of indenting the
12 curbing here since we've actually set the
13 building back further. The Mass. Ave.
14 sidewalk continues obviously with the trees,
15 and we picked up sort of short term parking
16 spaces here which allows us to get some of
17 the busiest activities of the church on Mass.
18 Ave. and not on Beach Street. Essentially
19 trying to balance the traffic demands into
20 the site. Residential more inclined Beach,
21 and short term driving by for the church
22 functions more on Mass. Ave. So that's that

1 idea. Networks of the present utilities on
2 the street. The existing bus stop would
3 remain there. And the newly implemented
4 bicycle lane would remain here with a short
5 term parking inboard from that. So that
6 would work with both of those solutions
7 currently.

8 Okay, Phil.

9 And lastly, before we turn it over to
10 your comments, of course, is the important
11 shadow study of the site. So we're going to
12 start in a June time frame. So I guess the
13 dates aren't on here. Oh, there we are.

14 MALE PRESENTER: June 21st.

15 RICARDO DUMONT: This is the highest
16 sun of the summer, nine a.m. the sun is --
17 this is south. North out there. East and
18 west this way. So very little shadow is cast
19 into any of our neighbors as the sun is very
20 high that time of the year.

21 Go ahead, Phil.

22 At 12 noon the sun's even higher. Of

1 course, very little shadow is cast from the
2 site again, we're taking advantage of the
3 south facing garden here throughout the
4 course of the year.

5 Go ahead, Phil.

6 At three a.m. as the sun is now
7 switching around to this orientation, again,
8 the shadows would not be affecting the most
9 immediate neighbors and abutters.

10 Go ahead, Phil.

11 And at six p.m. when the sun is
12 beginning to set in the -- mostly in the
13 summer, then we cast our longest shadows
14 across Beach Street really, and can you see
15 all the neighboring houses casting their own
16 shadows.

17 So very positive treatment there.

18 We go to the worst time of the year.
19 On December 9th at nine a.m. . December 21st
20 really, at nine a.m. Again, the long morning
21 shadows casting over but not going over to
22 the houses importantly on Orchard Street.

1 And at 12 noon again, even in the dead of
2 winter we don't cast shadows. So importantly
3 don't cast shadows to the back of the
4 neighboring houses. And only do we, in the
5 late afternoon at three p.m. do we actually
6 start casting shadows into the neighborhood
7 at the lowest sun angle of the year.

8 So, I guess to summarize here very
9 quickly, this was an attempt, earnest in its
10 desire, to really link the urban regeneration
11 mission of yourselves, the city, and the
12 neighborhood and the church and the
13 development team with the church community
14 mission. And not be subtractive but additive
15 to the future of this district of the city.
16 Thank you very much.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are you done? Any
18 questions from the Planning Board? Hugh?

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Your plans show 36
20 units and some blank spaces. Could you
21 clarify that?

22 GWENDOLEN NOYES: They're

1 actually --

2 RICARDO DUMONT: 46. So 46 units
3 are shown and indicated in the submittal. 46
4 units. Maybe I misspoke.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: I only count, and
6 there are only 38. So I'm trying to
7 understand.

8 RICARDO DUMONT: Top floor. Did you
9 get the top floor and the fourth floor?

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. For example,
11 there's a blank space on this floor.

12 GWENDOLEN NOYES: Again, again
13 undesigned yet.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: That going to be a
15 unit?

16 RICARDO DUMONT: Yes, that will be a
17 unit, yes.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: These are all to be
19 units?

20 RICARDO DUMONT: Yes.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think the traffic
22 is enough of a concern there, you really

1 should make some presentation to the traffic
2 idea particularly at this part of the public
3 hearing.

4 GWENDOLEN NOYSE: Okay. Scott?

5 SCOTT THORNTON: For the record,
6 Scott Thornton with Vanasse & Associates. In
7 terms of traffic, I'll just spend a few
8 minutes, I can go into the detail at a later
9 time. We met with the city, with the Traffic
10 Department. We had some meetings to scope or
11 to shape the scope of the traffic study, and
12 met also with the Community Development
13 Department during the process of the study.
14 What Rick had identified with the two forms
15 of access for the project is really a means
16 of splitting the traffic demands. The school
17 programs -- there's a number of activities
18 that are present at the church. There's
19 after school, there's preschool, there's the
20 food pantry activities. There are some other
21 activities that are present there. They all
22 occur in the existing -- the traffic

1 activities all occur in the confines of one
2 small parking lot. By splitting the traffic
3 demand to a new access point off of Mass.
4 Ave. while retaining -- consolidating the two
5 curb cuts that are presently there on Beach
6 Street into one, and providing a long
7 driveway ramp to contain or kind of absorb
8 any of the short term traffic movements that
9 occur for people dropping off children or for
10 the new residents going into or out of the
11 building, it really kind of meters the
12 traffic demand. As I think Gwen mentioned
13 earlier, the -- when we look at the traffic
14 increases due to the new residences, looking
15 at the mode split and the typical process
16 that we do, the mode split for that area has
17 about 38 percent transit usage, and another
18 14 and 15 percent or so bicycle and
19 walking/working from home behaviors. So you
20 wind up with about between 38 and 45 percent
21 of commuting behavior that's done by
22 passenger vehicle. This translates into

1 about 12 trips for the residences. I think
2 two entering and 10 exiting in the morning.
3 And then I think about 16 or 18 trips in the
4 evening time period with 10 entering and
5 eight exiting. And so when we do that, we're
6 able to preserve the traffic -- current
7 traffic levels at that Beach Street access
8 from the existing conditions. The food
9 pantry, which I think accounts for a lot of
10 the afternoon peak hour trips, those
11 activities would be pushed over to the Mass.
12 Ave. access. And then also those, that short
13 term indentation in the curb line on Mass.
14 Ave, that's something that could be used both
15 for people picking up for the food pantry,
16 for parishioners that drop off people on
17 Sundays. Some of the other activities that
18 occur later at night. CSO meets there. So
19 they could drop off there as well. And then
20 also for the retail activities, those trips
21 could occur off of that area.

22 RICARDO DUMONT: And I must say we

1 have allowed for if there were drop off of
2 children not only at that spot, we've allowed
3 for drop off in the garage as well. So we
4 can manage a drop off either in the garage
5 right directly to the elevator, of course, so
6 mom and dad could be happy that their
7 children are going with someone to the
8 elevator court up to the parish hall or on
9 Mass. Ave. We're allowing for both
10 opportunities for that.

11 And I think we need to look at the
12 traffic in the realm of what's there today.
13 We have a car wash site which generated 80
14 vehicle trips on a daily basis. And then you
15 have the congregation's uses in that parking
16 lot on Beach. So when we look at the holding
17 steady on the traffic in a good sense, and at
18 best distributing it more evenly to take some
19 of the pressure off of Beach which is again a
20 major circulator for Cambridge and
21 Somerville. That we feel that we have done a
22 great thing of balance leading the traffic

1 demands on this site and again having the
2 advantage of taking the car wash heavier uses
3 away.

4 SCOTT THORNTON: And just
5 piggy-backing on that, in terms of Level
6 service at intersections, no change with the
7 project. In terms of pedestrian Level
8 service, no change with the project. So no
9 exceedances in the Special Permit criteria.

10 RICARDO DUMONT: On the pedestrian,
11 Scott, I guess we would say that we're
12 actually doing a plus. As I said, we're
13 eliminating one of the curb cuts on Beach,
14 only now having the one curb cut on Beach.
15 And of course on Mass. Ave. we're eliminating
16 60 feet of curb cut which is now in front of
17 the car wash which then extends to the fire
18 station which is another 30 feet. So from a
19 pedestrian safety standpoint, we feel both
20 streets are actually improved from a
21 pedestrian safety standpoint.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

1 RICARDO DUMONT: So that's an
2 overvi ew.

3 SCOTT THORNTON: That's a very brief
4 overvi ew.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay, thank you.
6 I was going to ask if there are any
7 clari fyi ng questi ons. Charles, go ahead.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: Yes, I do have a
9 questi on. I'm curious, the four covered
10 parki ng spaces under the bui ldi ng of Beach
11 Street along the dri veway into the parki ng
12 garage, who are those parki ng spaces for?

13 RICARDO DUMONT: Mostl y for
14 pari shi oners especi al l y on Sundays. Agai n,
15 there' s fai rly, you know, a l arge el derl y
16 popul ati on i n the congregati on. So as we do
17 today, there are 18 surface parki ng spaces i n
18 the parki ng l ot on Beach Street today. Those
19 are mostl y used by some of other ol der
20 pari shi oners. So the goal i s to try to get
21 at l east our handi cap spaces there for those
22 who are l ess able to get down i nto the ramp

1 and down into the garage. Other parishioners
2 can also go down into the garage. There are
3 18 spaces in the garage for church use.

4 CHARLES STUDEN: We can talk about
5 this later. I'm just curious because
6 couldn't they be accommodated in the garage
7 itself? I'm concerned that the cars backing
8 and entering into that, into those spaces
9 along that driveway and in close proximity in
10 Beach Street would cause conflicts. And I'm
11 also thinking that if they weren't there, you
12 could move some of the building mass a little
13 bit further away from the church. Again, I'm
14 getting into detail. I want to clarify what
15 they were for. So, thank you.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ted and then Steve.

17 H. THEODORE COHEN: Blake Street is
18 it two way?

19 RICARDO DUMONT: Blake is a two way
20 street inward from Mass. Ave. inbound.

21 SCOTT THORNTON: No. Out to Mass.
22 Ave.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry.

2 Could you say that again?

3 SCOTT THORNTON: Blake Street is one
4 way from Orchard Street to Mass. Ave.

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: Out to Mass.
6 Ave. That's what I thought.

7 So if you didn't have the entry on
8 Beach Street, and the entry as it were on
9 Mass. Ave, if someone was exiting and wanted
10 to head, I guess, south towards Harvard
11 Square, what do they have to do?

12 SCOTT THORNTON: They --

13 H. THEODORE COHEN: They have to go
14 to Russell Street?

15 SCOTT THORNTON: Yeah. They would
16 either go out to Russell Street, come back to
17 Orchard and down to Beach, sort of go around
18 the block. Or look for a U-turn spot on
19 Mass. Ave.

20 H. THEODORE COHEN: An illegal
21 U-turn on Mass. Ave. .

22 RICARDO DUMONT: Which I admit I've

1 done a couple times myself.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: Which we all did
3 to get to the car wash.

4 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, Steve.

6 STEVEN WINTER: Two very quick
7 things. Is there a driveway in this project
8 between the proposed residential building and
9 the fire station?

10 RICARDO DUMONT: There is a --
11 presently right now no. That is a -- well,
12 let's call it this: There's a combined
13 pedestrian way or a ten-foot service drive if
14 we were to need it to get access for the
15 kitchen.

16 STEVEN WINTER: Service delivery
17 vehicles only.

18 PHIL: Just pedestrians.

19 RICARDO DUMONT: So we're hoping to
20 -- the church now brings trash from the
21 kitchen out back and that's directly back
22 fire station's alleyway too.

1 STEVEN WINTER: And the next
2 question is quickly, you did your report in
3 June. The study was in June. And you agreed
4 with Sue to use a methodology -- Sue
5 Clippinger to use a methodology where you
6 multiplied by four percent. Could you tell
7 me what that methodology is, how you got to
8 that?

9 SCOTT THORNTON: Yeah, we the counts
10 were done on June 9th and June 10th. Public
11 school was still in session, but Harvard and
12 MIT -- so the other colleges were having
13 graduation that week. And we had met with
14 the neighbor -- one of the -- I'm not sure
15 which neighborhood group, but we had met with
16 one of the neighborhood groups, and they were
17 concerned about us not accounting for the
18 college population. So we had discussed -- I
19 had discussed with the Traffic Department the
20 possibility of using some adjustment factor.
21 And typically in the transportation impact
22 study guidelines there are percentages that

1 can be used to account for these things. And
2 an adjustment factor between two and six
3 percent was used -- is specified we use four
4 percent.

5 STEVEN WINTER: That's very clear.
6 Thank you.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Go ahead, Charles.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: Could you please,
9 I'm just curious about the trash -- going
10 back to that question again.

11 RICARDO DUMONT: Yes.

12 CHARLES STUDEN: I see what's
13 illustrated on the drawing. I'm having
14 trouble imagining how this works exactly.
15 The trash will be picked up by the city or
16 it's a private trash company or both?

17 RICARDO DUMONT: Could be both. Let
18 me just explain. So there's two separate
19 trash ideas.

20 One is for the residents which is
21 housed and stored in the basement. And that
22 will be brought out on trash day either by a

1 managed company or we have someone to take it
2 out to the street level to be picked up by
3 the city.

4 CHARLES STUDEN: On Mass. Ave?

5 RICARDO DUMONT: No. That's on
6 Beach Street. You come up the ramp, out of
7 the garage for the residential population, so
8 that trash goes to Beach Street like the
9 trash for the church goes today. And then
10 the church's -- back of the house which
11 involves this kitchen facilities, etcetera,
12 for the parish hall, that backup house trash
13 is stored at surface level right next to the
14 alleyway courtyard at Mass. Ave. side and
15 enclosed location. And then that is wheeled
16 out to the curb on trash day by the church
17 members.

18 CHARLES STUDEN: Now, because
19 there's a kitchen there I imagine there's a
20 fair amount of delivery food as well. So all
21 of those delivery trucks pull up, do they use
22 those spaces along Mass. Ave. to --

1 RICARDO DUMONT: One of the intents
2 is that they do a parallel short term park
3 there to dolly in their food products,
4 etcetera into the kitchen.

5 CHARLES STUDEN: And I don't know
6 whether you've had conversations with the
7 fire station nearby, but I can see the
8 potential for --

9 RICARDO DUMONT: We have.

10 CHARLES STUDEN: -- some conflict
11 between the fire station and that kind of
12 servicing, you know, I don't know, trucks
13 pulling up. I mean if I were delivering, I
14 might be inclined to pull in the driveway if
15 the spots were blocked of the fire station to
16 go in.

17 RICARDO DUMONT: Again, one of the
18 things we can do there at the church is
19 actually manage the time of drop off and
20 deliveries better than we do today which is
21 more of a free for all. So, again, the
22 current condition is that you're dealing with

1 60 foot of cars next to the fire station and
2 somewhat more control the situation here.
3 But we can certainly manage the trash issue
4 and the drop off of food products better than
5 we have now. That would be one solution.

6 CHARLES STUDEN: Okay, thank you.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, hopefully
8 this is just clarifying because we do want to
9 get to the public hearing. Go ahead.

10 PATRICIA SINGER: Is there any
11 parking on Beach Street or any short term
12 parking, long or short term in front of the
13 church and near the driveway?

14 SCOTT THORNTON: At this point I
15 don't think that's been determined. By
16 consolidating the curb cuts, there's going to
17 be about 30 to 50 feet of space that's freed
18 up along Beach Street. Right now that's
19 permit parking, or Beach Street is parallel
20 form of parking. But, you know, I guess it's
21 -- we haven't, we haven't really discussed
22 that in detail with the Traffic Department

1 sort of what the other use of that space
2 would be.

3 RICARDO DUMONT: The way it is now,
4 there's a right-hand turning lane coming off
5 of Beach because of a light on Mass. Ave. and
6 a left-hand turn light. So with intense
7 times with traffic, is that you want both of
8 those lanes free as much as possible for some
9 length down Beach. But occasionally there is
10 parallel parking along that street.

11 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I think the
12 question is there city permit parking along
13 Beach?

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: There is no
15 parallel parking in front of the church on
16 Beach Street.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ahmed, did you have
18 a question?

19 AHMED NUR: I decided to hold my
20 question until afterward. Thank you.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay, great. Are we
22 done? Then, okay, thanks.

1 Okay, we'll start the public comment
2 portion. Again, for anybody who has arrived
3 late, we do have a sign-up sheet. But if you
4 haven't had a chance to sign up on the
5 sign-up sheet or change your mind after you
6 heard the testimony, I will ask at the end if
7 you want to speak so everyone will have an
8 opportunity to speak. We have had a request
9 that several of the folks have combined their
10 efforts into a brief PowerPoint presentation,
11 so we are going to ask them to set that up
12 and get that going. Once we have that
13 PowerPoint presentation, I will then go down
14 the list.

15 We really ask that you don't
16 necessarily repeat the same thing over. You
17 can say you agree or disagree with something
18 that has been previously said, but you don't
19 have to repeat the comments, the same
20 comments over. And we do ask that if you
21 can, that you come up to the podium and use
22 the mic and that our -- and we ask that you,

1 obviously other than the PowerPoint
2 presentation, we limit your comments to about
3 three minutes. Our member Charles has a
4 timer and will alert you.

5 Could you do that a little bit more
6 quietly? Thank you.

7 Charles has a timer and will be
8 alerting people when they're getting close to
9 their time. And we do have one Planning
10 Board member who is not here, so Charles is
11 the associate member who will be voting.
12 However, Ahmed can still ask questions and
13 participate in the deliberation.

14 JESSICA PRATT: My name is Jessica
15 Pratt. Shall I start?

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: You said there are
17 four of you. So I think you should all give
18 your names and use the microphones. Give us
19 your names and addresses and spell your
20 names, that would be helpful.

21 (Whereupon, a discussion was
22 held off the record.)

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, give all four
2 of your names.

3 JESSICA PRATT: So my name is
4 Jessica Pratt. I live at 11 Beach Street, on
5 the corner of Beach and Orchard.

6 COLLEEN PRATT: My name is Colleen
7 Pratt, I also live at 11 Beach Street which
8 is the corner of Beach and Orchard.

9 PATTY ARMSTRONG: I'm Patty
10 Armstrong P-a-t-t-y A-r-m-s-t-r-o-n-g, I live
11 at 36 Orchard Street and have for 25 years.
12 I'm a direct abutters.

13 LIDYIA GRALLA: My name is Li dyi a
14 Gralla. That's L-y-d-i -a G-r-a-l-l -a. And I
15 live on 19 Beach Street.

16 LESLIE BORDEN: And my name is
17 Leslie Borden. And I'm at 12 Sagamore
18 Avenue. And L-e-s-l-i -e B-o-r-d-e-n.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

20 JESSICA PRATT: So I'm going to go
21 relatively quickly because the Planning Board
22 has already seen this presentation, but there

1 are two things that are different. One,
2 there are photographs embedded in this that
3 you'll be able to see that show you a little
4 bit about our neighborhood. And there's also
5 some interesting statistical information as
6 well. So the Planning Board knows that
7 neighborhoods make our city strong. And this
8 project violates several of the Cambridge
9 ordinances. Specifically it creates four
10 concerns for our neighborhood.

11 One is the location of the entry and
12 exit ramp.

13 The other is integration.

14 The third is scale.

15 And the final is transparency.

16 Transparency in working with the developers.

17 And what we're asking, we're asking the

18 Planning Board to deny the Special Permit
19 until these issues are resolved.

20 So the image that you see on the right
21 is the footprint of this very large project.

22 The take away here is the sheer number of

1 abutters that this mixed use project impacts.
2 It impacts lots of people, lots of lives.

3 So the first thing we talk about is
4 entry and exit. We're asking the curb cuts
5 on Beach Street to be closed and access for
6 this building to be moved to Mass. Ave. And
7 we have some good reasons why.

8 First, the Beach Street location
9 violates the North Cambridge Overlay District
10 guidelines, and I'll show you that. Second,
11 Mass. Ave. is a precedent for condo complex
12 ramp access. And again I'll show you that.
13 Finally, the Beach Street location violates
14 the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance. It's
15 dangerous for pedestrians and bikers, and the
16 traffic study engineer Scott who is here, you
17 know, reported that the findings said that
18 the Mass. Ave. location would reduce
19 congestions on both Beach Street and Mass.
20 Ave. And finally, the two existing curb cuts
21 on Mass. Ave. they've been used for the car
22 wash for years carrying significantly more

1 traffic than this project would generate.

2 So the first is the Beach Street
3 location violates the Mass. Ave. overlay
4 district. It's right there. Principal
5 building entrance shall face Massachusetts
6 Avenue where a lot abuts the avenue. The
7 purpose is to protect residents and neighbors
8 from the traffic and noise and congestion
9 generated by these huge projects. And as
10 I'll show you this is the case all along
11 Mass. Ave. because we went from Harvard
12 Square to the Arlington city limits. And we
13 looked at all of these complexes. And of the
14 21 condos on Mass. Ave. between Harvard
15 Square and Arlington city limits, 97 percent
16 have ramps on Mass. Ave. The three percent
17 that don't, and I'll show you these are
18 small, less than 15 units, and the streets
19 that they pour out on to have very, very low,
20 low traffic.

21 So this is actually a Google map that
22 shows you all of the condo complexes on Mass.

1 Ave. and the addresses are there on the left.
2 And to show you we do our homework, these are
3 photographs of the ramps all along Mass. Ave.
4 And the theme is consistent, garages empty on
5 to Mass. Ave, not side streets. Now you may
6 say well, you'll find one or two. There's
7 one or two. It's a small building, and if
8 you read the sign carefully it says "Not a
9 through street." So the cars parked there
10 are dealing with the Beach Street traffic
11 situation. They're just not. So it's
12 unprecedented to have this design. But one
13 may ask how congested is Beach Street?
14 Because if you don't live there you may not
15 know. Now it's easy to get photos for you at
16 rush hour traffic, in the morning and in the
17 afternoon. So these photos that we're
18 showing you were taken Sunday afternoon. On
19 the left that's the traffic on Beach Street.
20 Every Sunday. Pedestrians, people coming up
21 from Orchard Street backs all the way up to
22 Elm Street. On the right it's just a higher

1 level view. Again, so you can see how the
2 traffic gets backed up on Elm Street.

3 The photo on the left is Orchard
4 Street, the same thing. And to speak to the
5 Saint James parking lot, which causes a
6 majority of the congestion at the bottom of
7 Beach Street. I counted 28 cars in that
8 photo on the left. I think the lot is legal
9 for 18. And you can see how the cars just
10 get packed and jammed and packed in. And it
11 happens all the time. But the overflow is
12 worse for just the parking lot. The overflow
13 spills out on the street, and you can see all
14 the cars parked to the right where it says do
15 not parking. And that prevents, just as you
16 were asking, people from taking a right on
17 Mass. Ave.

18 So, the Beach Street location violates
19 the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance. You guys
20 know the zoning ordinance better than I do.
21 But if a project is going to cause congestion
22 or hazard or it would be detrimental to the

1 health and safety, then I think that's what
2 the zoning law is supposed to protect us
3 from.

4 The fourth point is the Beach Street
5 location endangers pedestrians and bikers.
6 Pedestrians on Mass. Ave. are already on high
7 alert. You can see the photographs there.
8 They pass a fire station, a gas station,
9 multiple intersections, office buildings,
10 other condo complex ramps, retail stores.
11 Beach Street we have houses and churches.
12 And along the bottom you can see the photos
13 of our houses and churches. We have children
14 and parents that walk up to the bus stop at
15 the end of Mass. Ave. and Beach to take their
16 kids to school. We have elderly, young and
17 disabled from two other churches in the area.
18 And plus ourselves, the ones that walk to the
19 Porter Exchange T stop.

20 So the fifth point is the traffic
21 study, and I hate to put Scott on the spot,
22 but when he came and he spoke to residents,

1 he said two things. The first thing he said
2 was a large percentage of the Beach Street
3 congestion was caused by traffic in and out
4 of the church parking lot. And you can see
5 that by the photograph that has 28 cars
6 packed in there.

7 And the second thing that he said that
8 was interesting was the total traffic
9 generated by this project would be five times
10 less than what the car wash historically has
11 carried. So it's just common sense to have
12 the access to this building on Mass. Ave.
13 because A, you'd immediately reduce the
14 congestion on the Beach Street because you
15 get rid of the parking lot. And B -- A, A
16 and B -- and you'll still have less traffic
17 flow on Mass. Ave.

18 So just to make it very clear on the
19 two existing curb cuts, because I believe you
20 asked or maybe it was Steven when you leave,
21 can you go left? And everyone said no, but
22 the answer is yes, you can take a left.

1 Historically when you leave these two curb
2 cuts, you are able to take a left or right
3 coming down Mass. Ave. So there's no reason
4 that people have to go all the way down to
5 Russell Street. But it's a valid question
6 and it was an issue of concern to us. So we
7 asked Sue Clippinger for some crash data to
8 see how dangerous this intersection was. 22
9 accidents at the intersection of Beach and
10 Mass. Ave. Twelve accidents at the
11 intersection here. Fewer accidents, we're
12 using the two existing curb cuts where people
13 can take a left-hand turn with more traffic,
14 with traffic coming out of a car wash. So
15 again, you can argue that if all of this
16 traffic was moved to the two existing curb
17 cuts on Mass. Ave, you'd have fewer accidents
18 on Beach Street because you would have
19 removed all the traffic congestion on Beach
20 Street, and you'll still have less -- fewer
21 accidents here on Mass. Ave. and Blake where
22 the curb cuts are because there won't be as

1 much traffic as you would normally get with
2 the car wash. Am I going too fast or too
3 slow?

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, keep going.

5 JESSICA PRATT: So the final point
6 is the two existing curb cuts on Mass. Ave.
7 they've been used by the car wash for years
8 with many more cars than this project would
9 generate. We have a proven history that they
10 work. If it's not broken, don't fix it. You
11 can take a right-hand turn or you can take a
12 left-hand turn so it's not going to force
13 traffic down Russell Street. If the Traffic
14 Department is uncomfortable with that and
15 they do want to restrict people from taking
16 the left, although maybe the accident history
17 doesn't warrant that, but if it was something
18 they did want to do, then they can either
19 extend the median strip or Oaktree could move
20 the exit, you know, further south away from
21 the fire department. So there are viable
22 options for dealing with that.

1 So I think that's all we have to say
2 about exit, entry and traffic and parking.
3 And Colleen's going to talk about
4 integration.

5 COLLEEN PRATT: Good evening my name
6 is Colleen Pratt and I didn't spell it
7 before. So it's C-o-l-l-e-e-n. The last
8 name is P-r-a-t-t. I'm a 20-year resident of
9 the city of Cambridge. I'm a homeowner and I
10 live at 11 Beach Street. And I want to talk
11 to you very briefly about integration. And
12 you can see we have the ordinance up there.
13 I'm not going to read the whole thing, but
14 just the underlying part: Development should
15 avoid overwhelming the existing buildings in
16 the vicinity of the development. Visual and
17 functional disruptions should be avoided.

18 So as proposed the project is in
19 violation of the current zoning ordinances.
20 It clearly overwhelms the existing homes and
21 buildings, and it is visually disruptive to
22 the Beach Street cityscapes. And we're

1 going to very quickly look at some of the
2 buildings on Beach Street. If you look at
3 them again, they're all homes, a lot of them
4 built during the Victorian era, and the early
5 part of the 20th century, but they're
6 two-story buildings. There's a three-story
7 Victorian, but essentially, you know, you're
8 in that two to three-story range. And you'll
9 notice that none of them are large monoliths.
10 They're just residents and homes. If we go
11 to the next slide.

12 So if you look actually, it's really
13 hard -- I'm not going to be able to show --
14 so if you look, it's kind of hard. This is
15 their presentation, I'm on Mass. Ave. Looking
16 down Beach Street, and Jessie can't reach it,
17 but the Saint James is about -- the top of
18 Saint James Church which is the abutting
19 building, is actually about halfway up that
20 picture and it's hard, you can't point it
21 out.

22 MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I believe

1 i t' s i n t h i s a r e a h e r e.

2 COLLEEN PRATT: I t' s a b o u t h a l f w a y
3 u p. Y o u n e e d a c h a i r t o g e t i t b e c a u s e i t' s
4 s o h i g h. B u t i t' s a b o u t h a l f w a y u p. A n d s o
5 t h i s f o u r - s t o r y i s h a l f o f w h a t w e' r e g o i n g
6 t o s e e -- i t' s h a l f o f w h a t w e h a v e o n t h e
7 s t r e e t. A n d a g a i n, i t -- y o u k n o w, i t s h o u l d
8 n o t -- i t s h o u l d a v o i d o v e r w h e l m i n g t h e
9 e x i s t i n g b u i l d i n g s i n t h e v i c i n i t y o f t h e
10 d e v e l o p m e n t. A n d t h a t' s n o t w h a t' s
11 h a p p e n i n g. W e d o n' t h a v e m o n o l i t h s h e r e. W e
12 d o n' t h a v e h u g e c o n d o s. M a y b e o n M a s s. A v e,
13 b u t c e r t a i n l y n o t o n B e a c h S t r e e t a n d n o t o n
14 s m a l l s t r e e t s t h a t a b o u t t h i s d e v e l o p m e n t.

15 A n d I' m g o i n g t o p a s s t h i s p r e s e n t a t i o n
16 t o P a t t y A r m s t r o n g.

17 PATTY ARMSTRONG: I' m P a t t y
18 A r m s t r o n g. I' m 36 O r c h a r d S t r e e t. I' m a
19 d i r e c t a b u t t e r o f t h i s p r o j e c t a s i t' s
20 p r o p o s e d. M y t o p i c i s t h e s i z e. A n d t h e --
21 w h a t w e' r e s a y i n g i s t h e s t r u c t u r e, t h e
22 s t r u c t u r e w i l l c r e a t e a m a s s i v e w a l l t h a t

1 runs behind Blake and Orchard Street homes.
2 I think you saw some of that looking down the
3 Orchard Street views. We believe that
4 removing the fourth floor is an important
5 relief for the neighborhood. There are
6 planned -- we saw in what was submitted to
7 you and the Planning Board, that there are
8 rooftop terraces, and there are three stories
9 of balconies which are overlooking the
10 backyards of abutters on Blake and Orchard
11 Street, which is a significant loss of
12 privacy for the neighbors. And this proposal
13 actually is also using setback allowances to
14 expand building activity. So on these
15 rooftop terraces and on these balconies are
16 projecting into this very space that is meant
17 to help protect our privacy. And again,
18 that's....

19 The fourth point is transparency.
20 There are serious communication problems with
21 the neighbors. The neighbors have not been
22 listened to. The project proponents have not

1 involved us in their plans. They have come
2 and presented to us and told us what they're
3 going to do, and that this was a done deal
4 and this is how it was going to be done.
5 They have not allowed us to give our
6 thoughts, and they have not responded to them
7 with any kinds of changes or response. They
8 tell us that that's what they got to do and
9 we can live with it. The developer and the
10 church need to work out these issues with us
11 the neighbors. This should not be
12 approved until they have come to the table
13 with us and honestly listen to our concerns
14 and our worries.

15 JESSICA PRATT: One more slide.

16 PATTY ARMSTRONG: So there are -- we
17 feel there are a number of missing details,
18 and we just brought some examples. You know,
19 we had asked for a ground level elevations on
20 Orchard Street. Some of the designs that I
21 think are in the presentation that was given,
22 the proposal that was submitted to you do not

1 show a ground level view from Orchard.
2 Tonight we saw some, but this was our first
3 chance to see the -- we neighbors --and a lot
4 of the neighbors are not here. We did not
5 see the terrace or roof garden details until
6 the proposal was submitted. So that was a
7 bit of a surprise to us.

8 The perspective of Orchard Street views
9 in the -- again, what was submitted to you,
10 that perspective makes the project appear
11 very small. Smaller than reality. Again,
12 tonight's view we saw for the first time what
13 the reality is. Is that there's going to be
14 a massive presence behind all of these homes
15 on this lovely street. We also felt that the
16 submission as it came to you, focussed wholly
17 on Mass. Avenue and Beach Street with very
18 little concern for the Blake and Orchard
19 Street sides of the project. Which again
20 reflect the fact that the neighbors were not
21 included or involved in any of this, were not
22 consulted, were not asked. We were given

1 have details on plantings, they have
2 deciduous trees as being some kind of a
3 shelter. Not at all adequate. So we're
4 asking that you --

5 JESSICA PRATT: I can -- so, the
6 zoning ordinance, as far as I understand it,
7 gives the Planning Board the discretion and
8 power to protect neighborhood residents.
9 We're your neighbors. We're your friends,
10 parents, and we're residents of Cambridge.
11 And, please, when you think about this,
12 imagine it is your family, your friends, your
13 real estate and your real estate value that's
14 on the front line, because that's really what
15 this is.

16 These are the four things that we have
17 issue with. Entry and exit has to be on
18 Massachusetts Avenue.

19 Integration with the neighborhood.
20 These structures look nothing like our
21 properties. They're massive and violate the
22 zoning ordinance. They tower over residents'

1 property.

2 And if we don't have transparency
3 with the developer, then there is no
4 accountability. We don't know what they're
5 doing, and we can't hold them to anything
6 when it's done. We need better communication
7 from the developers.

8 Thank you very much for listening. We
9 tried to make it condensed for you.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

11 The next person who has asked to speak
12 is John Armstrong. And what I'll do is I'll
13 also give the name of the next person in line
14 so they can at least gear themselves up. In
15 particular if they're sitting in the middle
16 of the audience. So after John Armstrong we
17 have Preston, I think it's Gralla.

18 JOHN ARMSTRONG: Let me ask you, my
19 presentation, my presentation is I think
20 about five minutes long. If I can't give it,
21 then my neighbor will give the second half of
22 it.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, you can do
2 that. You both have three minutes.

3 JOHN ARMSTRONG: Okay.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: But again, I do want
5 to encourage people not -- if any points have
6 been made, don't repeat them.

7 JOHN ARMSTRONG: I'll do my best.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just so say you
9 agree with them. We don't need to have the
10 same point made six different ways.

11 JOHN ARMSTRONG: Okay. So my name
12 is John Armstrong, J-o-h-n A-r-m-s-t-r-o-n-g,
13 36 Orchard Street. I'm a direct abutter of
14 the project. I've lived there since 1985. I
15 also represent the Saint James Neighbors
16 Committee, a group of abutters and neighbors.
17 We've worked for four months on this project,
18 and we're glad to have our first chance to
19 speak publicly tonight. I'm here to ask
20 the -- I'm here to ask the Planning Board to
21 not approve, approve the Special Permit
22 tonight. As I'll recommend at the end, we

1 think that there are many issues and that
2 many actions need to happen before this plan
3 is acceptable. Right now I simply want to
4 speak fairly -- as directly as I can to
5 specific Article 19 issues relating to the
6 zoning ordinance. You should have gotten
7 these in a letter from me, but I'm not sure
8 you had a chance to read it.

9 First concern is with the building. We
10 object to the following features: 16
11 balconies by my count of significant depth,
12 large enough for furniture and barbecues,
13 extending towards abutters' properties on
14 Blake and Orchard. We strongly object on the
15 grounds of privacy and noise. Note that
16 there are no balconies on the side of the
17 building facing the church.

18 1.2 -- I won't read these numbers.
19 Mechanicals and roof decks on the third floor
20 including within the setback areas.

21 1.3, painted windows on the outside
22 corner of the building facing Orchard and

1 Blake. We question the conformity of this
2 architectural practice to the rules and
3 recommendations of the zoning ordinance.

4 1.4, no specifics on exterior lighting
5 facing abutters. We fear the possibility of
6 significant light pollution.

7 1.5, location of the sole entrance for
8 the 46 residential units on Beach Street.

9 This runs counter to Article 2107.11, overlay
10 district. Principal building entrances shall
11 face Mass. Avenue where the lot abuts on the
12 Avenue.

13 1.6, placement of driveway and ramp
14 down to the entrance to the underground
15 parking on Beach Street creates potentially a
16 24-hour a day noise and light problem. It
17 also requires -- and this is -- I want to
18 stress this, also requires construction of a
19 long retaining wall within a few feet of
20 abutters' properties, including mine. This
21 is against the recommendation of Article 19,
22 33.7.

1 1.7, placement of the mouth of the
2 drive against the Kingdom Hall building.
3 Three problems: Violates the required
4 landscape buffer setback, and the project is
5 requesting a relief on this. Requires a new
6 curb cut not overlapping with existing curb
7 cuts, and separated from them by a mature
8 city tree.

9 CHARLES STUDEN: John, could you
10 please wrap up your comments?

11 JOHN ARMSTRONG: Yes, okay.
12 Requires destruction of part of a stark stone
13 and iron low fence which was restored by the
14 Kingdom Hall.

15 And I want to mention one last point if
16 you'll let me, not in my letter. Apparent
17 violation of specific restrictions on use and
18 disposition of land parcel No. 49, Five Beach
19 Street on which the condo main entrance,
20 surface parking and driveway are being
21 placed. This was established by -- these
22 restrictions were established by trust

1 documents dating from 1892 and 1921.

2 So, I'll stop there. And pass on to
3 Preston if you want.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay, Preston. And
5 the next person who has asked to speak after
6 Preston, and I'm assuming that Jessica, Patty
7 and Colleen you're done? Is Lydia Gralla.

8 LIDYIA GRALLA: I'm done.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: You're done? Then
10 the next person after that is Leslie Borden.

11 JESSICA PRATT: See we got it all
12 out of the way for you. See, that was the
13 plan.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Jim Weitz. You're
15 next.

16 PRESTON GRALLA: Preston Gralla,
17 G-r-a-l-l-a, 19 Beach Street. I live four
18 houses down from the development, and I'm
19 continuing what John said.

20 The second issue is the traffic study.
21 The traffic study is invalid for a variety of
22 reasons. First is that the scope was too

1 narrow. Particularly its limitation to the
2 Mass. Ave. Beach Street intersection.
3 Article 1921 mandates that it include
4 intersections where the project have a
5 significant and measurable impact. So the
6 Orchard Street Beach Street intersection
7 should have been included as well. The
8 timing was inappropriate. June is really a
9 very low time for traffic. Saying that
10 adding four percent to the traffic load is
11 hard for me to fathom. I live on Beach
12 Street. I can tell you that traffic doubles
13 often when the students are back. So it's
14 very bad issue of timing. There was no
15 attention in the study to vehicular activity
16 relating to servicing the condo units, and
17 that's required to be studied. The traffic
18 study did not recognize the tipping nature,
19 the tipping point nature of traffic on Beach
20 Street. In other words, right now it's
21 blocked up terribly. You add a little bit of
22 extra traffic, and there's a geometric impact

1 there. So adding even a small amount of
2 traffic makes a massive impact there. Also
3 there's a failure to recognize in the
4 interpretation of findings that predicted
5 very low rate of trip generation for the
6 building in comparison with that recorded for
7 the car wash which actually has been
8 mentioned.

9 Finally construction. We fear the
10 negative impact of construction on the
11 neighborhood. There's going to be movement
12 of very large amounts of material onto and
13 off the site is going to impact the vibration
14 from heavy equipment, and associated things
15 like that. In view of all these issues, we
16 ask that the Planning Board, first of all,
17 not approve the Special Permit for all these
18 reasons.

19 Secondly, we ask that it use its
20 influence and authority to help bring about
21 resolutions to the many issues that can be
22 acceptable to all the parties. We ask the

1 process include a deeper and more sensitive
2 study of the impact of the project on local
3 traffic. Examination of the impact of the
4 ramp and drive replacement on the Beach
5 Street, on the Beach Street neighborhood city
6 scape and abutters. Construction --
7 construction negotiations between the Saint
8 James Church and the abutters in the
9 neighborhoods on the architecture of the
10 building with special attention to balconies
11 and other features. And a plan for
12 demolition and construction which minimizes
13 impact to abutters as neighbors.

14 One last point I'd like to bring up is
15 that we welcome the church in the
16 neighborhood. We want the church in the
17 neighborhood. So one final thing we would
18 ask is if at any point this development goes
19 forward, since the development is being done
20 to help the church stay a church, we'd like
21 the church in the neighborhood, too, so we'd
22 also like that as part of the agreement be

1 that the church itself remain a church and
2 not be subject to become condos at some point
3 or commercial development, and instead it
4 remains a church.

5 Thank you.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

7 After Jim the next person is Lily
8 Winslow but you didn't say if you wanted to
9 speak or not. And then after Lily it will be
10 Michael Salib.

11 Go ahead.

12 JIM WEITZ: My name is Jim Weitz,
13 W-e-i-t-z. And I live at 53 Orchard Street.
14 And I did send a letter to the Board. And I
15 oppose the current Oaktree Development for
16 two reasons: The height and size, and the
17 privacy and noise issues. And I would like
18 the Planning Board not to grant the permit
19 until the fourth floor and roof decks have
20 been removed, and the balconies have been
21 relocated to Mass. Ave. Thank you.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

1 Michael Salib. And then after Michael
2 the next person who's asked to speak is June
3 Hershey.

4 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: She just
5 left.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Let's see,
7 the next person I have who asked to speak
8 would be Alan Aukeman.

9 MICHAEL SALIB: Good evening. My
10 name is Michael Salib. I live at 19 Hunting
11 Street, Cambridge. And spell my last name
12 S-a-l-i-b.

13 So I wrote a letter. Did the committee
14 actually receive that? Excellent. I'm an
15 engineer. I went to school at MIT. I've
16 been here for about a decade, and I'm a
17 member of Saint James. And so I'd like to
18 speak in support of the project.

19 As an engineer, most of my focus lately
20 has been on global warming issues. And I
21 noticed that the city is actually part of a
22 group of cities devoted to addressing climate

1 change. We have a climate change action
2 plan. This is a major issue. This is
3 actually where climate change comes down to
4 making sacrifices. There is pretty much
5 nothing that we can do that will match
6 developing high density housing near public
7 transit infrastructure. Everything else is
8 not going to be as significant, and there's a
9 cost to actually addressing climate change.
10 That cost is traffic, according to the
11 Cambridge Department of Transportation study
12 would go up by two percent, or actually 1.7
13 percent at peak hours. That doesn't -- on
14 Beach Street. That doesn't strike me as a
15 huge loss for the neighborhood, but in
16 comparison to the loss that we would all face
17 with unabated global warming. I would
18 strongly argue you in order to satisfy the
19 city council's goals regarding global warming
20 and the voters goals that we need to move
21 forward and not delay the project
22 arbitrarily.

1 Thank you.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

3 Allen. And the person after Allen who
4 has asked to speak is Karen Meridith.

5 ALAN AUKEMAN: Good evening. Alan,
6 A-l-a-n -- thank you. Good accommodation.
7 Something we can't always offer in our own
8 building right now. My name is Alan Aukeman,
9 A-u-k-e-m-a-n. I'm a resident at 90 Inman
10 and I'm a member of Saint Jameses and I'm
11 member of (inaudible). We've been in the
12 congregation in North Cambridge since 1864,
13 and although that's in the last year of the
14 civil war, we're not here to start another
15 one. And we've worked with -- in good faith
16 with the planning office, with the traffic
17 office and with the city as a whole and the
18 neighbors appearing with the Porter Square
19 Neighborhood Association, very early in our
20 discussions with Oaktree, well before we even
21 had any even a non-binding agreement worked
22 out with them. And so we worked in good

1 faith, because we want to be and remain in
2 North Cambridge. Our congregation is sort of
3 living repository of the community. We have
4 members who have been with us since the
5 thirties and the forties. And if you look at
6 our history, I think it's all in the Special
7 Permit, we have a 40 to 60 year cycle where
8 our facility needs renewal or expansion, and
9 we're at that point again, our last expansion
10 happening in the 1950s. And we're doing this
11 as you see in the pictures, because in some
12 ways we have to, but we're doing it moreover
13 out of the sense of promise that those
14 children that are amongst us, some of those
15 will be individuals who in the future 40 to
16 60 years from now will be our elderly
17 members. And in terms of the last -- one of
18 the last speaker's concerns that we stay
19 there as a church. That's why we're doing
20 this. And we find it a very exciting
21 opportunity. Our congregation
22 institutionally has been witness to the

1 in-feeling of North Cambridge. When we went
2 up there in 1864, cattle were being herded
3 and soldiers were being mustered, and what
4 might have seemed like suburban expansion at
5 the edges of the city at the time now of
6 course are part of our vulnerable urban
7 fabric, and we've taken great pains to work
8 within the zoning envelopes and what we can
9 do to respect our abutters as outlined and as
10 encoded in the city code and zoning
11 descriptions. And we've worked diligently to
12 do that. And, again, that's out of the hope
13 and the promise that we see in Porter Square
14 and our continued life there for generations
15 to come.

16 Thank you.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

18 The next person to speak after Karen is
19 Susan Hunziker.

20 KAREN MERIDITH: My name is Karen
21 Meridith, M-e-r-i-d-i-t-h. I live at 110
22 Central Street in Somerville. I am the

1 senior warden of Saint James' s Episcopal
2 Church which is for those of you who are not
3 Episcopalians, president of the congregation.

4 I want to speak in favor of this
5 project. You've heard from a number of us at
6 Saint Jameses by letter and here in person
7 tonight speaking to the merits of project
8 that will transform a couple of less than
9 attractive parcels into something in keeping
10 with best practices in urban development. A
11 mixed use energy-responsible building that
12 includes residential units, commercial retail
13 space, green space and a home for a
14 non-profit organization that provides a
15 variety of services to the surrounding
16 community. Saint Jameses is blessed with a
17 number of professionals who can speak to
18 these issues, but I am not an architect, or a
19 landscape designer or an urban planner. I'm
20 a theologian, and I have to speak from my own
21 perspective. The charge has been laid on us
22 that we do not care for our neighbors. This

1 is not true. We at Saint Jameses believe
2 that we are called by God to care for our
3 neighbors, all of our neighbors, not just
4 those whose property happens to abut ours.
5 As a theologian, I further believe that God
6 calls us to show preference for the plight of
7 the poor and reverence for the earth as God's
8 own creation. By tearing down our hugely
9 inefficient, mostly inaccessible, energy
10 wasting parish house and partnering with
11 Oaktree in this new project, we are making it
12 possible for us to continue serving our
13 neighbors who are hungry and count on us to
14 help them keep food on their tables. Our
15 neighbors who are in prison and look to us
16 for hope and encouragement. Our neighbors
17 who are mentally ill and appreciate being
18 accepted for who they are. Our neighbors who
19 offer the gift of beautiful music to the
20 community. Our neighbors who are visiting
21 from all over the world and find with us a
22 home for a short time. Our neighbors who

1 don't have nice homes. In fact, many who
2 have no homes at all. These are our
3 neighbors and we care about them. It may be
4 that some would prefer to see our present
5 parish house continue its gentle sinking
6 into decay. We don't. We can't afford it.
7 The drain on the energy and finances of the
8 congregation is just too great. Likewise, we
9 have no wish to watch our beautiful landmark
10 church continue to crumble around us. The
11 endowment we hope to establish through this
12 partnership will make it possible to do not
13 just basic maintenance needed to keep the
14 roof attached or the tower from falling on
15 us --

16 CHARLES STUDEN: Karen, can you
17 please wrap up your comments.

18 KAREN MERIDITH: I have two
19 sentences left. But go a long way toward
20 restoring the interior as well. And finally
21 we would not enter into this partnership if
22 we did not see it as a way to show reverence

1 for the end by moving to a green building and
2 by turning a long neglected garden into an
3 urban green space that we can offer to our
4 neighbors.

5 Thank you.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you. The next
7 person that asked to speak is Susan, and
8 after Susan I have Andrea Salzman (phonetic)
9 but you didn't indicate if you'd like to
10 speak. Is Andrea here?

11 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I'm not
12 speaking.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

14 And then after that John Howard.

15 SUSAN HUNZIKER: My name is Susan
16 Hunziker, H-u-n-z-i-k-e-r. I live at 80
17 Orchard Street. I'm not an abutter of this
18 project, I'm speaking as an officer in the
19 Porter Square Neighbors Association. I'm
20 here to ask you to listen very carefully,
21 take to heart the presentation that was given
22 on the traffic that was given to you tonight.

1 This has been done by a lot of neighbors, and
2 put a lot of energy into it and a lot of
3 thinking about it. And it is unfortunate, I
4 think we said in the letter, that more work
5 was done by the neighbors on assessing it out
6 than possibly by the city.

7 The other thing I wanted to reenforce
8 in my letter is the issue of transparency
9 that was raised earlier. This has been the
10 most snake-bitten public process that I have
11 ever, ever been involved in. And I -- but I
12 believe that everyone involved with it, the
13 developer, the church, the neighbors, and the
14 neighborhood association have a little piece
15 in that. Is -- Gwen Noyes said at the
16 beginning that this has been going on for
17 about a year and a half. I think that the
18 involvement with the Oaktree and the church
19 has, but the actual public part didn't get
20 started until really May. There was a
21 presentation that was made in December or
22 June and then kind of went underground and it

1 She's next.

2 JOHN HOWARD: I am John Howard.
3 Eight Cogswell Avenue, Cambridge.
4 H-o-w-a-r-d. I'm speaking -- I'm president
5 of the Porter Square Neighborhood
6 Association. Susan and I have been working
7 -- we met originally with Holly over a year
8 ago and raised the flag this is going to be a
9 controversial and difficult issue. And it
10 has been very difficult to get everybody to
11 talk for the reasons that Susan mentioned.
12 The timing was wrong. I will also say that
13 this unusual combination of the Oaktree and
14 church meetings, there's nobody on the
15 developer side that can really speak for all
16 the developers. They have their own
17 negotiations they're doing, we can't
18 interfere with that. But as a result they're
19 not speaking in a coherent (inaudible) with
20 us. And that kept on going, kept on going
21 right through about now. We hope that if you
22 do decide to postpone this, that it will make

1 an opportunity for the developers to appoint
2 somebody and for the neighborhood to come to
3 the table and have a real conversation about
4 this that we don't believe has happened yet.
5 And I think the bottom line isn't so much all
6 the arguing over the details, although
7 they're very significant. I think that, you
8 know, it was very convincing presentation.
9 We have two letters in for you to read that I
10 don't want to repeat. But the bottom line is
11 we have here an opportunity at last to have a
12 real dialogue and it's high time that we have
13 that dialogue.

14 Thank you.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

16 Joan? Is Joan here? Jean.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I don't
18 want to speak.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Ruth Allen.
20 And after Ruth it is Hasam Azzam.

21 RUTH ALLEN: I'm not here for the
22 Connor petition so don't worry. Ruth Allen,

1 A-I-I-e-n. I live at 48 Fenno Street

2 F-e-n-n-o Street, Cambridge.

3 The reason I'm here today is I was
4 split sort of I was trying to figure out what
5 was going on. But I had some major concerns.
6 My husband actually is from this parish, and
7 I wholeheartedly believe that these people
8 are probably the most community-minded,
9 special people in the world. First of all,
10 my husband came from there so that's a good
11 start. And I really truly believe that they
12 think that this is the only way that they can
13 keep their parish going. I don't believe
14 that. I think Oaktree came in with a
15 proposal for them, kind of flashed this is
16 what we can do for you, and they
17 wholeheartedly believe that this is what--
18 the only chance that they have to save their
19 parish. Being in Cambridge, especially in
20 that area, you have a development right
21 next-door that was a funeral home. It became
22 a monstrosity. That has not even been

1 included in anything that Oaktree has even
2 said. You have -- for traffic patterns, so
3 you have this development coming up, you have
4 the development on the corner that was the --
5 that was the funeral home that's -- that
6 hasn't even finished yet. So that hasn't
7 been put into the traffic study. You have
8 the Kaya Restaurant right down the street
9 with how many proposals coming through. Plus
10 these people think that nobody drives in
11 Cambridge. I drive. I have two kids, I have
12 an elderly parent. I have to drive. These
13 people to afford Cambridge have to have two
14 salaries. A lot of them drive. I don't ride
15 a bike mostly because I'd probably get hit.
16 But the second part is it just doesn't make
17 sense to me. And these neighborhoods in
18 Cambridge really need to sustain themselves.
19 And we need not be in a development that
20 doesn't listen to them at first. And I've
21 been there. So I ask that, you know, I truly
22 believe Saint James should have something

1 Special Permit. Don't let them rush into
2 anything. Let them really think about it and
3 set in the neighborhood. That's all.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

5 Next I have Hasam Azzam. And after
6 Hasam it looks like there's -- is there a
7 John Day? You don't want to speak? John
8 Gay.

9 And the next person I have who said
10 they would like to speak is Jerry Callen.

11 HASAM AZZAM: Hi, name is Hasam
12 Azzam, A-z-z-a-m. I live at Four Beach
13 Street. I own the building which is the --
14 formerly -- she just spoke of, the former
15 funeral home. I'm the developer there. I
16 own also the building next-door which is a
17 three-family at Six Beach Street so I'm
18 probably the most affected person in town
19 with traffic on Beach Street. Essentially I
20 support -- I have no problem with the
21 project. I think if the church wants it and
22 it's allowed by zoning, it should be allowed.

1 However, on the traffic on Beach Street I
2 would agree with the neighbors that it's
3 very, very busy. And the main interest to
4 the project should be on Mass. Ave. It's
5 almost impos -- if one person wants to make a
6 left turn from Beach Street onto that
7 driveway, the traffic backs up actually
8 around the corner onto Mass. Ave.

9 Thank you.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

11 We have a whole lot of people who
12 signed up that said they don't want to speak,
13 and just for the Board's information there's
14 about 10 people in support and about four
15 people opposed who signed up who said they
16 don't want to speak. But between Hasam and
17 Jerry. So Jerry.

18 JERRY CALLEN: Hi, my name is Jerry
19 Callen, J-e-r-r-y C-a-l-l-e-n. I live at 63
20 Orchard Street. I've been a Cambridge
21 resident and homeowner for last 22, almost 23
22 years. First at 34 Lancaster Street and now

1 at 63 Orchard.

2 I have been commuting by almost every
3 possible mode over the past 12 years from
4 this location. Sometimes driving, sometimes
5 taking the T, sometimes walking or using a
6 bicycle. And currently I use a bus. So I'm
7 familiar very much with the conditions in
8 that area. And Porter Square is a major
9 destination for me for both the T and for
10 shopping as well. I am generally supportive
11 of this project. I can understand the
12 concerns of the abutters, and don't think I
13 would be very pleased either frankly if I
14 were in their position. I think, however,
15 that the church has a fairly compelling case
16 to make for this. I do think that the issue
17 of balconies and invasion of privacy in the
18 backyard should be considered on this
19 project. I don't believe that the traffic
20 issue is going to be significant. Again, I
21 have lived here for 12 years and commuted and
22 gone through that intersection many times

1 both morning and evening rush hours on foot
2 and by car, and it is in fact not great. But
3 I don't believe -- I tend to concur with the
4 traffic study that it won't be significant.

5 So anyway, I hope that in general as I
6 said, I'm very supportive of this. I do
7 think that the permit has to be delayed long
8 enough to take into consideration the
9 concerns of the immediate abutters, but I do
10 hope the project goes forward.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

12 Now, the next person that's asked to
13 speak is Ruth, is it Ryals? And after Ruth
14 it's Lincoln Hampton. Hampri n (phonetic)?

15 RUTH RYALS: I'm Ruth Ryals, and I
16 live at 115 Upland Road. And the name is
17 spelled R-y-a-l-s. And I'm a member of
18 Porter Square Neighborhood Association. I'm
19 generally in agreement with their letter and
20 their support of the proposal, but wishing to
21 have some -- having a delay so that the
22 neighbors and the church and Oaktree can work

1 out some of the issues. I am in favor of the
2 proposal. And I think one of the things that
3 hasn't really been focussed on, but I believe
4 it is the intent of the church to reclaim its
5 position on Mass. Avenue. It breaks my heart
6 every time I see a padlock on the door on
7 Mass. Avenue. It should not be the case,
8 especially for a church that has the kind of
9 outreach that they have. I mean, if they
10 have to post a homeless person there to guard
11 it. But I think it also makes a great deal
12 of sense to have Beach Street entrance and
13 exit for the residential. So I think those
14 two pieces make a good deal of sense. I
15 think the traffic study is flawed. In fact,
16 the methodology and the inability to actually
17 talk to the neighbors and -- beforehand is
18 very flawed. But you can solve a lot of the
19 problems by just being creative. Allowing
20 only a right-hand turn out of the garage and
21 not a left. So, what if they have to go
22 around the block. Lots of us have to do

1 that. The Beach Street has its problems, and
2 it needs to have some attention to the
3 traffic there in general. Not just for this
4 project. And I think some creativity has to
5 be brought to bear, because frankly the
6 person who was saying there were a number of
7 different developments that are going to
8 impact that particular street and that
9 particular intersection at Mass. Avenue and
10 further down Elm Street and at Orchard
11 they're not being taken into account. So
12 that's the sum total of my comments.

13 Thank you.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

15 Lincoln. And the next person who's
16 asked to speak after Lincoln is Rachel Evans.

17 LINCOLN HAMPTON, JR.: My name is
18 Lincoln Hampton, Junior. H-a-m-p-t-o-n. I
19 have live at 79 Martin Street, Cambridge.
20 I'm a minister at Nine Beach Street, the
21 Kingdom Hall of Jehovah Witnesses. Many of
22 you are familiar with the Kingdom Hall.

1 Quite a few years ago we had to renovate what
2 was known as the Woodbridge Gymnasium, that's
3 what the Historical Society made sure that we
4 remembered it as. And we were subsequently
5 given the project of using our quick build
6 method to restore a Queen Anne style building
7 in way that the neighborhood wanted it to be
8 restored and remain to look the same as,
9 while our intent was just to have a simple
10 place of worship. But as a result of that,
11 that gave us a lot of work to do. We had
12 quite a bit of work to do. And quite a few
13 volunteers that might have witnessed by a lot
14 of people in this room that came to try to do
15 what was monumental type work, especially the
16 stone work that was done in front of Kingdom
17 Hall. So our main concern tonight is the
18 Special Permit here is now asking relief of
19 the five-foot landscape. Now we're really
20 concerned about that part, because in the
21 presentations different things were shown.
22 There was the -- there was some presentation

1 of where the five-foot landscape was actually
2 there. And then there were instances where
3 it was shown, where it was taken away. So
4 we're not sure that the Board actually saw
5 this correctly. But the fact is that in
6 relieving them of that five feet, that's
7 gonna put them right up against our building.
8 And we didn't have the opportunity to move
9 the building further away from their
10 property. We had to sustain the building
11 exactly as it is was, and to just, you know,
12 upgrade it obviously, but to sustain it in
13 its exact position. So we didn't have an
14 opportunity to give them, you know, any
15 leeway or away from their building. We could
16 have used the smaller building as it were.
17 But we had to restore the building that was
18 there. Now we have to maintain this building
19 in a fine manner. We're not sure if that
20 five-foot buffer that we be given by the
21 setback normally there, now being relieved,
22 what possibilities that might give us and

1 actually getting access to that side of the
2 Kingdom Hall so that we can also maintain it
3 as we have.

4 We saw the original presentation. We
5 recognize that the zoning allowed for the
6 five feet. We realized we don't have an
7 argument with the present zoning situation.
8 However, for this relief it does raise a lot
9 of questions for us as to how we will
10 maintain that and why we were specifically
11 insisted upon maintaining the front,
12 especially with the stone work and grill
13 work, the fence, which we've looked at
14 pictures that have existed for quite a few
15 decades --

16 CHARLES STUDEN: Again, can you
17 please conclude your remarks?

18 LINCOLN HAMPTON, JR.: Yes.

19 So that is why we're particularly
20 opposed to the Special Permit.

21 Thank you.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

1 After Rachel the next person who asked
2 to speak is Mary Caulfield.

3 RACHEL EVANS: My name is Rachel
4 Evans. R-a-c-h-e-l E-v-a-n-s. My family of
5 four lives three blocks from Saint James at
6 27 Saint James Avenue in Somerville. We own
7 one car and four and a half bicycles and we
8 travel through this neighborhood on a daily
9 basis. I'm a member of Saint James Church
10 and I work at the Massachusetts Department of
11 Energy Resources where everyday I struggle to
12 reduce this Commonwealth's carbon footprint,
13 and I support this project.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.
15 Mary.

16 MARY CAULFIELD: My name is Mary
17 Caulfield. M-a-r-y C-a-u-l-f-i-e-l-d. I'm a
18 19-year resident and homeowner in Cambridge.
19 I live at Six Crawford Street, and I'm 17
20 year parishioner at Saint Jameses.

21 I support Saint Jameses with my
22 volunteer hours and also with my tithes and

1 offerings. I believe that this project is
2 essential to our survival.

3 Thank you for your attention.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

5 Yes, as far as the list I have, this is
6 all I have of people have asked. Is there
7 anyone who would like to speak?

8 DAVID FALANGA: My name is after
9 Lincoln Hampton's.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh. It looked like
11 you checked you didn't want to speak.

12 DAVID FALANGA: David Falanga,
13 F-a-l-a-n-g-a. I live at 30 Madison Avenue
14 in Cambridge. I've been there for 40 years.
15 I'm also a minister of the Kingdom Hall of
16 Jehovah's Witnesses.

17 Just to continue on what Lincoln
18 Hampton was saying, an additional concern
19 that we have is with the way that they want
20 that setback is damage can be caused to the
21 existing building, especially the foundation
22 with all the drilling and the digging.

1 Because as you can imagine, the building
2 being so old, well over 100 years old, the
3 foundation is of the old cobblestone type of
4 slate foundation that they used to use at
5 that time. So we're very concerned about
6 what that will do to the building in terms of
7 the foundation.

8 So that's all I have to say, and I'd
9 ask you to take that into consideration.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Thank you.

11 And, again, we'll -- I'll get to you.
12 Just to keep tally of the people who have
13 requested not to speak since I last told you,
14 we have three people who are in support and
15 two people who are opposed.

16 Go ahead.

17 JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

18 My name is James Williamson. I live at
19 1000 Jackson Place in the Jefferson Park
20 Public Housing Development in North Cambridge
21 where I've lived for the past two years and
22 started to take more of an interest in what's

1 happenin g i n North Cambri dge. And that' s why
2 I' m here, a sense of ci vi c obl i gati on, and
3 obl i gati on to my nei ghbors. And some of us
4 arri ved l ate because we were at a candi dates
5 forum toni ght, and I' m sorry about.

6 I was bapti zed and confi rmed an
7 Epi scosl oppi an as we used to call i t i n my
8 fami ly sometimes, when we were feeli ng a
9 l i ttle di sgruntl ed perhaps. My mother
10 founded a shel ter for battered women wi th Bud
11 Cedarhome at hi s ol d church i n Whi te Ri ver
12 Juncti on, Vermont. And I thi nk i t' s sti ll
13 there today. I t' s called the Haven.

14 I thi nk there' s probabl y nothi ng worse
15 than a l ong funeral , and except maybe i f i t' s
16 the bui ldi ng that got put there i n i ts pl ace.
17 And i f somehow i t coul d be part of the
18 agreement that that bui ldi ng get torn down,
19 maybe there coul d be some progress on the
20 di sagreements about thi s proposal . I woul d
21 l i ke to thank the nei ghbors, the resi dents
22 for a great presentati on. I f we had some

1 presentations in the past on the issues I
2 cared about. I'm in great sympathy with the
3 issues that have been raised by neighbors and
4 abutters, and I'm especially -- I just want
5 to express my solidarity with Lincoln from
6 Kingdom Hall and the Jehovah's Witnesses
7 congregation. Lincoln made a great
8 presentation to the North Cambridge
9 Stabilization Committee, and I thought he's
10 been very thoughtful, and I commend to you
11 his concerns. And finally my one particular
12 interest in this is -- and I notice that it's
13 in the Saint James -- in the redevelopment
14 proposal encouraging walking. I'm a walker.
15 I do take the bus by that location every
16 single night on my way home. But I do walk a
17 lot. And my -- I tend to see things from
18 street, the street level. And as a
19 pedestrian, as a sort of a concrete cowboy if
20 you will. And I'm concerned about whether
21 the building is setback far enough. There is
22 a concern expressed by the view of the fire

1 station from Porter Square side. I'm
2 concerned that it may not be set far enough
3 back to accommodate the view of the church,
4 and I think people have talked about that and
5 appreciate that, the view of the front
6 entrance of the church from the other side,
7 from walking down from the north side on the
8 north side of the sidewalk. So that's the
9 specific concern that I would like to
10 highlight in addition to being supportive of
11 the concerns raised by others.

12 Thank you.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

14 Is there anyone else who would like to
15 speak? Let's start with over there and then
16 you're next and then you're after that. And
17 I'll come back over here.

18 CYNTHIA OWEN: My name is Cynthia
19 Owen. And I'd like to say to my Jehovah
20 Witness friends --

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you give your
22 address?

1 CYNTHIA OWEN: Seven School Street,
2 Somerville.

3 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Ma'am,
4 your name again, please?

5 CYNTHIA OWEN: Cynthia Owen,
6 O-w-e-n. 25 percent of the membership of
7 Saint James comes from Somerville, so I think
8 I have some input that I can make. Now to my
9 Jehovah Witness friends, they park in the lot
10 and we welcome you, sir, to park there. So
11 that is a problem that could be solved. But
12 with all deference to Holy our minister, I
13 would like to put aside the religious aspect
14 of this. Even though Saint James is a
15 historic church and this architectural
16 brilliance and all that, I would like to
17 point out the role that Saint James can play
18 with this new building. Presently we have an
19 orchestra practicing there. We have a lot of
20 outreach activities, and with this new
21 building we would be able to create a focal
22 point in Porter Square which is lacking. The

1 Porter Square shopping center is not really a
2 great place. It has a few shops and
3 whatever. It needs a focal point, and we
4 would be able to have concerts and things and
5 raise the cultural level of the community,
6 and that is my concern and contribution.

7 Thank you.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

9 BENAZEER NOORANI: My name is
10 Benazeer Noorani, B-e-n-a-z-e-e-r Noorani,
11 N-o-o-r-a-n-i. I'm familiar with having to
12 spell out my name.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: And your address?

14 BENAZEER NOORANI: My address is 19
15 Hunting Street in Cambridge. I wish I can
16 say I've been a resident of Cambridge for 25
17 years. 25 years ago I was living on an Air
18 Force base in Southern Mississippi. 20 years
19 ago I was living on an Air Force base in
20 Louisiana. 15 years ago an Air Force base in
21 southwestern Ohio. I'm sure you get the
22 picture. I've lived in Cambridge for about

1 eight years starting when I arrived here to
2 go to college. Two years ago I took a job in
3 Washington, DC and within a year I felt
4 something I never felt before, homesickness.
5 So I quit my job and moved back to Cambridge
6 which is the only place I've considered home.
7 Hearing some of the presentations from the
8 Porter Square Neighborhood Association, I
9 hear a lot of us versus them language. And I
10 just want to emphasize that Saint James is a
11 part of the community. We're not some they
12 that has nothing to do with the community.
13 We have young families. The year I got
14 married at Saint Jameses church, four other
15 young couples who live in Cambridge also got
16 married there, one of whom is already raising
17 a child in Saint Jameses. My husband and
18 plan to send our children Cambridge public
19 schools when we have them, if we have them.
20 We're part of this community. We love this
21 community. We have our concerns about the
22 traffic on Beach Street as well. We have to

1 drive there on Sunday mornings. I worked at
2 the church over the summer, I'm well aware of
3 the problems. And I hope as a member of
4 Saint James's to help push this project, to
5 reduce the traffic concerns as much as
6 possible. We're not unaware of these
7 problems, and we love this community and
8 wants to continue to thrive.

9 Thank you.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

11 RICHARD CLEARY: My name is Richard
12 Cleary, North Cambridge Stabilizations
13 Committee. Entirely unremarked --

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Your address?

15 RICHARD CLEARY: Oh, 15 Brookford
16 Street. Entirely unremarked as far as I have
17 heard tonight, and entirely undiscussed in
18 the year that I have been attending meetings
19 concerning this project, is the limitations,
20 the severe limitations that are placed on the
21 -- any development of this property as the
22 result of the preservation restriction

1 agreement, an easement that the Commonwealth
2 of Massachusetts has, and has had for two
3 decades against this property. Charlie
4 Sullivan -- and there is a second agreement
5 that the church has with the Cambridge
6 Historic Commission which is never discussed
7 by the developer. Charlie Sullivan mentioned
8 these restrictions in a letter to the Board
9 dated September 22nd, but I don't see that he
10 attached the documents themselves. And so
11 with the assumption that he did not do that,
12 I would like to submit the two documents that
13 I am referring to. The preservation easement
14 that the Commonwealth has, and the memorandum
15 of understanding that the church made in 2005
16 with the Cambridge Historic Commission. If
17 you look at those documents, the first one
18 was done under Chapter 184 of the General
19 Laws which allows the Commonwealth to take a
20 restrictive easement to protect the
21 architectural and historical integrity of
22 important buildings, and this building is

1 very important, I won't belabor the long
2 history of this building, this unusual
3 building in its very historic location. That
4 restrictive agreement says that no major
5 alterations to these premises will be done.
6 The church did receive certain funds from the
7 Commonwealth which resulted in this agreement
8 being imposed, this easement being imposed.
9 And then if you look at the supplemental
10 agreement with the city, there are several
11 stipulations that the church has made that it
12 will preserve, for example, preserve open
13 views of the church. This -- the wrap around
14 condos completely obliterated views of the
15 church. That any development will be
16 compatible with its use of a church. That it
17 will -- any development will retain the free
18 standing character of the church.

19 CHARLES STUDEN: Richard, could you
20 please conclude your remarks?

21 RICHARD CLEARY: Okay. There is
22 also discussion they will not encroach, if at

1 all possible, on what's called the Knight's
2 Garden. And of course the Knight's Garden is
3 greatly damaged by this. So I would simply
4 like to ask if you do not deny the Special
5 Permit, that you defer action on it until
6 after the state historical commission and the
7 Cambridge Historical Commission have allowed
8 these -- this development to go forward,
9 because you're just wasting your time if you
10 approve something that they do not approve.

11 Thank you.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

13 There were some folks over here. Why
14 don't we start there.

15 BECKY ARMSTRONG: Hello, everybody.
16 My name is Becky Armstrong, and I live at 36
17 Orchard Street and I'm a direct abutter.

18 I agree with all of the points made
19 before. I'm in opposition to this proposal
20 as well as for a number of reasons which I'm
21 going to emphasize. Firstly, this building
22 does not fit into the neighborhood's

1 aesthetically at all. The materials don't
2 match the materials used in the church or in
3 the neighboring firehouse. So -- or for that
4 matter on the neighborhood of Orchard Street,
5 Blake Street and Beach Street. It's a
6 completely different feel. It's a huge
7 apartment complex versus the beautiful houses
8 that we have on Orchard Street. And as you
9 know, Orchard Street was voted one of the
10 most beautiful streets in this past year. So
11 having this huge building, dramatically
12 alters the atmosphere of Orchard Street. And
13 one thing that has been left out by everybody
14 is the fact this will greatly decrease the
15 property values of all the properties on
16 Blake, Orchard and probably Beach Street.
17 Basically they're asking permission to
18 radically change the feeling of our
19 neighborhood. For me this has huge personal
20 value because I spent the last 19 years of my
21 life growing up in the house that directly
22 overlooks this property. I look down into

1 the playground of Saint James Church, and
2 that has been a wonderful part of my
3 upbringing. My room directly looks down into
4 it. And I also have beautiful open open sky
5 space that I look out across. Having this
6 four-story looming building would cut that
7 sky space in half. And not to mention all of
8 the balconies that will be facing out on to
9 my room, looking into the yards of my
10 neighbors and my family. So, I understand
11 that, you know, everybody has good intentions
12 in this project. It's just a matter of
13 communication between everybody. Between the
14 neighbors, between the church, and deciding
15 that if this is truly a community project,
16 everybody needs to be involved. And what is
17 the best way that we can, you know, bring
18 people together on this project and bring
19 people together to think of the best way to,
20 you know, increase the productivity of the
21 church as well as the neighborhood? Bring
22 everybody together, think of a good plan that

1 actually produces, you know, a communi ty
2 feeling versus a huge apartment compl ex whi ch
3 frankly I j ust don' t thi nk bri ngs a sense of
4 communi ty. I t sets up a huge wal l agai nst
5 our enti re nei ghborhood and di vi des the l and.
6 So, I j ust ask that these thi ngs be
7 consi dered, and thank you for your ti me.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

9 Go ahead. Counci l l or Kelly.

10 CRAIG KELLY: Good eveni ng. My name
11 is Crai g Kelly. I l i ve the Si x Sai nt Gerard
12 terrace, and I commend the proponent on thei r
13 creati veness i n comi ng up wi th thi s proposal ,
14 but i t makes i t very di ffi cul t for peopl e to
15 judge i t except as a one off. Looki ng at i t
16 from my perspecti ve as someone that goes by
17 i t al most every day si nce I l i ve i n North
18 Cambri dge, I thi nk we' d be better off wi th
19 the exi t and entrance to the parki ng garage
20 on Mass. Ave. I f I were one of the abutters,
21 I woul d strongl y obj ect to havi ng bal conies
22 overl ooki ng my property. I actual l y hear

1 that a fair amount from people around the
2 city, the intrusion of balconies and roof
3 decks into their privacy. I don't think this
4 Special Permit is at the approval level yet.
5 I think there's an awful lot of work to be
6 done to meet the neighbor's concerns in a
7 detailed and more deep letter that you have
8 in front of you. And if anyone wants to talk
9 to me about that, I'd be happy to do so.

10 Thank you.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

12 Is there anyone else who hasn't signed
13 up and who would like to speak?

14 (No response.)

15 It looks like -- typically what we do
16 at this point is close the public hearing for
17 verbal comment, but we -- until we make our
18 decision, we allow written comment to be made
19 so you can continue to write to us.

20 Is there any concern that the Board
21 about closing the verbal comment at this
22 point? Then we'll do that.

1 I think it's been, it's been a long
2 night so I think we need a short break. But
3 it's going to be longer because we have
4 business after this. So I'd like see if we
5 can keep the break to about ten minutes. And
6 then when we come back, we'll probably ask a
7 few more questions. I think Sue we will
8 probably ask you to give some commentary from
9 the Traffic Department. And I can tell you
10 we will not be deciding this tonight. So
11 we'll talk to the Board about how they'd like
12 to proceed during the break. So could we
13 have a break let's start back at about 25
14 after.

15 (A short recess was taken.)

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Beth, did Sue step
17 out?

18 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Roger's going to
19 get her.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. What we're
21 going to do is just have Sue -- she had sent
22 us a letter from Traffic's comments on the

1 project. We'll have her talk about that
2 letter, and then afterwards I'll ask the
3 Board members to -- we obviously will not
4 have time to deliberate this tonight because
5 of the time. So I'll ask the Board members
6 to indicate whatever issues, questions they'd
7 like you to think about and address when you
8 come back when we do deliberate it.

9 Sue, can you address the issues in your
10 letter?

11 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Sue Clippinger,
12 C-l-i-p-p-i-n-g-e-r, City of Cambridge
13 Traffic and Parking Department.

14 So, in the letter we gave you we did
15 include the summary of the traffic study and
16 the summary of the Planning Board criteria.
17 The project has 186 daily trips -- vehicle
18 trips, not counting transit, walking, bike.
19 186 vehicle trips daily, 13 in the a.m. and
20 27 in the p.m. So in the letter to you we
21 made a couple of points. One of them is
22 there's no -- currently no on-street parking

1 on either the Beach or Mass. Ave. faces of
2 the parcel of the church and the car wash.
3 And one of the concerns that we have talked
4 about a lot is some of the short term parking
5 activity which currently takes place in the
6 church parking lot off of Beach Street
7 associated with the food pantry, with the
8 school, and with any other kinds of drop off
9 and pick up activities, and the fact that the
10 garage may have a harder time sucking those
11 kinds of vehicles into it and we don't want
12 to end up with short term parkers taking a
13 shot at parking in the travel lane especially
14 on Beach Street or on Mass. Ave. in the bike
15 lane. So the proponent has made a
16 recommendation for changes in the curve line
17 on Mass. Ave. that would create the two
18 parking bays. One of the things that we've
19 looked at since then, which we actually
20 haven't even had a chance to share with the
21 developers, we have a hatched out area up
22 against the median on Mass. Ave. so the

1 actual impact on the city sidewalk is
2 probably even less than what's drawn on the
3 picture. But I think that that is a positive
4 way of providing areas in which we can try to
5 manage short term pick up and drop off
6 activities which need to be taking place
7 which are generated by the many different
8 activities that the church is engaged in.
9 And by having those spaces on Mass. Ave. can
10 deal with some of the concerns that have been
11 raised tonight and in the previous weeks
12 about the impact of some of that parking lot
13 activity that's at the church now and those
14 activities that could have adverse impact on
15 Beach Street. So that was item one.

16 Item two, we are taking the incredibly
17 unpopular position that we think that the
18 safest place for the access to the parking
19 garage is on Beach Street. The reason we're
20 saying that is a relatively straight forward
21 comment coming from a Traffic and Parking
22 Department, which is there's a signal at

1 Mass. and Beach Street, and that signal means
2 that we have good control at that
3 intersection for turning movements. And so
4 people who are coming to and from the parking
5 garage are able to use that signal to go in
6 whichever direction they're coming from.
7 What the traffic study showed was about 15
8 percent of the trips to the project are
9 coming -- are coming from -- are coming from
10 the Elm Street direction, and about 50
11 percent are coming from Mass. Ave. split
12 coming from the two directions, not quite
13 exactly half and half but within a percentage
14 point. So you really have three major
15 directions from which vehicles come and
16 leave. And so utilization of the signal to
17 manage those movements is obviously from a
18 Traffic Department's perspective, a safer and
19 more organized way to manage that traffic.
20 And we feel comfortable that Beach Street
21 will not be adversely affected by the
22 increased trips associated with the people

1 going to and from the garage.

2 The third point that we're making here
3 is recommending that the Board put some
4 language in this permit -- if you issue a
5 permit that puts responsibility on the -- on
6 the church essentially, but on the project,
7 to make sure that they are managing
8 activities that may create parking problems
9 that could create impacts either on Beach
10 Street or on Mass. Ave. So if the food
11 pantry is occurring at a time that overlaps
12 with peak activities, and it can be shifted
13 to a time in which it is not overlapping with
14 peak activities to allow it to go without
15 adverse impact, you know, those kinds of
16 things. The school is there, and there's a
17 lot of parent drop off, and there's a very
18 active effort to make sure that's managed and
19 that they have a responsibility for
20 continuing to make sure they are taking
21 actions that will allow the public right of
22 way to function.

1 The fourth point is really just more
2 detail but just the design of the changes
3 along the Mass. Ave. curve line, you know,
4 needs to be worked through with the city in
5 terms of the design detail on that. There's
6 some many -- you know, a listing of
7 mitigation and TDM measures that are
8 relatively small and which have been not
9 controversial in talking with the developer.
10 So I think that is pretty much the sum of
11 what's here. So if you have questions.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Questions?

13 CHARLES STUDEN: Yes, I actually do.

14 Going back to the service area between
15 the fire station and the proposed new
16 residential building, and maybe this is
17 something the applicant can help us
18 understand better when they come back, I
19 still see it, and I guess I'm asking it as a
20 question and a comment at the same time, the
21 potential for a significant amount of
22 conflict there. And maybe it's because I

1 don't understand the nature of really what's
2 going on with the food pantry and the other
3 servicing requirements. There's going to be
4 a retail store there on the corner. Trash
5 gets removed there. It gets stacked up on
6 the street. And I'm worried about the impact
7 it might have on the fire station next-door.
8 Just, again, going to the comment I made
9 earlier that somebody might be tempted to
10 just pull into that driveway thinking oh,
11 I'll just do this quickly when suddenly
12 there's a fire and the door goes up and the
13 fire truck can't get out and so on. Maybe
14 that is a danger. But anyway, I'm just
15 curious about that. And that's driven by the
16 fact that I'm afraid that the six spaces on
17 Mass. Ave. may not be enough, but again maybe
18 you can help us understand that. It just
19 makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable.

20 And then the second issue has to do
21 with the Beach Street entrance which actually
22 I like very much, but I'm wondering -- one of

1 the residents made a comment about the
2 congestion and had a suggestion that if you
3 restricted the exit from the garage, can only
4 make a right-hand turn, it would somehow make
5 things better. Could you comment on that?
6 Would that making things truly better or make
7 things worse? I'm not sure.

8 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I'm trying to
9 remember them in the order they start. Fire
10 stations have people in them all the time.
11 So, I actually think that it's probably not
12 likely to be a problem, especially if it's a
13 reoccurring activity. The fire department
14 employees in that station, I'm sure will
15 either in a very diplomatic way work with the
16 church or in a very undiplomatic way tell the
17 driver to get the hell out of there.

18 You know, I share your concern about
19 the six spaces and what's enough and what's
20 not enough. And I don't have an answer for
21 that. I don't have a numerical formula I can
22 run and tell you what's an answer. The one

1 thing that I feel good about is I think
2 something is better than nothing. And I
3 think it's very worrisome when you have so
4 many activities. And today the lot in front
5 of the church is picking up a lot of that
6 activity, and, therefore, allowing the
7 streets to be less impacted than they might
8 otherwise. And I think the garage is --
9 people are going to be a little more
10 reluctant to go into a garage than they are
11 to go jam into a surface lot. So trying to
12 make sure that the, you know, there is some
13 place for a lot of those short term things.
14 The six spaces will be a challenge for us,
15 you know, in terms of regulating and, you
16 know, is it loading? Is it trash pick up?
17 Is it drop off? What are some of those
18 things, maybe it is something that will
19 probably change, you know, as activities
20 change and needs change. And, again, it goes
21 back to the language that I'm recommending
22 that the church also has a responsibility to

1 be working with us to try to move things away
2 from conflicting times. So if the deliveries
3 are wanting to come in with delivery stuff in
4 the morning, then maybe the food pantry
5 people shouldn't be picking their food up at
6 the same time. Or whatever the different
7 activities might be. So I think it's -- it's
8 sort of two pieces, one, how we regulate the
9 spaces and then enforce them? And then
10 secondly, how the scheduling for the various
11 activities that are likely to put demand on
12 those spaces occur?

13 And then time restrictions. I think
14 that the people who are trying to get out
15 garage and can't get out of the garage, I
16 don't worry about so much because if they
17 can't get out of the garage, they can't mess
18 up Beach Street. It's the people who are
19 trying to get into the garage who are more
20 likely, which is what people talked about,
21 the left turns into the garage. You know,
22 it's not a high volume. And, you know,

1 hopefully they'll get there before too long
2 and it will be something that we'll have to
3 work on in terms of, you know, signal timing
4 adjustments or other kinds of things or
5 enforcement activities to try to make it
6 work. But there is a 18 space or a 24 space
7 parking lot that's there today. So these are
8 not all new activities. There are some
9 existing activities. And the curb cut for
10 the garage is further away from the
11 intersection of Beach and Mass. than the
12 current curb cuts. So I think that also
13 provides a little more space for things to
14 work.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Tom.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: You sat through
17 tonight just as well as we did. And you said
18 it yourself, what you're suggesting on Beach
19 Street is probably the single most unpopular
20 thing that we -- we're going to have to
21 grapple with. And while I think I'm
22 convinced that it probably is not as bad as

1 it was depicted, nevertheless it would be
2 interesting to hear you sort of talk about
3 what the alternative would look like if we
4 tried to do it on Mass. Avenue. If we really
5 did try to have the entrance go roughly where
6 the car wash was, which I took many times in
7 my life, can you sort of think that through a
8 little bit out loud as a -- is that an out of
9 the question alternative? Could it work?
10 What would it be like?

11 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I'm assuming that
12 it would want to be as close to the fire
13 station as possible. It would obviously --
14 you know, change the building design. It
15 would change the curb layout issues that, you
16 know, for the spaces we were trying to
17 create.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: It would be a
19 radical change from what we've been looking
20 at that's for sure.

21 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I mean, clearly
22 if you only had the car wash site and you

1 were building housing there, that's where the
2 driveway would be. You would have no
3 options. You know, I don't think we're
4 saying it's impossible. I think we're
5 saying, we as a department, are much more
6 comfortable with turning movements, and the
7 activity happening as a signal rather than an
8 unsignalized location. The car wash probably
9 didn't have its peak activity at peak hour,
10 but there have been crashes along that block
11 as well as along Beach Street. So, you know,
12 you're basically either taking a left into a
13 Mass. Ave. opening blocking the left lane on
14 Mass. Ave. or you're taking a left out trying
15 to get a gap to go out. Or you're deciding
16 to go -- that you're not gonna do that, and
17 then you're either doing an illegal U at
18 Walden probably or you're going around the
19 block on Russell. I don't know if people
20 would bother to do that to get back around to
21 end up at the same place you would have been
22 anyway which is Mass. and Beach unless, you

1 go on Elm. If you come out of the
2 driveway --

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: You can turn left
4 or right.

5 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: You can turn
6 left.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. The
8 median is open there.

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, because
10 there's an opening for the fire station. It
11 was really never an opening for the car wash.
12 It was always an opening for the fire
13 station. So either you're going out to take
14 that left, unsignalized, you know, as you get
15 your gap. If you decide you don't want to
16 take the left, then you take a right and take
17 your illegal U-turn at Walden or you take a
18 right and you take your first right which
19 would be Russell, and then go back, depending
20 where you're going. Go back on Orchard, go
21 back on Elm, go back however you're going to
22 go. And then when you're coming into the

1 site -- and it's the left always that are
2 always more difficult, not the right. So
3 when you're coming into the site, you're
4 taking a left.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: At that break in
6 the --

7 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: At the break in
8 the median.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Right. Which is
10 doable also.

11 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Right. And
12 coming in is a little easier because you're
13 really only looking for a gap in one
14 direction. Whereas going out you have to get
15 a gap in both directions.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: And I guess you
17 can argue the same thing you're arguing with
18 Beach is that because the traffic impact is
19 low, it's perhaps not that big a deal?

20 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Well --

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's a whole lot
22 less of a deal, as they argued, as the young

1 woman argued in the beginning, the car wash
2 was -- had many more trips than you're
3 projecting now.

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, and I don't
5 know if a lot of trips or small trips or what
6 makes sense. You're talking about making --
7 you know, it's going to be safer to make your
8 turns at signal than unsignalized. I'm just
9 saying in the relative scheme of things if
10 you're telling -- you're asking me who is a
11 traffic person, what would I prefer?
12 Obviously I'm going to prefer that turns
13 happen at a signal rather than at an
14 unsignalized location. And I think it's a
15 safer operation. And there may be, you know,
16 you know, maybe there will be accidents if
17 there's a driveway on Mass. Ave. and maybe
18 there won't. And as somebody here was
19 saying, you know, if it's really terrible
20 than we might say right in, right out only.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ahmed.

22 AHMED NUR: Along those lines what

1 are the possibilities or is it likelihood of
2 installing a new signal for the purpose of
3 that -- I'm very unfamiliar with the distance
4 of the signal and whether you have signal, is
5 there one on Beach Street?

6 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: This project
7 would never warrant a traffic signal even if
8 there was no other signals in the area to
9 complicate things. But there is, there's a
10 very unpopular flasher at the fire station
11 which is a fire pre-empt signal. And it's
12 sitting right on top of this location. So it
13 would have to somehow get integrated with all
14 of that, which currently is just a stand
15 alone preempt for the fire department to
16 allow them to get out. And we're trying to
17 run the Mass. Ave. corridor in coordination
18 for the peak hour directions from Harvard
19 Square to Arlington Line.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any other questions?
21 Hugh?

22 HUGH RUSSELL: Charles drew my

1 attention to the four spaces that are in an
2 alcove off of the access drive. Do you have
3 an opinion about those?

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So, having no --
5 saying nothing about urban design which I'm
6 not supposed to talk about anyway, but I
7 think they're really positive from a traffic
8 management perspective, because I think that
9 we should be making sure -- I don't know what
10 they're going to do on Sunday, that's not my
11 biggest concern. But during the weekday
12 hours, that's another opportunity if the
13 church is making sure that, you know, it's
14 not staffing people who are working there,
15 that they're really open for visitors or
16 short term parking, it provides four spaces
17 on the Beach Street face which allows for
18 people who might not be willing to pull all
19 the way into the garage but would pull into
20 one of those spaces to get their food, pick
21 up their kid, go for a meeting, you know,
22 whatever short term things. And, again, I

1 think we're trying to have options for people
2 so that we're -- they're not impacting the
3 operation of Beach or Mass. Ave.

4 CHARLES STUDEN: You're not
5 concerned about the ramp in the backing out
6 of those spaces into the driveway? I find it
7 hard to believe that a car that's parked
8 furthest to the right if you're trying to
9 back out, depending on the time of the day,
10 that it wouldn't be a bit of a challenge.
11 You'd have to be out into the driveway before
12 you would even know if anybody was coming or
13 not.

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, I think the
15 driveway activity is going to be pretty low.
16 And I think one of those spaces ends up being
17 a disability space, so you've got both an
18 access aisle and the fact that that space
19 will not be used maybe all the time. So, you
20 can line them up in a way that gives you the
21 best sight lines.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: One of the concerns

1 that was expressed in the public comments was
2 that the traffic study, they felt that the
3 traffic study itself was narrow. It didn't
4 take into enough intersections that are
5 affected. I know you typically approve the
6 study, but can you just comment on that?

7 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. We have a
8 sort of basic guideline that we're looking
9 for around 40 trips in an intersection. It's
10 hard with a project like this -- this is --
11 how many square feet are you? I keep
12 forgetting.

13 GWEN NOYSE: 75.

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So they're 78,000
15 square feet. It's a 50,000 square foot
16 trigger for the traffic study. So we're
17 talking about relatively small volumes. And
18 so we didn't scope a lot of intersections,
19 you know. If I, you know, I probably should
20 have scoped, you know, the other two people
21 wanted, but I don't think it -- from what we
22 looked at it, wouldn't have triggered any of

1 the Planning Board criteria. And I'm not
2 sure at that it would have given you
3 different information than the information
4 that we have today.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: And what's your
6 feeling about the ramp itself and
7 maneuverability and being able to go down it
8 and turn and do all that stuff? Have you had
9 an opportunity to kind of look at that?

10 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Well, you know in
11 terms of the --

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Radiuses and
13 maneuverability.

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: The width is
15 going to be fine. There's a sharp corner at
16 the bottom that they'll have to deal with.
17 We always look at these things in great
18 detail between any Planning Board permit and
19 the building permit for the actual building
20 to make sure that, you know, all those
21 turning radiuses work. I don't think it -- I
22 think it's all doable within the, you know,

1 w i t h i n t h e b a s i c f o o t p r i n t o f w h a t t h e y ' r e
2 i d e n t i f y i n g .

3 W I L L I A M T I B B S : T h a n k y o u .

4 A n y o t h e r q u e s t i o n s f o r S u e o r
5 c o m m e n t s ? T h a n k y o u , S u e .

6 S o , a s I s a i d , w e ' r e n o t g o i n g t o
7 d e l i b e r a t e t h i s t o n i g h t , b u t i f p e o p l e h a v e
8 c o m m e n t s a n d i s s u e s , t h e y ' d l i k e t o m a k e s u r e
9 t h a t t h e p r o p o n e n t s a r e p r e p a r e d t o t a l k
10 a b o u t w h e n t h e y d o c o m e b a c k a n d w e d o
11 d e l i b e r a t e , y o u s h o u l d i n d i c a t e t h o s e n o w .

12 S t e v e .

13 S T E V E N W I N T E R : T h a n k y o u ,

14 M r . C h a i r .

15 T h e i s s u e s t h a t I ' d l i k e t o k n o w m o r e
16 a b o u t a r e I ' d l i k e t o s e e s o m e k i n d o f a
17 p r e s e n t a t i o n o n t h e i s s u e s o f t h e b a l c o n i e s
18 a n d t h e p r i v a c y a n d h o w t h a t ' s g o i n g t o b e
19 a f f e c t e d . I t h i n k w e ' v e g o t s o m e r e a l
20 c o n c e r n s h e r e . A n d I t h i n k t h e y ' r e
21 l e g i t i m a t e , I t h i n k w e n e e d t o l o o k a t t h e m .
22 T h e o t h e r i s s u e t h a t I t h i n k i s r e a l l y

1 important here is the issue of how the
2 infrastructure for this proposed building is
3 going to impact the Kingdom Hall. That they
4 worked so very hard on to -- and they
5 received a preservation award for it, and
6 they really did everything that they were
7 supposed to do. And we can't go in there now
8 and turn their work around and degrade it.
9 So I think that's going to be really
10 important.

11 And the last thing that I want to say
12 is that, you know, we heard -- this was
13 really good testimony tonight. We heard
14 really good stuff. We heard people say that
15 we worked in good faith. And we heard people
16 say that more communication is required. And
17 we heard people say don't lose sight of
18 what's really able to happen here, which is
19 the building of a piece of community. This
20 is -- there's some really good stuff here.
21 And I feel that this is the moment for the
22 folks here in this dialogue to seize the

1 dialogue for yourself and to get a
2 facilitated dialogue, something really good,
3 and to pull all this good stuff out.
4 Together you've got people with a vision,
5 you've got people with a sense of stewardship
6 all around. You've got people with a sense
7 of mission. People who feel strongly about
8 their community. All the parts are here if
9 we can get a facilitated dialogue together, I
10 think that really good things can happen. So
11 I implore you to do that.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

13 Patricia?

14 PATRICIA SINGER: I have two points
15 that I'd like to have clarified at the next
16 meeting, please.

17 The first one has to do with the
18 historic nature and preservation documents.
19 My understanding is that we need to get
20 clearance from Cambridge Historic Commission
21 as well as Mass. Historic Commission. I'd
22 just like a better understanding of what's

1 entailed there. And similarly I heard
2 something mentioned this evening about some
3 trust documents, and I'd like to know whether
4 that has merit and doesn't have merit.

5 And a minor detail, two minor details.
6 I'd like to understand what's going to happen
7 with service vehicles for the condominiums.

8 And finally going back to the point the
9 Jehovah Witness and the wall and the ramp. I
10 understand that the ramp will curve the way
11 in order to preserve a tree. And I'm
12 wondering if the ramp didn't take that curve
13 if we would not -- and probably got too many
14 notes in there, but if we didn't save the
15 tree, could we then not have to have the five
16 foot setback waiver? So I guess the
17 engineering around the ramp more clarity on
18 that.

19 Thank you.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ahmed.

21 AHMED NUR: I also have three
22 questions to be answered.

1 One is for the staff. The public
2 didn't raise the question with regard to the
3 zoning ordinance being violated. If that
4 could be answered, that would be great. Some
5 chapters that were referred to.

6 And the second question I have is the
7 -- as Steve mentioned, the balconies.
8 There's also some parapet wall showing for
9 privacy reasons how high they are. I'd like
10 to see elevation details on equipment heights
11 and elevations.

12 And let's see, and my third one -- I
13 think that's all I can think of. That's all
14 that comes to mind for now.

15 Thank you.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Thank you.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: You want to go
18 first?

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: A small point.
21 There's a description that the condominium
22 trash was going to be put into barrels and

1 brought out and left out on the street for
2 the trucks, but there's no place except for
3 planting beds to leave those barrels. And it
4 might be quite a number of them. That should
5 be clarified. Another point, I'm not -- I
6 could not tell from the presentation what
7 actually uses were taking place at the
8 church. Is there a day care center or
9 preschool? Is there an after school program?
10 What is a food pantry? How does it work and,
11 you know. What kind of trips does it
12 generate? A very short narrative would give
13 me more comfort in the -- as to what the
14 traffic impacts are of these kind of uses.
15 Of course we know that churches are dynamic
16 institutions and -- but still I think knowing
17 what current status is or what the church is
18 planning would help us a lot.

19 And then I'll get into the kind of -- I
20 don't know how to put this as a question,
21 it's like Jeopardy I guess. My opinion is
22 that I'm convinced that by Sue's arguments by

1 the Beach Street access and because basically
2 because of volumes are so low, you know, if
3 one car every four minutes tries to get out
4 of that driveway, in or out of that driveway,
5 I don't think anybody's going to notice on
6 Beach Street. The big problem is the --
7 which all the abutters spoke to is that the
8 character of the building is very harsh. It
9 is not consistent with a residential
10 character of the buildings which are really
11 unusually a fine collection of frame houses
12 on Blake Street and on Orchard Street. I've
13 never actually walked down Blake Street. And
14 I've never walked, I guess, down Orchard
15 Street. I've driven down Orchard Street.
16 When you walk, you see more things. It's
17 really lovely, lovely houses. And you could
18 see from the sort of movie presentation that
19 it was going to be this very substantial
20 structure which had a very linear character
21 whose unknown, but consisted of horizontal
22 lines. I don't know what those lines meant.

1 Are they terra-cotta tiles like on the
2 Mal fool Building (phonetic) or are they
3 clapboards or are they panels? I don't
4 really know. That needs to be clarified.

5 But basically the 25 years ago or so we
6 built a development in the Hillary Square are
7 terrific. It's in the Broadway and open side
8 of Hilliard Street. If you happen to live on
9 Dana Street, there's a wall of a building
10 that's 13, 15 condominiums long unbroken.
11 It's -- you can go down there and see what
12 that looks like. And it's not nice. And
13 people there didn't like it. And I think,
14 you know, for all the good things I can say
15 about Oliver Square, that's not a good thing
16 and that's the kind of thing that's being
17 proposed here. You know, if there's to be a
18 fourth floor, then it probably should not be
19 separated and emphasized by an overhang
20 corneous which maybe a rooftop in Paris maybe
21 where it's broken up, and you know it has a
22 very different character. I think the views

1 on Mass. Avenue, the way I'm sort of willing
2 to let historic folks deal with that, but I
3 think the wing on Mass. Avenue obstructs the
4 view of the church and obstructs the view of
5 the tower, the fire station, the actual side
6 of the fire station isn't very interesting,
7 but I think that's really not right. So in
8 some sense I agree with everybody who spoke
9 tonight because I think -- and that's our
10 challenge here is we have good people who are
11 trying to do good things. And they have a
12 basic plan that's not -- it's really not
13 quite sensible. But the way in which it's
14 worked out is pretty brutal. And the
15 question is is that the way it has to be?
16 Are we going to be forced to make a choice
17 between that, between those conflicting
18 objectives or is there a way to change the
19 architectural character? Change the massing
20 in some way? Introduce other elements? So
21 that's -- those are my comments.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Tom.

1 THOMAS ANNINGER: I have very
2 similar comments to what Hugh said. I won't
3 say it as well and I'll say it much more
4 briefly. This is a very strong project for
5 two reasons at least:

6 One is we're doing away with the
7 unsightly eyesore, car wash. I think that's
8 a plus for a number of reasons. Noise, dirt,
9 I don't need to go on on that. The other is
10 that it creates a sustainable church, as you
11 put it, and I think you put it well. It
12 gives it a new lease on life, and I think
13 those are two reasons to make it a very
14 strong project. I too, was surprised by the
15 architecture. By the lines. You used in
16 your descriptive packet here words such as
17 "elegant" and "compatible," I'm not sure
18 that's the word you used, but that's what I
19 got. When I saw that, that's not what jumped
20 out at me. I found it austere, cold, and
21 somewhat surprising in its blocky feel. The
22 windows are something that I looked at when

1 you were showing your three-dimensional tour,
2 and I saw I think what you were trying to do.
3 The church has these very tall rectangular
4 windows. (Indicating.) And you seem to
5 reflect that in the buildings themselves, and
6 I guess I would put a question mark there, is
7 that really, is that really -- are you doing
8 yourselves a favor by reflecting that in the
9 buildings? I don't think so. I think there
10 is something in a church that one can
11 understand when you have these windows shaped
12 like that. But to reflect that in a
13 residential building at best makes it look
14 church like, which I'm not sure is quite what
15 you want in a residential building. I think
16 you want something warmer than that. At
17 worst it may be just wrong, headed in the
18 path you're going down. So I too, in
19 somewhat different words, feel the way Hugh
20 does that there's some rethinking perhaps and
21 possibly some serious rethinking that needs
22 something to warm this up to make it fit

1 better, make it more residential.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Ted or Steve?

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: I really had no
4 questions, but you really articulated my
5 concerns which were primarily about the
6 appearance of the building and the fact that
7 from my point of view it makes no attempt to
8 talk to either of the church or the fire
9 station. And while I've never been really
10 applauded the brickling over at Harvard Square
11 and everything being brick, I wonder if maybe
12 brick or a warmer material is something that
13 this building needs. And, you know, I think
14 Hugh said it correctly, that it's very
15 brutal. And I don't think the other
16 buildings are brutal. And I think that it
17 just is not, you know, getting along very
18 well with the neighbors there.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Charles?

20 CHARLES STUDEN: I'm going to be a
21 little more positive here. I'm thinking that
22 first I like this partnership between Oaktree

1 and the church. They're coming together to
2 achieve what seems to be very, very
3 worthwhile goals for both and for actually
4 for everyone in the city of Cambridge to be
5 honest. I think that of course the devil is
6 always in the details. I think that what I
7 really like about this project is what I call
8 the diagram. And the diagram that I'm
9 looking at, and that I like is taking this
10 very important historic church and it's
11 putting residential development on the same
12 parcel. It's also accommodating other church
13 uses on the ground floor. It's got the
14 entrance to the residential portion,
15 pedestrian entrance as well as vehicular
16 entrance on Beach Street which is a
17 residential street and then keeps the
18 presence of the church and the entrance to
19 the church and all of the church functions in
20 that location as well. But like my
21 colleagues on the Board, I also have a
22 concern about the architecture and the

1 building materials. And I'm not going to go
2 on about that, because I think everyone has
3 already talked about it. But specifically
4 the elevation of the residential portion
5 facing the garden seems particularly brutal
6 and tall. And I wonder if it would make
7 better sense to move the balconies to that
8 elevation away from the residential side.
9 The other advantages, of course, you get much
10 more sunshine. All the balconies are kind of
11 on the northern side of the building where
12 they're not going to be that nice most of the
13 time.

14 Let's see, and then the other -- one
15 other thing is the setback of that
16 residential portion along Mass. Ave. And I
17 know you're going to have to deal with the
18 Historical Commission and MHC, but the acute
19 angle of that building as -- near the corner
20 by the fire station is particularly troubling
21 in terms of its relationship to the fire
22 station. And I think what it does to the

1 view of the church as you're going down the
2 street. And I know this is a difficult
3 thing, but somehow I'd like to see that
4 elevation -- the way that's handled, handled
5 a little bit differently if it could be. And
6 I'm not sure exactly -- I have a couple of
7 ideas. Hugh and I walked the site together
8 and we were talking about it. It is a
9 challenge. But I think it's something that
10 you might want to take a harder look at and
11 maybe you can come up with something that
12 again, I think you are going to have to deal
13 with the various historical agencies that
14 will be reviewing this as well.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess I have a
16 couple of things or more than a couple.

17 One relative to the traffic study. I
18 just have a little pet peeve, and that is a
19 study is very technical and that always does
20 the technical stuff and we always have the
21 numbers. But I think it's always good in lay
22 people's terms just talk about the traffic in

1 a, you know, right now it's congested here,
2 there are a lot of people coming out of this
3 lot, it conflicts with traffic going here.
4 When we're done with the things we're doing,
5 that's lessened. We're going to be
6 putting... just, if you listen to Sue and
7 listen to Hugh, you're getting that
8 collective story, but it would be nice if you
9 had just a bit of clarity there. Because the
10 traffic congestion piece that we have to deal
11 with as far as the Special Permit is very
12 clear about whether or not there's -- are we
13 creating congestion or not? I think
14 regardless of what the technical numbers on
15 the study says, I think I'd like to hear from
16 you, what's your feeling about congestion or
17 how that's helping or not helping. In a
18 related issue and it's not because I see
19 anything particularly wrong but I want to get
20 a better understanding of the maneuvering
21 that's happening in the garage. You said
22 people can do some drop off down there but

1 people are driving in and parking and we have
2 service vehicles down there. I want to get
3 a sense of the flow and maneuvering and
4 making sure all that stuff works. We haven't
5 talked about the landscape, but it's funny, I
6 too agree with my, just so that you know,
7 it's pretty consistent, I agree with my
8 fellow Board members that I am concerned
9 about the building aesthetics and just how it
10 looks. As I looked at the three-dimensional
11 model, one of the things I noticed is that
12 the landscape and the trees are critically
13 important because if it's shown the way you
14 have it in your three-dimensional view,
15 you'll notice the edges of the building as
16 it's poking out on the street, which actually
17 I think has some positives to it even if you
18 look at the diagram, the forms are related to
19 the forms around them on the two street
20 sides. But as far as the neighbors are
21 concerned in the back, it's just a wall even
22 though I understand you dropped the height

1 down. And I think we need to get a better
2 understanding of that. But without those
3 trees being as full as they show in that
4 three-dimensional thing, three-dimensional
5 representation, when you're on Mass. Ave,
6 that solid line of wall that goes down and
7 just wraps around the church is extremely
8 dominant. And it's, you know, people are
9 saying it's austere and I think that's a real
10 issue. How do get some form and how to break
11 up those forms so they have more residential
12 feel and it doesn't feel like an apartment
13 block plopped around these very nice other
14 forms, or forms of the residential houses
15 around it as well as the church itself. I
16 think is important for me.

17 And the other issue I want to make sure
18 that we at least talk about, you do have some
19 issues where you're going to be close to
20 foundations and doing digging and
21 construction, I'd like you to address those
22 things when you talk about it. And I think

1 my fellow Board members had a comment on
2 almost everything else I have on my list so I
3 won't go over those again. I guess with that
4 we will --

5 PATRICIA SINGER: May I make one
6 point?

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Sorry, Patricia.

8 PATRICIA SINGER: I listened to you
9 talking about the architecture. I took a
10 different viewpoint on it. Which is that the
11 church is a gem, and that the cleanliness and
12 austerity of the building wrapping it are
13 actually like a canvas highlighting the gem.
14 And so I mean maybe I read things through the
15 words that you all read differently, but I
16 thought that it was a very nice thought to
17 pick up this masonry somehow from the church
18 and put it on the bottom of the building.
19 And then to give it some kind of a canvas to
20 see the church against. So I actually rather
21 like the plainness of it.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: I would just say to

1 that that I think obviously then addresses an
2 issue you'll need to talk about, you'll need
3 to talk about what your concept is there and
4 then we can all feel that -- give you our
5 opinions and you feel that you've addressed
6 whether you've done it or not. I do agree
7 with Hugh that even though you mentioned
8 those things, it was hard to understand what
9 the materials are. You did say it was brick
10 and you did say it was wood above. And I
11 remember saying okay, is it painted wood? Or
12 what's going on there? So I think you just
13 need to explain what your concept is -- and
14 yes. Good.

15 All right. We have other business. So
16 we will -- Beth, you might want to mention to
17 folks who are interested when we're meeting
18 on this next and when to come back.

19 BETH RUBENSTEIN: We do post our
20 agendas on the city web site, which is
21 [www. cambri dgema. gov/ cdd](http://www.cambri dgema. gov/ cdd). And you could also
22 always call the Community Development

1 Department 349-4600 and they will let you
2 know when it's going to be on the agenda. We
3 can't tell you tonight because we have to
4 determine for how long it's going to take for
5 all this work to be done.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: If you can clear out
7 as quietly as you can because we have other
8 business to attend to.

9 (Whereupon, a discussion was
10 held off the record.)

11 * * * *

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: It's been a long
2 night so we'd like to get started. I think
3 -- and, Beth, help me out here. But I think
4 my understanding is what we're trying to do
5 tonight is first, we need to determine if
6 this is a minor amendment or major amendment.
7 If it is a minor amendment, we want to
8 continue on and do a review of the buildings
9 themselves tonight.

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: That's exactly
11 right.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: If we determine it's
13 a major amendment, then we will have to
14 advertise and do a public hearing and you'll
15 have to come back.

16 BETH RUBENSTEIN: That is correct.
17 And also just to add, generally, the major
18 and minor amendment distinction holds in a
19 PUD permit. The reason we're able to -- the
20 Board is able to consider the question of it
21 being a minor change because of a Special
22 Permit decision, and I believe the Board has

1 that in Section 11. That decision carved out
2 a minor amendment option. That's why it's
3 able to be before you.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

5 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr.
6 Chairman, a procedural question? Because I
7 and several other people have been involved
8 in this whole thing for many, many years.
9 And from the Board --

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: So have we.

11 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, I'm
12 sure of that. However, this -- my
13 understanding you're just -- that you had a
14 meeting on the 22nd of September, but then
15 didn't sign a lease until the 1st of October.
16 And now I received this stuff yesterday
17 morning, and it says hearing date October
18 20th. So, is this --

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: This is not a public
20 hearing yet.

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why would
22 material be sent out indicating it's a

1 hearing? Because we just spent hours on the
2 thing down in Cambridge which is very
3 important.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: That was a public
5 hearing. This is not a public hearing.

6 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, I
7 understand. But this is very important to
8 those of us -- and it also involves Arlington
9 because part of this stuff is in Arlington --

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: I understand, but
11 you asked for a procedural question. The
12 procedure is we have to do what I just said.
13 We have to determine if the changes they want
14 to make are a minor amendment or a major
15 amendment. If it's a minor amendment, we --
16 they can come before us and we can comment on
17 their building issues.

18 If it was a major amendment, then they
19 have to come back for a public hearing and
20 that's all we're doing tonight.

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I
22 understand that.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: We really do have to
2 proceed.

3 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. But
4 Arlington still was not notified.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: I don't know how we
6 deal with notifying other communities.

7 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I called
8 and somebody sent out a copy of the material
9 to our planning director --

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: This is under
11 general business tonight, not public hearing.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: That's right, this
13 is general business.

14 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I
15 understand what you're saying, but I'm
16 objecting. I'm sorry, my name is Elsie Fiori
17 (phonetic). My address is 58 Mott Street in
18 Arlington.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Very good.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: I'd like to put on
21 the table a procedural option, which is that
22 we address the major/minor amendment. If we

1 determine it's a minor amendment, we then
2 decide it will postpone further discussion of
3 it until a later date.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: That's a third
5 option.

6 So, I think clearly the first thing we
7 have to do is determine if it's a major or
8 minor amendment, and I would encourage you to
9 focus on that issue and that issue alone. We
10 are familiar with the project. We understand
11 the issues. I think you just tell us, you
12 know -- you've done that in writing, but in
13 the presentation we shouldn't, we shouldn't
14 expand this, you know, beyond that. You
15 should just give us your reasons why you
16 think it's a minor amendment, and then we can
17 make a determination based on that. After we
18 make that determination, we'll then determine
19 what we do afterwards.

20 RICHARD MCKINNON: Mr. Chairman,
21 members of the Board, thank you very much.

22 For the record, my name is Rich

1 McKinnon, and I live at One Layton Street,
2 apartment 1905 at NorthPoint in Cambridge,
3 Mass.

4 We are here tonight to try and respond
5 to some of the issues that came up at the
6 pre-application conference. In particular,
7 the issue what is the central theme of the
8 master plan? What is the master plan about?
9 And I'm going to run right to the issue
10 whether or not this is a minor or major
11 amendment. And what it says in the zoning is
12 this: It's the intent of these districts to
13 permit an appropriate level of development in
14 the districts consistent with the public
15 interest in protecting wetlands where they
16 occur, restoring areas currently developed to
17 urban uses back to their natural state.

18 I'll also go to the master plan, the
19 design principle and leading off is this:
20 The goal of the Cambridge Discovery Park
21 master plan is to create a distinguished
22 urban campus over time. And in doing so, to

1 relate -- relocate all development to the
2 north and west of Acorn Park Drive, return a
3 substantial land to open space, and form an
4 urban edge to the expanded wild.

5 It's always been the reservation,
6 Mr. Chairman, it's been the heart and soul of
7 the master plan and the zoning. And it was
8 with long work, with a very dedicated group
9 of environmentalists that after years of
10 contention we were able to reach the
11 unanimous Planning Board recommendation and
12 Council vote on the zoning for Special
13 District 4. The heart and soul of the
14 reservation, the point that you asked me to
15 think about, Mr. Chairman, is what is the
16 purpose of the master plan?

17 The purpose of the master plan is to
18 take down all of the buildings along the
19 Little River, tear up the old MDC parking
20 lot, and replace all of that with a restored
21 wetland and open space area, confining all of
22 our development to a single 11 acre parcel.

1 And that is precisely what we continue to do.
2 Most of the comments at the last time were
3 focussed on what happens within that 11
4 acres, appropriately so. And that's
5 important. But it's important to remember
6 it's a 27 acre site, and that 11 is being
7 developed. 70 percent is being returned to
8 open space, and the restoration of the
9 reservation has always been at the heart and
10 soul of the master plan and the zoning, and
11 that has not been interrupted in a single
12 way.

13 My sense is, Mr. Chairman, I think
14 Robert has a thing to say, but rather than a
15 lot of Boards, we'll let you ask the
16 questions of us if there's more than you need
17 rather than taking a lot of time to make a
18 guess.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I think you need
20 to make your case.

21 RICHARD MCKINNON: Okay.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: You need to say we

1 think this is a minor amendment because and
2 here are the points that --

3 RICHARD MCKINNON: Absolutely.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- we -- that
5 addressed and make the case.

6 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Thank you.

7 Robert Schlager on behalf of Cambridge
8 Discovery Park. Thank you for seeing us at
9 this late hour. I will be very brief, I
10 assure you of that.

11 We're here this evening essentially to
12 present what we refer to and what is referred
13 to in our Special Permit decision as a minor
14 amendment. What is involved in a minor
15 amendment is essentially the proposed layout
16 and sequence of our original Special Permit
17 may change over time. We are here this
18 evening to propose four simple changes to
19 you. If you look at page one of the booklet
20 that we presented, you will see a list of
21 items that --

22 THOMAS ANNINGER: Minor amendment

1 narrative?

2 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Yes. There's a
3 large scale. The page start out with is if
4 you look page one. Page one lists the items
5 that show no change, and the items that show
6 change. In connection with Building 200 and
7 300, we're here this evening to make four
8 minor changes to the configuration of those
9 two buildings versus our master plan. As you
10 can see, if you focus on the board, perhaps
11 that will be easier. Building 100 to your
12 left, toward the west and Building 200, 300
13 in the center. The original master plan
14 provided for a continuation of Building 200
15 and 300 as a part of Building 100 in a
16 roughly 100,000 square foot building. In
17 order to accommodate the needs of a
18 perspective tenant that we have now, who has
19 executed a lease for approximately 200,000
20 square feet, we have been asked to shift
21 Building 200 closer to Building 300 which
22 results in a shift of approximately 80 feet

1 to the east and 47 feet to the west for
2 Building 300. Those two changes collectively
3 involve reworking the roadway known as
4 Discovery Way, and the side of the building
5 facing Route 2 as Concord Turnpike. There is
6 no change in parking. There is no change in
7 the full scale master plan build out. There
8 is no change in height. There's no change in
9 FAR. There are no changes to the physical
10 relationship of the elements associated with
11 these two buildings.

12 I'd be happy to answer any questions.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you -- I mean,
14 from my perspective, the physical elements as
15 both the buildings and the circulation
16 pattern and the roads and the open space, so
17 I think you need to, for me, you'll just need
18 to give me a better sense of what's going on
19 there.

20 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Sure. The
21 original master plan had contemplated
22 Building 200 and Building 300, as you see in

1 the block to your left 2004, Building 200
2 plan to the east of Building 100. And
3 Building 300 with the roadway down the
4 center, we refer to as approved access if you
5 will. We're looking to shift that access
6 approximately 80 feet to the west in order to
7 accommodate a combination and consolidation
8 of Building 200 and 300. Building 400, as
9 you can see, shifts very so slightly to the
10 east. What you see now is Garage A to
11 your --

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, you need to
13 talk functionally. We can see the physical
14 changes. How are things serviced? How are
15 people moving around? What's the circulation
16 patterns? How are pedestrians moving from
17 the buildings? That to me is what the
18 physical relations are.

19 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Okay.

20 Garage A remains exactly where it was
21 in the top left-hand corner of the project.
22 Garage B to the east remains exactly where it

1 was in the right-hand corner of the project.
2 Building 400, as you can see, the roadway
3 between 400 and 500 remains pretty much
4 exactly where it is. It picks up a slight
5 arc to improve the access and make it a
6 little bit more attractive than what was
7 previously provided for. And the main change
8 is the revision to the entry roadway which
9 runs presently in the center of Building 200,
10 is shifted to the east approximately 80 feet.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Plus you then entered
12 some new pedestrian connection through there?

13 ROBERT SCHLAGER: That's correct.
14 The pedestrian connection is protected with a
15 trellis as well as a very attractive
16 landscaped corridor.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: What part of my
18 reaction to this is it's a little different.
19 All the pieces are moved slightly. Is it
20 better or worse?

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Or functioning the
22 same is what, a minor amendment?

1 from a master plan point of view, this is a
2 minor change, and the kind of change that's
3 sitting on the Board on these kinds of
4 developments over the years that we've seen
5 in every similar scale project that's built
6 in phases. It's the nature of the way things
7 happen. But this demonstrates to me also
8 that this plan is strong enough to be able to
9 take advantage of an opportunity, make some
10 shifts and go forward.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Comments?

12 Yes, Tom.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: I agree with Hugh
14 that this is minor. My memory of how we
15 looked at it is this: When you did your
16 first building, we talked a lot about what we
17 call a geometry of the layout. And I
18 remember distinctly, I think I was one of
19 them, we were somewhat unhappy with the
20 geometry, the way it was, but we all agreed
21 that it was premature to address the geometry
22 when there was a moment in time when you had

1 your next major tenant. And it was then that
2 you were expected to come back to us. But I
3 think we all contemplated that if you moved
4 some of the pieces around, that was never
5 seen as anything other than an attempt at
6 improving and changing to the -- underlying
7 conditions of your new tenant and so on. I
8 happen to think this is an improvement,
9 because if you take a look at page five,
10 which is the old one, I remember distinctly
11 what bothered us. On the old one, if you
12 look at sort of the middle, there was quite a
13 congestion, it was congested. Everything
14 came in the middle and it looked like a
15 traffic intersection that didn't work very
16 well. You've actually parsed that. You've
17 pulled that apart. So that if you look at
18 page seven, that congestion is now been
19 broken down in what seems to me a more
20 uncongested geometry. And I think we always
21 contemplated that kind of a change. And I
22 think we contemplated that as a minor way of

1 looking at it, and therefore I think it is a
2 minor amendment.

3 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Thank you.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Comments?

5 STEVEN WINTER: I concur.

6 CHARLES STUDEN: I do as well.

7 BETH RUBENSTEIN: It would be good
8 for the Board to take a vote when you're
9 ready.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure. But we're not
11 ready yet. I know it's late.

12 I think I wanted to really emphasize
13 one of the issues because I want to make sure
14 it's very clear that even though you make a
15 lot of cases about the fact that you have a
16 tenant and, you know, this change was needed
17 because of the tenant, that that's not the
18 driver for us to determine whether it's a
19 minor or major amendment or not. That we
20 really do look at the issues and say whether
21 it is or not.

22 In my case I look at it and say the --

1 the major change is the central circulation
2 path in the middle and it's shifting over.
3 And the addition of the second one. And so
4 as I look at it, I say is that major or is it
5 minor? I would -- I kind of look at it in a
6 sense of NorthPoint where we kind of
7 established a network of streets and a
8 network of parcels and, you know, there was
9 -- there's how do we do this? In my mind, in
10 this particular case of that shifting of that
11 central roadway to the side, is not as --
12 this was never set-up to be that restrictive
13 I guess in terms of what that is. I'm just
14 thinking out my thought process on this one.
15 So that -- and I would agree that the
16 shifting of it and then creating of the
17 smaller one, it gives you three buildings
18 that are quite frankly better proportioned
19 than they were originally. I always had the
20 problem with the other buildings attaching
21 themselves to the existing buildings before.
22 But the core thing I look at is, is the

1 garage in the same place? Is the perimeter
2 all in the same place? Are you doing a
3 consistent thing with where you're calling
4 the active areas and the open spaces? So, I
5 was scratching my head on this one when you
6 first came, but I think I would agree that I
7 would consider it as minor, too. So it seems
8 like a lot of people are at that point so can
9 we get a motion? We need a motion.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right. Shall I
11 give it a try?

12 I move that we treat the change in
13 master plan as a minor amendment.

14 LES BARBER: Tom, can you speak in
15 the mic.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: I move that we
17 treat the change in the master plan as a
18 minor amendment. Looking at 1237, two of the
19 ordinance because the changes do not alter
20 the concept of the PUD in terms of density
21 floor area ratio, land usage, height, open
22 space or the physical relationship of

1 elements of the development, and the reasons
2 are given in greater detail in the minor
3 amendment narrative provided to us.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do we have a second?
5 Seconded.

6 All those in favor?

7 (Tibbs, Cohen, Anninger, Studen,
8 Russell, Singer, Nur, Winter.)

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: So now the
10 discussion is do we go through the review now
11 or do we do that at another time?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Beth did indicate
13 that I guess our next meeting was available
14 for that kind of a discussion?

15 BETH RUBENSTEIN: The next meeting
16 is the 10th. There is time on the 10th. We
17 may hear from the previous project if they
18 can pull everything together that you've
19 asked them to do, and that's all we have
20 right now.

21 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Mr. Chairman, if I
22 may, might we give you a very brief one

1 minute overview.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: No. We're -- what's
3 your thoughts?

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: At quarter to 12
5 I would certainly prefer if we have the
6 opening at the next hearing, at the next
7 meeting to come back and do it then. And I
8 realize you've waited a long time, and
9 there's a lot of people here, but I think it
10 would be better for all concerned if we could
11 approach it fresh.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. And give it
13 the kind of -- you have saved several weeks
14 in the minor amendment to your path can still
15 be swift.

16 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Procedural
17 question, please?

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, wait a minute.
19 So does the Board agree to that?

20 (All agreed).

21 So what we're going to do is they're
22 going to come back and we're going to review

1 -- do the good building design review at our
2 next meeting.

3 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: And will we
4 have a chance to have part of that
5 discussion?

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: No. This is -- it's
7 not open for public comment.

8 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Let
9 me tell you if I may, when this thing
10 started --

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Now, wait --

12 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: We were
13 told that each time a new building was
14 proposed, it would have to go through a whole
15 review --

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Which we're going to
17 do next time.

18 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: That the
19 public expected to take part in.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: It's not a public --

21 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why not?

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: That's just our

1 rules. And, Beth, I'll have to ask you to
2 explain.

3 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: You spent
4 four hours on a parking lot and fixing a
5 garden that the people could have done for
6 nothing if people are helpful, people but the
7 public is not going to be allowed to make
8 comments on this thing which the traffic --
9 I'm not concerned about the buildings and the
10 size, although I don't consider moving a
11 building 50 feet to be a minor change. But
12 the traffic that's going to ensue here is
13 going to be incredible. This is a swamp
14 we're talking about. It floods.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: When we approve the
16 project the first go round, that was the
17 opportunity for all those issues to go.
18 These are just, these are just --

19 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you
20 didn't approve the whole thing like this.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, we did. We
22 approved the whole thing and all we're doing

1 is addressi ng each thi ng as i t comes al ong.

2 FEMALE AUDI ENCE MEMBER: We were
3 still told that we were able to and perhaps
4 i t wasn't here. Perhaps i t was some other
5 venue. We were told we would be able to
6 di scuss i t. I want to tell you somethi ng i f
7 I may and i t's a personal thi ng.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Excuse me. I thi nk
9 I'm going to have to ask our staff to explai n
10 what the process i s.

11 FEMALE AUDI ENCE MEMBER: No, I know
12 what the process i t.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: I t's almost
14 mi dni ght.

15 FEMALE AUDI ENCE MEMBER: I f I may.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: I 'm going to adj ourn
17 the meeti ng.

18 FEMALE AUDI ENCE MEMBER: I t's about
19 my father I 'd like to speak.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Di d you want to talk
21 to Li za about the i ssue on the Board of
22 Zoni ng cases?

1 This item is done. If you feel you
2 want to talk about a process issue, I would
3 suggest you wait until we're done.

4 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: What good
5 is it? You're telling me we don't have any
6 process. It's all for you people and if we
7 don't like it we can't say anything about it.
8 We'll just have 57,000 cars more on Lake
9 street everyday because you people are gonna
10 decide that it's a good thing.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again --

12 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: And you
13 have a derth of women on your Board, I
14 noticed that.

15 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: They're in the
16 staff positions.

17 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, sure.
18 Carry the coffee.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: I'm sorry, are you
20 talking about --

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: No, I'm talking
22 about Board of Zoning --

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: We're moving on to
2 our next order of business.

3 ROBERT SCHLAGER: Thank you.
4 (Whereupon, a discussion was
5 held off the record.)

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's late and I
7 don't want to drag this out, and perhaps this
8 is a minor point to you all, I actually felt
9 that we didn't actually have the discussion
10 that it deserved on the Rounder Record zoning
11 matter. One thing that was missing in the
12 discussion is when we said we supported the
13 separation, there was no discussion of why we
14 supported it, and I think just to support it
15 may follow, may not be as persuasive, may not
16 be adequately persuasive so I was looking for
17 a nod to the idea -- Li za can look back at
18 the notes of our previous discussion so that
19 she can add some reasoning to it. But I
20 didn't want that to not go be on the record
21 that's all.

22 WILLIAM TIBBS: Did you --

1 THOMAS ANNINGER: Have you been
2 unclear about that?

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Did you find the
4 reasoning? You said you had found our notes.
5 Have you had time to look at them?

6 LIZA PADEN: Right. I misspoke when
7 I said that to Tom. What my plan is to go
8 through the transcript for the deliberation
9 and the decision for the item when you had it
10 as a Special Permit and to take that
11 information, that discussion and put it into
12 the BZA recommendation.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Earlier we talked
14 about just the three facts. I mean the, you
15 know, so that I guess my -- I just want to
16 make sure we're not sending them something
17 that we all just don't agree with. Because
18 again, we've had that issue before where what
19 was presented didn't -- some Board members
20 didn't feel it represented what we said. And
21 I think earlier we said we're going to
22 present those three facts which are just

1 presenting the facts as we saw it. And I do
2 agree that having a quick reason as to why we
3 thought that separation was better, makes
4 sense. But I just want to make sure we had
5 all agreed to that.

6 LIZA PADEN: Well, I can propose --

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: You can tell us.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: The reason was
9 actually very simple, we felt the ongoing
10 operation particularly of a condominium would
11 be much easier to have it not connected
12 legally to the office uses that each -- let
13 them negotiate with each other as neighbors
14 rather than under the condominium structure.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Does everybody agree
16 with that?

17 (All agreed.)

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: There was a
19 complex of a two tier condominium that
20 probably would --

21 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

22 THOMAS ANNINGER: A condominium and

1 a second condominium, there was two
2 associations. That was a little complex
3 unnecessarily so. Thank you. I'm grateful
4 that we had a chance to -- I just make a
5 comment on process. I think one of the
6 problems is when we do Zoning Board cases in
7 front of 70 or 100 people, Hugh pointed this
8 out to me, while everybody is sort of waiting
9 for the public hearing to come, we don't
10 deliberate in the usual thoughtful way. And
11 I think we felt a little bit stymied by the
12 framework of the process. And so I thought
13 we needed a second look.

14 Thank you.

15 LIZA PADEN: Sure.

16 BETH RUBENSTEIN: No problem. We'll
17 see you on the 10th.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

19 Meeting is adjourned.

20 (At 11:50 p.m., the meeting was
21 adjourned.)
22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
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 3rd day of November 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.

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

