

1 PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

2 GENERAL HEARING

3 Tuesday, March 16, 2010

4 7:00 p.m.

5 in

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

9 Hugh Russell, Chair

10 Thomas Anninger, Vice Chair

11 William Tibbs, Member

12 Pamela Winters, Member

13 H. Theodore Cohen, Member

14 Patricia Singer, Member

15 Ahmed Nur, Associate Member

16 Steven Winter, Member

17 Charles Studen, Associate Member

18 Beth Rubenstein, Assistant City Manager
19 for Community Development

20 **Community Development Staff:**

21 Liza Paden

Les Barber

Roger Booth

Susan Glazer

Stuart Dash

Iram Farooq

22 **REPORTERS, INC.**

23 **CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD**

24 617.786.7783/617.639.0396

25 www.reportersinc.com

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

I N D E X

CASE

PAGE

Update by Beth Rubenstein 3

Board of Zoning Appeal Cases 5

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PB#246, 106 and 296 Vassar Street 38

PB#247, 22 Water Street 87

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. PB#38, One Canal Park 185

2. PB#243, Alexandria 185

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This
3 is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning
4 Board and I welcome you to our first seven
5 o'clock session with a slightly revised order
6 of agenda. We will start as always with an
7 update by Beth Rubenstein.

8 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Thanks, Hugh. I'm
9 a little off my game I didn't know we were
10 starting with me but that's great. I usually
11 announce our upcoming meetings. After
12 tonight we'll have completed our March
13 meetings, and we'll be meeting in April on
14 the 6th and on the 20th.

15 April 6th will be the second public
16 hearing for the Alexandria or Binney Street,
17 East Cambridge which is of great interest to
18 a lot of folks. And on April 20th we've got
19 three public hearings. One is the starting
20 up of a proposed residential project on the
21 site where the old bowling board was on Mass.

1 Ave. And there's a proposal to go up and
2 build residential and ground floor retail. I
3 think they're looking for side area and
4 setback waivers. So it's a Special Permit.

5 And then later that night, this is
6 April 20th, we'll have the second hearing on
7 the Smith residential project. They were
8 doing a parking reduction. This was here
9 some months ago. We extended their time
10 deadline. So they're here with some time
11 lag.

12 And then also we'll be hearing again
13 with the One Canal Park folks about their
14 request to get out of their requirement that
15 they have ground floor retail. That's a busy
16 night on the 20th.

17 And in May we are scheduled to meet May
18 4th and 18th. And in June on June 1st and
19 June 15th. And we'll see how the new time
20 works out. And if it works out, we'll
21 continue with the seven o'clock and I think

1 that's it.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

3 So the next item on our agenda is a
4 discussion of the Board of Zoning Appeal
5 cases.

6 LIZA PADEN: Okay, on the agenda for
7 March 25th at the Board of Zoning Appeal, one
8 of the cases I wanted to point out to you is
9 case No. 9908 which is 545 Cambridge Street
10 which was a Planning Board Special Permit at
11 the last March 2nd Planning Board. And the
12 Planning Board granted the Special Permit to
13 allow the conversion of the second and third
14 floor occupancy to four residential units. I
15 was not aware at the time that the applicant
16 also submitted a case to the Board of Zoning
17 Appeal for a Variance to add a roof deck to
18 the single-story warehouse space that's
19 behind the building. And I suggested to
20 Mr. Resnick, who is here this evening, that
21 he come and talk to the Board about that

1 Variance specifically because the Planning
2 Board had just looked at it. Is that --

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

4 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

5 MARC RESNICK: Hi. So if you
6 remember I was here a week or two ago. It
7 seems I may have broken protocol, but I
8 didn't know that. I came here a couple weeks
9 ago to get a Special Permit for this building
10 on Cambridge Street, and I also had already
11 applied for a Variance but I didn't realize
12 that I was supposed to do it in conjunction
13 to do two things. One is to remove the rear
14 stairs from the inside of the building and
15 put them on to the back where the big
16 extension is. And also to build a roof deck
17 because there was no open space.

18 If you take a look at some of the
19 pictures, this very, very ugly, plain picture
20 is the current roof as it stands today. And
21 if you look at the one that was on the top --

1 the one on the top is a rendering of what the
2 existing building looks like now. So, with
3 -- if you look -- that is that rear
4 staircase, that small extension and light
5 purple off the back. It's totally
6 non-visible from the street. It's completely
7 surrounded. It's no taller than the existing
8 structure. Only the house is on the sides.
9 And I showed some of the little courtyards on
10 the houses along the side of our existing
11 building. So those courtyards currently but
12 up against that one-story addition. And I
13 built the roof deck or designed it so that it
14 would only -- there's a barrier -- like, if
15 you look at this one, this one shows that is
16 the rear stairs. Just that little addition
17 there. And the roof deck is on the side and
18 it's basically only going to be seen from one
19 side. It's a full wall up against it on one.
20 And it's set way back from the edge of the
21 roof so that the people that are on the roof

1 deck will not be able to like look down on to
2 those other people's porches. You know,
3 patios out back.

4 This is like just another rendering of
5 this addition is what's going to be built.
6 And that roof deck setback in its way back
7 off the rear lot line, and on this side where
8 the houses are, it is only just to get in and
9 out of the door. In other words, all the
10 rear deck is on the other side and set way in
11 from the side and set way in from the back.
12 So hopefully it won't bother anybody. And
13 that was the idea of keeping it way into the
14 sides. You can't look down into other
15 people's yards. And it's lower than the
16 existing roof lines and totally hidden behind
17 the other buildings. So, you know, that's
18 the stairs. The stairs is the most important
19 thing for me because it improves the floor
20 plans, because I was able to get Zoning
21 within the existing structure, there's some

1 limitations in that there's only one place to
2 have a staircase out that is inside the
3 building which only allows you to come out of
4 that little door right there. So the units
5 on the right-hand side had to walk down the
6 staircase all the way to the far edge and all
7 along the back so that all the windows will
8 be gone in the rear of the units because all
9 the windows will be in the stairs. The
10 hallways. So 20, 30, 40 foot long hallways
11 running down the back of the building and
12 done a staircase down to that little door
13 there. So by putting the stairs out here,
14 now, the back, all the windows in the rear of
15 the building become windows to the apartment
16 again. And that's what we're trying to do
17 there, build an addition to have a staircase.
18 There's no living space in there. It has to
19 be covered because of the code requires a
20 second means of egress be covered. Those are
21 the two things I'm trying to do. Put the

1 staircase out back to make a proper means of
2 egress, and to have some outdoor space for
3 the residential apartments if that's okay.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Any questions?

5 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Resnick, what is
6 in that building that the deck is upon?

7 MARC RESNICK: It's empty floor
8 space. It will be commercial space. It's
9 one of the two units on the first floor. The
10 way the building is -- because there's such a
11 large rear extension, I'm trying to find it.
12 This large extension off the back is all just
13 one story. So the first floor unit on that
14 side of the building, I don't know if you can
15 see it, but on this side of the building it's
16 5,000 square feet, one commercial space. And
17 then so this deck will be on top of a
18 commercial space.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We can only
20 have one person talking at once because it
21 makes it very hard to record what's being

1 said.

2 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry.

3 MARC RESNICK: That entire space is
4 just a large commercial space that has only
5 street frontage in the front.

6 STEVEN WINTER: But it is an active
7 space and a space that's used?

8 MARC RESNICK: Yes, it will.

9 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

10 MARC RESNICK: Any other questions
11 anybody?

12 CHARLES STUDEN: No.

13 PATRICIA SINGER: Can you reach the
14 ground from that roof deck and from those
15 back stairs?

16 MARC RESNICK: Yes.

17 PATRICIA SINGER: How will that
18 impact the tandem parking that we talked
19 about it?

20 MARC RESNICK: It won't impact the
21 parking. There's one picture that shows

1 that. It might be best to show it here.
2 This here is where they'll come out. The
3 roof deck will be up above this and then
4 you'll be able to come down the stairs and
5 come out that area there. But it will still
6 get rebuilt so that you can still have cars
7 parking in here and still walk out and come
8 down -- you'll actually come back -- the top
9 two stories and that first floor addition and
10 comes out of that. So it will be a common
11 area built in around there. And that's why
12 the parking then will have a common area
13 where the people, if they let us do park
14 here, then those people can come up the rear
15 stairs, right up into the back of their
16 apartments, rather than walk all the way
17 around the front of the building and come in
18 the front door.

19 (Pamela Winters in attendance.)

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Any other questions
21 or comments?

1 CHARLES STUDEN: No.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my feeling is
3 that first I was a little annoyed that we
4 hadn't heard about this because we granted a
5 permit based -- and now the plans are
6 changing. And I guess that means you'll have
7 to come back and get an amendment to our
8 decision to incorporate the new plans if this
9 indeed is granted; is that correct?

10 LIZA PADEN: Well, it's something
11 that I have to look into further to see what
12 the BZA grants. Because one of the things
13 that the Planning Board granted was the two
14 bicycle spaces in the interior. And right
15 now they're showing a set of doors where the
16 bicycles were going to be located. So,
17 that's one change to the plans.

18 MARC RESNICK: I'm sorry, the
19 bicycles will still be in the same exact
20 location as they were. I had hand drawn in
21 the bicycle locations after the original

1 plans were built by the architect because I
2 was not aware at that time of -- that I
3 needed the bicycle spaces. So, this floor
4 plan in the egress will not move the bike
5 spaces. They'll still come out the same side
6 door and come out that way out of there.
7 Same. The people coming off of back stairs
8 out the deck around the same door and the
9 bicycle spaces.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

11 LIZA PADEN: So the answer is I
12 don't know if it's going to be a Major
13 Amendment. We're going to have to look at
14 it, because I think that it is different than
15 what the Planning Board approved. And what
16 would have to come back if for nothing else,
17 at least for the Planning Board to review the
18 approved plans as acceptable and keeping with
19 the original Special Permit. And that
20 Special Permit's a conversion of the existing
21 space, but there's now more space than was

1 what you looked at.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Has anybody
3 looked at whether there's setback relief
4 needed for the stair?

5 LIZA PADEN: For the stair? I'm
6 assuming that Inspectional Services looked at
7 that in the BZA application.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

9 MARC RESNICK: So, I'm sorry, I
10 thought you had to apply for the Special
11 Permit as a Special Permit and apply to the
12 Variance Board separately for the Variance
13 and that's why I did two permits
14 simultaneously and separate because I just
15 thought that different boards would be
16 approving different items. So I didn't mean
17 to --

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Am I right we
19 could have done both at the same time?

20 LIZA PADEN: The Planning Board, on
21 the application, it does list a request for

1 the information if you're going to any other
2 Board or Commission for any other permits or
3 Variances. And because there was no BZA case
4 listed, I just assumed they were doing
5 exactly what they told me, exactly what had
6 been done over two years ago. And over two
7 years ago there was no discussion of the roof
8 deck. And usually when there's going to be a
9 Variance, people will list that they're going
10 to go for a Variance for roof deck, exterior
11 setbacks, whatever they're going to -- and so
12 you'll see those in the plans even though
13 there's one part you're looking at.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Then we might delay
15 our decision in a situation like that until
16 the Zoning Board acted so we can do it all at
17 once.

18 LIZA PADEN: Right.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: I thought if we're
20 issuing a Special Permit, we can extend that
21 to other Zoning Board issues. Perhaps that

1 doesn't extend to a Variance?

2 LIZA PADEN: Not to variances. If
3 it was something that was a BZA permit, then
4 it could be rolled into this. But what
5 they're asking for is a dimensional variance
6 and you can't grant that. You can only grant
7 what's going on inside the existing
8 structure.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Well, tonight
10 what we're being asked is do we want to make
11 a comment to the Zoning Board on this
12 request? Then after the Zoning Board acts,
13 you'll have to come back and talk to the
14 Department to see what we'll have to do. My
15 own feeling is I don't particularly want to
16 comment to the Zoning Board.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I guess I
18 want to say this about that: I wouldn't want
19 the Zoning Board to read into our silence
20 opposition to it. Perhaps I can't tell why
21 Hugh is feeling that way, but I think if it's

1 displeasure at not having had full
2 disclosure. I see that not as necessarily
3 the right reason for not saying anything. I
4 might have said in a case like this that I
5 think the request, particularly for the
6 staircase, I'm not so sure about the roof
7 deck, but the staircase seems reasonable to
8 me and does complement what we were trying to
9 do which is to have good residential space.
10 And so it seems like a logical extension of
11 that concept. I haven't studied it as
12 carefully as I might have to see if there
13 were any better alternatives. But I don't
14 see how that would impact anybody negatively
15 and I think it would make for a better
16 project. And I'm -- I would be willing to
17 say something like that to the Zoning Board.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my reluctance
19 to comment was that we haven't studied it and
20 that we, you know, we did look at a different
21 project and granted a permit for a different

1 project, differing project is a better way to
2 say it. And, you know, I don't want to be
3 against it. I think it's, you know, it's
4 plausible. But I really haven't looked at it
5 carefully. I would have looked at it
6 carefully if we'd known about it.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Should we make that
8 comment then to the BZA so that they won't
9 get a confused message that we're against it?

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that would
11 just confuse them.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, since we
13 don't comment on every ZBA case that's before
14 them, I don't know why they would take our
15 silence as being in opposition to it.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: That's true.

17 H. THEODORE COHEN: I personally
18 don't find the staircase objectionable at
19 all, and I have no strong feelings one way or
20 the other. I guess I would feel that this is
21 well within the ZBA's jurisdiction and they

1 can hear the abutters and they can make a
2 decision based on what they hear. But if
3 other people felt like chiming in one way or
4 the other.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Is that enough of a
6 statement to satisfy you, Tom?

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: How does it read
8 now, the statement?

9 HUGH RUSSELL: That we have no
10 objection.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, that would be
12 fine. That would be fine. No objection is
13 good enough. Typically just to answer your
14 point about, at least sometimes say nothing.
15 Typically I think it is fair to say when we
16 issue a Special Permit, then we usually say
17 something if there's an adjoining Variance so
18 that it looks like the two are integrated.
19 If we say nothing, it leaves, it leaves a
20 little bit of a disjointed feeling to it.
21 And that's the point. So I think no

1 objection is fine.

2 (William Tibbs in attendance.)

3 LIZA PADEN: You want me to send a
4 comment that you have no objection to the --
5 that's all, I want to be clear.

6 And just a point before we -- I know
7 it's after 7:20. I don't know whether or
8 not, I don't know -- I guess I'm getting used
9 to the new schedule, but the MIT hearing was
10 advertised for both 7:20 and 7:30 in two or
11 three different places. What I would like to
12 ask is if the Board would like to proceed to
13 the telecommunications antenna that's at
14 Concord Avenue at the corner of Fawcett
15 Street while we wait until 7:30 and just be
16 safe until starting the public hearing then.
17 Thank you. And I'll get it together for the
18 next meeting.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Are there any
21 other cases?

1 LIZA PADEN: This is Anne Grant and
2 she represents the Clear Wireless company.

3 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Good evening,
4 my name is Anne Grant. I'm at Prince, Lobel,
5 Glovsky and Tye and I represent Clear
6 Wireless, it's an affiliate of Sprint
7 Spectrum. By way of background before I get
8 into the specifics what Clearwire is actually
9 in the process of doing, is launching a
10 fourth generation mobile broadband network
11 nationwide which will allow it to interface
12 which would be in competition with more
13 traditional wireless carriers like Verizon
14 and Comcast and etcetera. At this particular
15 site Sprint currently has six antennas
16 facade-mounted on the penthouse on the
17 rooftop. And what Clearwire is proposing to
18 add is three wireless backhall dish antennas
19 which would be facade-mounted on the rooftop
20 penthouse and would be painted to match so as
21 to blend in with what's existing at the site

1 currently. There's no other further
2 equipment that Clearwire is actually
3 proposing to add. And I'm happy to answer
4 any questions that the Board might have about
5 the proposal or if you need copies of the
6 plan.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: We'd like to see some
8 photo sims.

9 So I see in the photo sims that a
10 single antenna that's being used in several
11 locations is that what we're talking about?

12 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: It's the dish?

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

14 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Yes, that's
15 the proposed addition. There will be three
16 of those all of which will be facade-mounted
17 as shown on these photographs.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I only see one.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: We only see one.

20 CHARLES STUDEN: Different
21 elevations.

1 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: I think the
2 photo sims may only show it from that angle
3 of the building. And I've got a set of plans
4 that I can show the location of the other
5 two, but all three would look the same, be
6 the facade-mounted similarly.

7 LIZA PADEN: If I might help. One
8 of the things about these antennas is this
9 line is the outline of the building. Okay?
10 These dishes are going onto the roof
11 penthouse. So I think what happens is these
12 will not be visible from the public way and
13 that's why you're only seeing the one view
14 where it's going to be visible from the
15 public way. And so that's why.

16 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: That's
17 correct. I apologize. It's somebody else's
18 site. So I haven't been there.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Is the view that
20 we're looking at where it's visible from
21 Fawcett Street or Concord Avenue?

1 AHMED NUR: 28 Fawcett Street.

2 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: At the bottom
3 of the photograph it says what location.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: Looking from
5 Fawcett Street?

6 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Yes. There's
7 one from 28 Fawcett and one from 14 Fawcett.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Which is very
9 close to Concord Avenue?

10 LIZA PADEN: Right. This is the
11 corner building.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: This is the corner
13 building.

14 LIZA PADEN: And this view --

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: And just the top
16 of this building, the view where it sets back
17 with a different color is very important. It
18 makes a huge difference in giving that
19 building some scale and actually making it, I
20 think, a fairly successful of that
21 prominence. So it would be unfortunate if it

1 were visible from Concord Avenue. And this
2 doesn't answer that question.

3 LIZA PADEN: I suspect that this
4 building, because across the street, across
5 Concord Avenue, you have -- you're going up
6 and you're going further away, you're going
7 into the reservation, you're not going to see
8 it when you're along Concord Avenue. And
9 then there's the whole line of trees that are
10 in front on Concord Avenue where Nevil has
11 been rebuilt. You might see it if you have
12 good eyesight from above the trees, but
13 you're not going to see it, I believe, from
14 Concord Avenue driving towards it because
15 this is the view that faces down Fawcett
16 Street going into the quad area.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So in the plan that
18 you're holding up, can you point out which
19 side is Concord Avenue? I'll see whether I
20 guessed right.

21 LIZA PADEN: I believe that this is

1 Concord Avenue (indicating).

2 AHMED NUR: Along the green?

3 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: You said it's on the
5 corner?

6 LIZA PADEN: Right. I think this is
7 Concord Avenue. And I think this is where
8 the antennas are (indicating). And I think
9 that because this is the north elevation,
10 this is south elevation.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: While you're
12 looking at that, let me just say, I think
13 this will be visible from a project that
14 hasn't gone up yet, but that some day I
15 expect will which is that Fawcett residential
16 project from the one that Mr. Victory
17 presented to us, Victory, Jr.

18 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: And I think it
20 will be visible from there. And that's not a
21 small matter.

1 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: The other
2 thing I could say, too, is that given that
3 there's already currently a couple antennas
4 up there, the impact for what it actually
5 looks like now would be minimal from the
6 dishes. They're only about two feet in
7 diameter and they were -- if you look at --
8 it's not as -- it's not a huge significant
9 difference in terms of having equipment on
10 there. I mean, they certainly can paint
11 those in any way that would make the Board
12 comfortable in terms of visibility.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: So it looks like the
14 site plan is actually the most interesting
15 document, because the view from Fawcett
16 Street is looking at the antenna that's on
17 the back of the building. And the ones on
18 the front are not pictured because they are
19 obscured by the bulk of the building -- this
20 whole penthouse is seen from the front.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: It seems as if

1 this is going to be a location for an
2 increasing number of antennas. We are seeing
3 incremental changes that every time say well,
4 just one more isn't going to make a
5 difference, but there seems to be no end in
6 sight. It will be a series of additions that
7 will become in a sense its own declaration
8 along there at one point and all you'll have
9 are antennas as each generation piles on to
10 the next. I guess the question I would ask
11 is is there no way for the next generation to
12 do away with the previous one or to join in
13 with a previous one so there can be some
14 reconciliation which is the word of the day?

15 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: I mean, I
16 don't know how the technology is going to
17 develop. But what I can say is in a lot of
18 instances with this new WI-MAX technology,
19 and at this site I'm not sure, I can't speak
20 to, but there is -- the dishes operate with
21 WI-MAX antennas. This site currently has

1 three WI-MAX antennas already on there.
2 Oftentimes where Sprint -- Clearwire's
3 affiliated Sprint. So for Sprint's purposes,
4 the project that Clearwire is doing, where
5 possible and where able to do it, they have
6 oftentimes they'll use three WI-MAX antennas
7 and they may already have 12 antennas up
8 there that Sprint's using for the PCS
9 Services, and sometimes they will -- they're
10 able to take off the antennas of the 12 that
11 are currently there and replace it with the
12 WI-MAX and use the other three remaining to
13 provide the PCS Services. So there are
14 instances where it's an upgraded technology
15 and they're able to replace something with
16 what's new. I can't speak for the other
17 carriers. I can't say what's going to happen
18 in the future, but certainly where possible
19 Sprint's worked and Clearwire's worked to
20 make this least visually impact.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Are you saying

1 that there's no possibility here for
2 replacement?

3 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Not in this
4 case, no, because there is actually -- Sprint
5 has three antennas up there. My guess is
6 that they probably already did replace --
7 Sprint -- and I can't say for sure, but
8 there's six antennas, three of them are used
9 for PCS services and three of them are used
10 for WI-MAX. The WI-MAX may have come in and
11 replaced what was existing. That's not part
12 of this proposal. That was done previously.
13 The dishes are what they're proposing because
14 the dishes allow -- well, the dishes allow --
15 they work on line of sight and they're
16 wireless. They don't actually require as
17 many cables to be brought into -- the dish is
18 allowing them to operate the antennas
19 wirelessly. And so in that case that limits
20 the amount of equipment that's being brought
21 on the building. But the dishes, there's

1 nothing, the dishes cannot replace anything.
2 They're used to help the WI-MAX antennas work
3 in this particular project in this instance.
4 But in general going forward, you know,
5 there's a possibility that the technology may
6 change but that doesn't mean that they keep
7 the old and add new.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't want to be
10 out here alone as the only voice. It doesn't
11 seem entirely unreasonable to me to ask for
12 an engineer to tell us that there's no room
13 here for replacement or consolidation. I'm
14 not entirely convinced that -- maybe I'm not
15 understanding it properly. But if -- I
16 didn't hear definitively that that was
17 considered so I attempted to give a bit of a
18 request, a push towards, an effort at
19 consolidation of replacement before we make a
20 recommendation.

21 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: What I can

1 say, I guess my answer to you --

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me.

3 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Oh, sorry.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my feeling
5 would be that we could buck that decision and
6 that process to the Zoning Board.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: And say we're
9 concerned about proliferation and we would
10 want them to ask about this replacement and
11 that would also give the applicant, you know,
12 a week to actually have the answer to that so
13 when the Zoning Board asks the question,
14 they'll be prepared to answer it.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that's
16 what I meant. I think that's exactly what I
17 meant.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: I agree.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: And to bring an
20 engineer who can speak to that.

21 BETH RUBENSTEIN: I was just going

1 to suggest that you may want to suggest to
2 the BZA that they ask their applicants for
3 antennas to do that routinely. If they
4 already have an in-station in the building,
5 to let everybody know in the last 10 or 15
6 years whether they've replaced any, just as a
7 general practice.

8 STEVEN WINTER: I also noted that
9 the Clearwire is a subsidiary of Sprint; is
10 that correct?

11 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Yes.

12 STEVEN WINTER: So what we have is
13 there are companies operating under different
14 names but it's the same company with the same
15 corporate leadership. We should be able to
16 compile those requests and ask them to be
17 global in that sense.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think with this
19 multigenerational cycling, I think Beth's
20 idea of making this a routine part of the
21 analysis seems exactly what it should be.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And that
2 could be added to our comments.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Right.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Anything more
5 we want to say about this?

6 PATRICIA SINGER: I'd also like to
7 point out that unfortunately the antennas
8 that break the roof line are not Sprint
9 Clearwire otherwise we could have asked for
10 mitigation.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you very
12 much.

13 ATTORNEY ANNE GRANT: Thank you.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: You might want to
15 collect your -- we routinely give these back
16 to save the environment.

17 So there's a sign in Tech Square that
18 an ego sign as I call them.

19 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: That's the last case.

21 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: We don't allow in our
2 Ordinance signs that every major tenant in
3 the city wants to put on their buildings so
4 we process as they come.

5 LIZA PADEN: Okay, the sign that
6 they're proposing to put at the top of the
7 building which is above the 20-foot limit is
8 15 and a half square feet at Tech Square.
9 And the sign is 96 inches by 25 and a half
10 inches, and it's Tolerx. It's like a hundred
11 feet up or something. So the applicant
12 proposes to put the sign at the top of the
13 building. It's on the facade of the building
14 and it would be placed similar to the other
15 signs that are already at Tech Square which I
16 can't remember off the top of my head what
17 they are.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Forester.
19 Inside Diax (phonetic).

20 HUGH RUSSELL: We had discussed
21 trying to come up with specific regulations

1 permitting. And each time we do that
2 basically the staff advises us that each
3 installation is so individual in a general
4 rule, it has to be in good taste and not too
5 big. And that's not the regulatory language.
6 And we could grab it as a Special Permit, but
7 I'm hopeful that the Zoning Board will keep
8 this -- I don't see any problem with the
9 particular one.

10 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, what is
11 our decision point? What is required of us
12 here?

13 HUGH RUSSELL: We can't recommend or
14 not recommend approval to the Zoning Board.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Or do nothing.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: We could do nothing
17 in which sort of absence of comment is I
18 think interpreted as consent in these cases.

19 PATRICIA SINGER: If we could wait
20 one minute so the photo sim can come around,
21 that would be helpful.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, I would say if
2 we do something, it's interpreted as consent.
3 I mean, there are a lot of cases that we just
4 don't deem to even want to talk about, but
5 that doesn't mean that we automatically
6 consent to them.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess maybe the
8 word consent is misleading. I would say when
9 we do nothing, it's a sign that we're saying
10 that it does not raise landing issues that we
11 feel we need to comment to the Zoning Board
12 on.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: That's right.

14 CHARLES STUDEN: That's correct.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: The key would be to
16 start using these letters as a cellular
17 antenna. Any other cases that people want to
18 discuss tonight?

19 (All Agree, no.)

20 HUGH RUSSELL: It being later than
21 7:30, we'll go to our other advertised case

1 which is Planning Board 246, 106 and 296
2 Vassar Street, Special Permit to construct a
3 freestanding wind turbine.

4 The way a public hearing works is the
5 proponent describes what he wants to do. The
6 Planning Board may ask clarifying questions,
7 clarify that and then we ask for comments
8 from the public. There's a sign-up sheet
9 over in the corner. If you don't get on the
10 sign-up sheet, we do ask after we go through
11 the sign-up sheet if other people want to
12 speak. We ask you to limit your comments to
13 three minutes. And when you speak, to give
14 your name and address so that it can be
15 recorded.

16 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Before the MIT
17 folks describe their -- if the Board would
18 like, before we start hearing from MIT, our
19 staff will give a brief recent history of the
20 City's changes in Zoning that are allowing
21 wind turbines in the City, some by Special

1 Permit and some as of right.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Does the Board want
3 to hear that?

4 STEVEN WINTER: I would like to.

5 (All in Agreement.)

6 IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you. Good
7 evening. I just wanted to remind you that
8 this is the first time we're hearing a wind
9 turbine case under the recently adopted
10 Article 11.40. Which this came out of the
11 Green Building Task Force recommendations.
12 And you might remember that last year there
13 was a great deal of interest in selling wind
14 turbines. The Museum of Science had to go
15 through a Variance process as did Harvard
16 University. And so the Green Building Task
17 Force was asked to forward this piece so the
18 rest of the Zoning has gone for it, but this
19 piece was adopted in September. Very
20 exciting first case.

21 So really there are two, it's a two-

1 pronged process for academic areas. The task
2 force felt strongly and the Zoning reflects
3 this, that there should be some method to
4 allow for learning about wind turbines,
5 particularly in the urban context. And there
6 is an as-of-right stream that educational
7 institutions can now adopt, but that's
8 limited to building mounted turbines and
9 which is the reason why MIT is not going that
10 route, and is here before us for this Special
11 Permit. Because what they're proposing is a
12 ground-mounted turbine.

13 So, this now goes under the Special
14 Permit stream which allows wind turbines
15 citywide and the size, there's no height
16 limitation. But the Board explicitly
17 determines what that height in the permit,
18 what height is allowed. There also is not a
19 setback limitation for the turbine itself.
20 And, again, that location gets determined in
21 your Special Permit decision.

1 The criteria that you would be looking
2 at are really the visual impacts, which
3 includes scale and size as compared to the
4 neighborhood where the turbine has been
5 proposed. Any impacts on significant view
6 sheds that might exist and also the
7 sensitivity of the surrounding area. So
8 historic area or an open space area would be
9 a greater area of concern where you think
10 more as opposed to an industrial area. And
11 finally noise and vibration impacts. So,
12 there are a series of recommendations. So
13 note, you cannot mount antenna on top of
14 cellular antenna on top of the wind turbine
15 as much as you might want to. They have to
16 be a subdued color. They cannot be brightly
17 lit. They cannot be used for signage or
18 advertising. They must meet the noise
19 ordinance. And finally, all maintenance must
20 occur within the property and cannot extend
21 on to the public right of way or abutting

1 parcels. You can, if you choose, create a
2 time limit on your Special Permit which
3 people can come back and get a renewal later
4 on. And this was envisioned because in
5 certain particularly more sensitive areas it
6 might be a concern where you would want to
7 see how it works out in terms of impacts of
8 shadow and noise and how that is perceived by
9 the neighbors. It seems like -- well, I
10 won't say anything. And I think that's
11 probably the set.

12 Oh, I guess there is a final piece
13 where there is a requirement for a bond for
14 removal of the turbine in case the property,
15 you know, in case they let it go derelict and
16 the property owner is to remove that. And
17 that is based on an evaluation by the
18 proponent's engineers as to the cost of what
19 it would be to remove that. That's the
20 zoning. And thank you very much.

21 STEVEN WINTER: Excuse me,

1 Mr. Chair.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

3 STEVEN WINTER: Very briefly I want
4 to thank Beth and to note that your staff has
5 done a really tremendous job on this
6 particular regulatory issue, and I'm also
7 very excited that we're seeing it here and
8 acting it out and helping this kind of
9 technology to find a good home.

10 BETH RUBENSTEIN: We appreciate
11 that. And you know the rest of the green
12 zoning recommendations are ready to go. And
13 now that the Council has committees, we
14 expect the rest of the package with
15 everything else, and there's a lot of else to
16 be under review. And of course when it's
17 referred to, the Ordinance Committee will be
18 referred back here for public hearing so
19 we'll be looking at the rest of it soon.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Proceed.

21 ADAM SERAFIN: Thank you. Good

1 evening. My name is Adam Serafin. That's
2 S-e-r-a-f-i-n. I'm a planner with the MIT
3 Department Facilities. I'm before you
4 tonight on behalf of MIT seeking a Special
5 Permit under Section 11.43 for the
6 installation of a wind turbine on the MIT
7 campus. With me tonight are Kelley Brown,
8 Senior Planner with MIT Department of
9 Facilities. And also Kathy Araujo who is a
10 doctoral student with the MIT Department of
11 Urban Studies and Planning. Shortly Kathy
12 will be presenting you some of the
13 preliminary findings of project Full Breeze
14 which is a student-led project that's been
15 conducting wind resource measurements on
16 campus to determine the optimal height for
17 the wind turbine. And also a number of other
18 members of project Full Breeze in the
19 audience as well.

20 We are proposing to install one
21 freestanding 2.4 kilowatts Skystream wind

1 turbine on the campus for the purpose of
2 education, research and the small scale
3 generation of electricity for on-site
4 consumption at MIT. The turbine will be
5 mounted on top of a 60-foot tubular steel
6 tower. The tower diameter, it's 14 inches at
7 its base, tapering up to 6.17 inches at the
8 top. Mounted on top of that will be the
9 turbines. The turbine blades are 12 feet in
10 diameter. And you can see the -- with
11 reference to scale people standing next to
12 it, quite small residential scale turbine.
13 The total height of the tower and the turbine
14 from -- measured from the base to the very
15 apex of the turbine blade will be 67.5 feet.
16 As you can see in the photos, the tower
17 itself will be a grey color. The turbine
18 will be white. The tower will be mounted
19 onto a concrete pier foundation set into the
20 ground, and underground electrical conduit
21 will run from the base of the tower into the

1 nearest transformer connection to attach to
2 the grid.

3 As part of this proposal, we are
4 planning to install one turbine. However, we
5 are seeking two sites for approval. The
6 reason we're doing this is MIT is currently
7 conducting a wind analysis at both sites to
8 determine which has the optimal conditions
9 for the most efficient operation of the
10 turbine. If you've been to the site or
11 visited or seen the photo simulations, you
12 may have noticed a tower, a temporary tower
13 with anemometers on it. We also have
14 anemometers located on the, one of the light
15 towers at Steinbrenner Stadium, the existing
16 light post. These are measuring wind data
17 and other information to determine which site
18 is most optimal. And when the results of the
19 wind analysis are complete, we'll install a
20 single turbine at the site which produces the
21 best results.

1 To take you through those two sites,
2 the first site is Steinbrenner Stadium. To
3 orient the Planning Board, this is Vassar
4 Street running along the north. To the south
5 is Amherst Alley which is a MIT private way.
6 And here is Memorial Drive. The existing
7 neighborhood it consists of MIT athletic
8 fields, MIT athletic buildings and a few MIT
9 academic buildings and parking. The actual
10 wind turbine site would be here to the south
11 of Steinbrenner Stadium pushed flush up
12 against an existing fence that separates the
13 stadium from a practice field here framed by
14 the tennis bubble, the Astroturf and the
15 stadium itself. It was pushed flush up
16 against this wall so as not to interfere with
17 athletic activities that do occur here in the
18 practice field. The turbine would be located
19 approximately 350 feet from the nearest
20 public way which is Vassar Street. And I'd
21 like to take you through the second site.

1 The second site is Briggs Field which
2 is just to the west of the previous site.
3 Once again Vassar Street running along the
4 north. Amherst Alley, the private way
5 running along the south. This particular
6 site is 250 feet from Vassar Street which is
7 the nearest public way. It will be located
8 at the edge of the playing fields pushed
9 flush up against the fence that separates the
10 athletic soccer field from the existing
11 parking lot the west gate parking. This
12 neighborhood, this area is also characterized
13 by a playing field, parking, residential
14 properties, MIT residential to the west and
15 the south. And as part of this Special
16 Permit, we're required to submit photo
17 simulations of the site, one from the site
18 itself and one from the nearest public way.
19 This is the Steinbrenner Stadium site. This
20 photo simulation was taken from the south, to
21 the southwest of the Steinbrenner Stadium

1 looking to the northeast. You can see the
2 wind turbine here. And you can see it in
3 relation to the existing stadium lights which
4 are approximately 70 feet in height. As
5 stated, this is 67.5 feet in height.

6 And here's the same turbine looking
7 from Vassar Street looking south on to the
8 site. You can see it here in relation to the
9 existing stadium lights and also a flag pole
10 just for size reference.

11 Moving on to view site 2, Briggs Field.
12 This is a view of the tower and turbine from
13 the parking lot looking to the east. As you
14 can see here, the tower on the other side
15 just -- on the other side of the fence that
16 separates the playing fields from the parking
17 lot, you can see that the color, the grey and
18 white blend in quite well with the sky line
19 and fit well with the environment.

20 And here is a second photo simulation
21 from Vassar Street approximately 250 feet

1 away looking south towards the turbine
2 installation. The turbine and towers will be
3 installed using a small crane as this type of
4 -- this particular type of tower does not
5 have a lay down option. Many of the -- of
6 these tower types actually can be wenched up
7 from a fixed point. This will be lifted up
8 with a small crane. This will be conducted
9 entirely on the MIT property without the need
10 to trespass on to public way or our adjacent
11 non-MIT property. Similarly on-site
12 maintenance will be conducted using a bucket
13 truck or a lift as there is no lay down
14 option so to speak for this particular tower
15 type.

16 I'd like to speak about noise rating.
17 According to the manufacturer, the noise
18 rating on this particular turbine is 45
19 decibels at 40 feet away. As stated, the two
20 proposed sites are 250 and 350 feet
21 respectively away from Vassar Street. So at

1 this distance noise should not be a problem.
2 The way the turbine meets all requirements of
3 the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance.

4 In terms of shadow impacts giving the
5 narrow diameter of the turbine and the narrow
6 profile of the actual rotor blades, shadow
7 impacts from the wind turbine will be quite
8 minimal. And once again located 250 feet or
9 350 feet from the Vassar Street. The
10 majority of the shadows will fall on the MIT
11 property, mostly in the athletic fields.

12 As far as the impacts of flicker shadow
13 from a spinning turbine, according to the
14 manufacturer, the flicker shadow from this
15 particular turbine should be relatively
16 undetectable due to the relatively high speed
17 of rotation for minimal -- for operating
18 speed. So essentially the turbine will not
19 start spinning until the breeze has hit eight
20 miles per hour. It will be rotating quite
21 quickly. So shadow impacts for flicker

1 should be quite minimal.

2 Now I'd like to hand the presentation
3 over to Cathy who will talk about project
4 Full Breeze and the opportunities that will
5 be presented with the installation of the
6 turbine.

7 KATHY ARAUJO: Good evening. As you
8 heard from Adam tonight, we at MIT are
9 working to optimize --

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me, give your
11 name and spell your name.

12 KATHY ARAUJO: Sure. So I'm Kathy
13 Araujo, A-r-a-u-j-o. And as Adam had already
14 mentioned, so I'm a doctoral student in urban
15 planning. I specialize in clean energy
16 conversions and I'm also co-president of the
17 MIT wind energy group. And so as he's
18 outlined thus far, we're working to optimize
19 the use of urban wind power in the
20 development of sustainable energy options.
21 Teams of researchers at MIT are currently

1 looking at the complex influences that are
2 urban terrain has on wind flow patterns as
3 well as environmental and other effects of
4 wind power usage. Projects Full Breeze
5 conducted by many graduate students who are
6 here tonight have specifically looked at the
7 feasibility of the two sites that are in our
8 application. We've been looking at wind
9 resource assessments, we've been looking at
10 the economics grid integration and the policy
11 side of these sites. Thus far with
12 preliminary findings, both sites continue to
13 be good candidates but we're looking to do
14 this sort of right the first time so we're
15 looking to extend that analysis further.
16 It's ongoing. And once we've determined
17 which site appears to be the most optimal,
18 that's the one we're looking to install that
19 turbine with.

20 So the plan is to develop basically a
21 living laboratory in which we extend research

1 by analyzing wind patterns, turbulence, sheer
2 that the built environment has with
3 computational flow dynamic models. We also
4 look to assess actual versus projected
5 shadow, flicker and sounds, as well as
6 monitor other environmental effects. Our aim
7 with this is to develop locally specific
8 findings as well as to identify ways to
9 optimize urban turbine performance. Going
10 beyond the benefits of the pure research,
11 course projects and internet based reporting
12 are also under development. So we consider
13 Cambridge a member of the City's requirement
14 protection to be an excellent environment for
15 such endeavors. With that Adam, my team
16 members, MIT partners are happy to answer any
17 questions. Thank you.

18 ADAM SERAFIN: I'd like everyone
19 that's involved with this research and
20 project Full Breeze to raise their hand just
21 to acknowledge them and all the hard work

1 that they've done in analyzing this wind
2 data.

3 (Show of hands.)

4 ADAM SERAFIN: Thank you, Kathy.

5 We feel that both sites for the wind
6 turbine meet the standards for granting
7 Special Permit under Section 11.43 of the
8 Zoning Ordinance. The two proposed sites are
9 athletic fields, and in both cases the wind
10 turbine will be visible from the nearest
11 public way which is Vassar Street. However,
12 given the narrow diameter of the tower and
13 the rotor blades and the 250 to 350 foot
14 distance from Vassar Street, the wind turbine
15 will not have a negative visual impact on the
16 abutting properties of the neighborhood. The
17 size, scale and bulk of the turbine is
18 compatible with the adjacent buildings in the
19 neighborhood, which consist of MIT-owned
20 residence halls, athletic and academic
21 buildings, as well as MIT fraternities to the

1 south. The wind turbine will have a profile
2 similar to that of a light pole and will
3 blend in the landscape well with both
4 locations. The small scale of the wind
5 turbine in terms of the installation will not
6 have significant impact on view sheds or view
7 corridors adjacent -- towards adjacent
8 architectural and natural features
9 surrounding the site. Additionally the wind
10 turbine will not have a negative impact on
11 the MIT athletic fields adjacent to the
12 installation. Shadow impacts from the wind
13 turbine we feel will be minimal, as will any
14 impacts due to flicker shadows. As stated
15 earlier, the wind turbine has a noise and
16 vibration -- will have little noise and
17 vibration impact on neighboring uses with a
18 measurement of 45 decibels as the 40 feet
19 away.

20 In response to the requirements of the
21 Special Permit we feel there are no other

1 factors in regard to the operational and
2 visual impacts of the wind turbine
3 installation that suggests the need for
4 imposing a time limit on the Special Permit.

5 And in conclusion, MIT feels that the
6 wind turbine will represent the positive
7 addition to the campus and will serve as a
8 strong symbol of MIT's commitment to energy
9 and research and education. Additionally, we
10 feel this project will be a symbol of
11 Cambridge's support for innovative energy
12 projects. Thank you.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

14 I have one question which I would like
15 to ask. And you say the sound level is 45
16 decibels. And I'm wondering at what speed is
17 that? Is it something that's higher when the
18 wind is blowing stronger? Is it -- I think
19 there would be no sound if the blades weren't
20 rotating. And also, what's the frequency
21 characteristic of that sound level? Is it a

1 tonal sound or a white noise? Is it from the
2 blades or from the gear from the generator or
3 what?

4 ADAM SERAFIN: To my understanding,
5 according to the manufacturer, the 45 decibel
6 at 40 feet is at full operating speed of the
7 turbine. And to my understanding that would
8 be the maximum amount of sound as well.
9 There is a point where it -- where the
10 maximum operating speed is reached even if
11 the wind is blowing faster, the turbine will
12 not actually blow faster. There is some sort
13 of limiter on it that will not allow it to go
14 passed its operating speed. In terms of the
15 frequency Kathy may be able to speak on that.

16 KATHY ARAUJO: Sung Ho has been
17 working on the sound aspects of our
18 feasibility study. Can you come up front and
19 talk about that?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: And give your name
21 and spell it for the recorder.

1 SUNG HO LEE: Good evening. My name
2 is Sung Ho Lee. I'm a PhD student,
3 mechanical engineering department. S-u-n-g
4 H-o L-e-e.

5 The frequency of the rotating blade is
6 3.7 that we are currently trying to install
7 is about between 2.5 to 3 hertz with the
8 maximum rating power condition. And very
9 minimum impact for this very unlikely to be
10 perceived in human eyes. Based on our
11 research so far.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

13 SUNG HO LEE: For the sound effect,
14 to give you some sense how big the 40 decibel
15 will be in compared to other sounds nearby.
16 And, you know, very quiet bedroom equivalent
17 to 35 decibel. And a car at 40 mile per hour
18 about 100 meter away is equivalent to 50
19 decibel. You can have some understanding of
20 how much sound will be in 40 decibel. So,
21 yeah.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: I suspect the air
2 conditioning sound we're hearing at this
3 table is in that range.

4 PAMELA WINTERS: Maybe even louder.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

6 SUNG HO LEE: Thank you.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Are there other
8 questions?

9 STEVEN WINTER: I just had one and
10 then we're going to have public testimony
11 too, correct?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

13 STEVEN WINTER: I had a question
14 about the flicker shadow. And my question
15 is: Is there an urban placement of this kind
16 of infrastructure where the flicker shadow
17 becomes more or less of critical component in
18 us understanding how appropriately it fits
19 into urban fabric?

20 ADAM SERAFIN: I believe that's
21 another component that project Full Breeze

1 has extensively studied. And I'll let him
2 address it.

3 KATHY ARAUJO: Do you mind restating
4 the question?

5 STEVEN WINTER: Sure. Regarding the
6 flicker shadow, is there a placement of this
7 technology where the flicker shadow might
8 become a more or less critical impact in an
9 urban fabric?

10 SUNG HO LEE: Yeah, the flicker
11 shadow mostly become significant problem for
12 the larger scale wind turbine, like a multi
13 (inaudible) typically people concerned about
14 flicker shadow only in the case of large wind
15 turbine. But in this case we have a fairly
16 amount of -- the size is pretty small. 3.7
17 meter in diameter. The way the wind turbine
18 blade is rotating. But, we did a research
19 again to make sure it never affects the
20 environmental or community group nearby
21 there. And actual like zone where the

1 flicker shadow effect could actually be
2 perceived by human eyes is limited by 37
3 meter away from the wind turbine which is
4 still the middle of the sports activity
5 field. So there's not any residential area
6 in here. And beyond that region is actually
7 -- it's not like a flickering effects. It's
8 much more like a constant shadow shading
9 behind the wind turbine we think. So, yeah,
10 so, again we concluded that not gonna be a
11 very significant concern. We might have to
12 have.

13 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

15 H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. Is there a
16 rationale for the particular height of the
17 pole?

18 ADAM SERAFIN: The -- to my
19 understanding the -- as far as selecting a
20 height for a turbine obviously, you know, the
21 higher you go, the farther you can get away

1 from building turbulence coming off of
2 adjacent buildings. And I believe that the
3 -- the study group has been looking at
4 obtaining wind data from multiple heights
5 from different anemometers. I believe the
6 wind data at the higher elevations were
7 getting the best wind data or the highest
8 amount of sustained wind.

9 KELLELY BROWN: My name is Kelley
10 Brown from MIT. This particular one that's
11 what the manufacturer makes and that's what
12 they're donating and that's why it's the size
13 it is. They do have a smaller one a
14 residential size one, but we felt this size
15 would work well in this setting.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we'll go to
17 public testimony. And again, I remind you to
18 give your name and address. The only name on
19 the list is David Rabkin.

20 DAVID RABKIN: I'm David Rabkin,
21 D-a-v-i-d R-a-b-k-i-n. I live at 184 Huron

1 Avenue. I also work at the Museum of
2 Science, and I met some of you about a year
3 and a half ago when you granted me a Variance
4 to put a wind turbine laboratory on the roof
5 of the museum.

6 One of the units that we put up there
7 is a Skystream 3.7 so I now have a year of
8 experience operating the exact turbine that
9 they will be installing. So, they've
10 referred to manufacturer's specs in this
11 conversation. I can refer to real experience
12 with it. So with regard to flicker, if you
13 stand right next to a wall on the sun's
14 behind you and you hold your hand up, you'll
15 get a nice clear shadow on your hand. Back
16 off 100 feet you won't get a clear shadow
17 anymore. So the kinds of distances they're
18 talking about, you know, they're telling you
19 the truth and we have the same experience.
20 You don't see clear shadows of our turbines
21 up on the roof and down on the plaza or in

1 the driveway. With regard to sound, it's
2 tough to make sense of what 45 decibel really
3 means. What it means is that if you're
4 standing underneath our turbine on the roof
5 of the museum, you have to really listen for
6 the thing. It's a very quiet turbine. We
7 have somewhat noisier turbines, but none of
8 them are offensive. None of them are an
9 issue. None of them even begin to compete
10 with the ambient noise of the McGrath O'Brien
11 Highway. They can't compete with the air
12 conditioning and this is a pretty quiet
13 turbine. Noise is the No. 1 public concern
14 that I ran into when I did my public
15 outreach. It should be a total nonissue with
16 this turbine.

17 Aesthetics, I just got an e-mail from
18 the head of the condo association Henry Chase
19 in the West End, he likes the turbine that he
20 sees out his living room window. He has no
21 flicker problems with it. And he says he's

1 particularly fond of it because it gives him
2 a good sense of the wind direction and the
3 wind speed.

4 Another question that comes up is
5 birds. So we have had no bird kills or bat
6 kills at the museum. I don't think we've
7 clobbered any. Our red tail hawk continues
8 to kill pigeons with incredible vengeance.
9 And our seagulls continue to nest on our
10 roof. So all seems well with the birds.

11 One thing that I will share with the
12 folks from MIT is that the performance
13 characteristics of this turbine that we have
14 pretty much exactly match what the
15 manufacturer says it should do in terms of
16 how much power you get at each wind speed.
17 You express that relationship with something
18 called a power curve. The power curve that
19 we are experiencing precisely matches what
20 the manufacturer has published. And that's a
21 darn good thing, and I think that's a little

1 bit unusual in the new wind turbine world.

2 So, I would -- I'd support this
3 project. I think it's a great wind turbine.
4 I think it's beautiful. I can't comment on
5 how much power they'll get out of it. It's
6 probably about, you know, a lonely of a
7 location you'd get anywhere in Cambridge. I
8 think it's got a pretty good shot of giving
9 them great data and great experience. And I
10 see no problems with this turbine. And I
11 would encourage you to support it.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

13 Does anyone else wish to be heard on
14 this matter?

15 STEVE KAISER: My name is Steve
16 Kaiser, K-a-i-s-e-r. I'm on Hamilton Street.
17 Two points in favor of the proposal and one
18 against.

19 On the noise, just to give a little
20 context for the 45 decibels, it involves
21 numbers, it involves decibels which are

1 algorithmic which people have a difficulty
2 understanding decibels. I found a reference,
3 a limit, a noise limit of 55 decibels set by
4 the Federal Highway Administration. It's the
5 lowest noise level for any land use category,
6 55 decibels. And that is for forest and
7 parks areas. This is what's most fascinating
8 here is the reference, it is an area defined
9 by serenity and quiet. They have a federal
10 highway agency concerned with serenity, I
11 think is wonderful. But the number 55 is
12 clearly higher than the number 45. I think
13 that's a good reference point.

14 The other is MIT is founded, as I
15 recall, as an MIT graduate as a land grant
16 college in 1862. And that was I think one of
17 the first federal education bills during the
18 Abraham Lincoln administration and it is in
19 effect a public purpose at MIT. So in effect
20 getting into energy issues and being active
21 in that area can be considered a valid funded

1 purpose.

2 Which leads me to my third concern,
3 which is if you go on the website of the MIT
4 energy club, and particularly any of the
5 websites, but including the subcommittee on
6 wind, they list corporate sponsors. And when
7 I was at MIT, we had student groups all over
8 the place. We never had corporate sponsors.
9 So I'm wondering what is going on at my alma
10 mater. And the two I noticed is BP and Shell
11 are in the wind power business. So I think
12 that MIT needs to be a little bit more
13 careful about this. Is this commercial
14 corporate research or is this valid MIT
15 related research? That would be my only
16 concern. Otherwise I would see this as a
17 very valid project.

18 Thank you.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

20 KATHY ARAUJO: I'd like to respond
21 to that.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: No.

2 LIZA PADEN: They'll ask you if they
3 want you to respond.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish
5 to offer testimony?

6 (No response).

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Seeing no one, I
8 suggest we close this to oral testimony.

9 Is it our desire to act on this
10 petition now tonight?

11 (All in Agreement.)

12 STEVEN WINTER: I do have some
13 questions.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Proceed.

15 STEVEN WINTER: I have a question
16 about Mr. Serafin. I want to talk with you
17 and have you talk with me about the base.
18 Now the base that we have here sounds as
19 described as very attractive. I see this as
20 an attractive piece. That is, it's the base
21 itself seems to be held with a concrete

1 foundation covered with landscaping. So you
2 don't see it. So you simply see the pole
3 rising out of the earth. Which I like that.
4 That's nice. Does that kind of landscaping,
5 that kind of installation preclude the
6 so-called lay down option in every case?

7 ADAM SERAFIN: I can't speak on
8 every case, but in this particular case I
9 mean in consulting with the manufacturer and
10 also talking to engineers for the
11 installation of this, due to the soil
12 conditions at MIT, you know, it's the area
13 used to be -- is fill much like the Back Bay
14 was created on the Boston side of the river.
15 It's going to require a concrete foundation
16 to go down quite deep. I've been told 18 to
17 20 feet to anchor this turbine. But this
18 particular pole type, there is no lay down
19 option regardless of the type of
20 installation.

21 STEVEN WINTER: And I guess I'd like

1 to take the discussion, keeping it focussed
2 on aesthetics and landscaping and urban
3 fabric, does the lay down option then create
4 a less attractive base for us to view because
5 it has that infrastructure at the bottom so
6 that the whole thing can be leaned down?
7 What's your opinion on that?

8 ADAM SERAFIN: I think in terms of
9 comparing this particular model with
10 something of a lay down option, I think from
11 any distance greater than probably, you know,
12 a few paces it would be difficult to discern
13 between the two types of base. And I think
14 that, you know, if there were concerns, it
15 would be concealed look using landscaping or
16 screening of some sort.

17 STEVEN WINTER: Okay. Thank you,
18 Mr. Serafin.

19 And the other comment is a comment but
20 I did want to direct it to Kathy Araujo, and
21 I wanted to say to you the policy issues that

1 you mentioned as part of the project that
2 you're working on, those are very, very
3 important issues to municipalities. And
4 right now the municipalities do not know a
5 lot about this kind of technology and what it
6 means to them. And particularly there are
7 towns in Metro Boston and I'm sure all over
8 the country, but in Metropolitan Boston these
9 towns are now adding density. They get it
10 and they know they have to do it and they
11 have to do it appropriately. And they are
12 also creating green technology and adding
13 green technology. So I think as you look at
14 the policy issues, looking at not just cities
15 and urban landscaping looks but how towns,
16 developing town centers and retaining the New
17 England character of these town centers, the
18 kind of policy issues that these managers and
19 administrators are going to face, I think
20 that would be helpful.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, Pat.

1 PATRICIA SINGER: I'm curious how
2 long this study is going to take and how long
3 will it take after the study is concluded to
4 actually install this? In other words, could
5 this go on for another five years?

6 ADAM SERAFIN: Kathy, can you speak
7 to the length of the study?

8 KATHY ARAUJO: Sure. The study is
9 just about completed. So we have a
10 preliminary study in place already, and the
11 final version should be available within
12 basically weeks. And in terms of the
13 installation, it should be -- the turbine, if
14 and when approved, should be in place by the
15 end of the summer.

16 ADAM SERAFIN: And as far as the
17 actual installation itself, I've been told
18 one to two days for the pouring of the actual
19 concrete footing and one day for installation
20 of the actual tower and turbine.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Charles.

1 CHARLES STUDEN: I just want to say
2 that I'm very excited about what I've heard
3 here tonight. I think that this turbine
4 project is something that has tremendous
5 potential, and I'm hoping that the research
6 that comes out of it does benefit all of us
7 at some point. Anything we can do to reduce
8 our reliance on fossil fuels as far as I'm
9 concerned, is something that we should be
10 paying close attention to, especially our
11 reliance on foreign oil for example. I want
12 to say in particular I compliment the
13 university. I really appreciated the booklet
14 that we got in advance of this hearing. It's
15 extremely well put together, and very cogent.
16 And in particular I liked the narrative that
17 accompanies the conformance with the
18 Cambridge Zoning Ordinance what you've
19 written here and agree with it. And I,
20 again, I think this is a very, very good
21 project and congratulations.

1 ADAM SERAFIN: You're welcome.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: I have somewhat of a
3 follow up on Patricia's question, and that is
4 how once installed, how long do you think
5 this particular turbine will be there?

6 ADAM SERAFIN: That's a good
7 question. As far as the information from the
8 manufacturer on the I guess the shelf life of
9 this, they don't particularly provide any
10 data. Does anyone from our group happen to
11 know what the life is?

12 KATHY ARAUJO: The manufacturer
13 stipulate about 20 years.

14 ADAM SERAFIN: 20 years.

15 KATHY ARAUJO: At least 20 years.

16 ADAM SERAFIN: Thank you.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: And is it MIT's
18 intention to continue to monitor it and do
19 stuff with it for that period of time?

20 ADAM SERAFIN: Yes, we will
21 continuously monitor it to ensure that it's

1 -- the installation is being maintained. And
2 as far as we can see in the future, we will
3 continue to be conducting research with it.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

5 AHMED NUR: I wanted to make -- I
6 have a couple of questions and a comment.
7 And my comment is I do welcome the Greenville
8 recommendation of this wind turbine. I'm
9 actually glad that the City of Cambridge have
10 its Ordinance in Zoning and a few towns will
11 adopt windmills but no turbines. The
12 question I have is the blades move at eight
13 miles per hour wind, and let's just say it
14 maxes out, as you said, or regulates itself
15 at a maximum velocity, do you generate this
16 2,400 watts, kW is that at the lowest or sort
17 of medium? That's one question that I have
18 in terms of the energy.

19 And the reason why I'm asking is we
20 have at my place of work we have one that
21 generates only 400 watts, and it's basically

1 emergency pump for a roof drain. So that's
2 the one question that I have.

3 And the second question that I had is
4 the visibility. It's location area I believe
5 the view two or the location two, I want to
6 say on the west side of the field near the
7 parking lot. Is there a way why it is not
8 closer to one another as opposed to the other
9 location? Is there a distance problem, for
10 example, or closer to a light pole that's
11 already there than bringing this one right
12 next to the parking lot? And my concern
13 there obviously flickers. It's right below
14 the parking and the sun rises from the east,
15 people will be disturbed by that shadow. And
16 the other thing is how close is it to the
17 baseball field? Will it be reached by a
18 ball, for example? A foul ball. Thank you.

19 ADAM SERAFIN: Sure. I'm going to
20 address the visibility and length of baseball
21 field questions first.

1 So as far as the placement here and the
2 visibility from the parking lot, we actually
3 selected this site in working with our
4 department of athletics physical education
5 recreation to be in a location that was the
6 most favorable for them for not causing any
7 sort of interference with play on either of
8 the soccer fields or their place in this
9 location. As far as visual impacts, are you
10 asking about co-locating it near a light pole
11 or ensuring that it's far enough away from
12 adjacent light poles?

13 AHMED NUR: What was preventing you
14 from getting it all in one place? Closer to
15 either a light pole or an existing structure
16 at that height as opposed to dividing them at
17 this distance?

18 HUGH RUSSELL: It's one or the
19 other.

20 AHMED NUR: There's only one? That
21 takes care of the problem. Then I would

1 prefer it not at that location anyway.

2 ADAM SERAFIN: And as far as
3 adjacencies to the baseball and softball
4 field, you can see at this site quite far
5 away. It's a possibility if someone hits it
6 really far, then they're a pretty talented
7 player. And as far as the other site, yeah,
8 I mean, there is the possibility of a foul
9 ball coming back on to this side, but there
10 are sporting activities here and I don't know
11 what the odds are of it happening, but, you
12 know, it is near the foul ball line. And to
13 your last question on the optimal speed. As
14 you state, yes, at different operating speed
15 you get different efficiencies. And for this
16 particular turbine, the manufacturer does
17 list optimal wind speeds. And according --
18 just looking at a quick chart here, it looks
19 like this particular model achieves its
20 highest efficiency at about 13 miles an hour.
21 There's a power curve here if you'd like to

1 see it. Kathy.

2 KATHY ARAUJO: We can have Sung
3 answer a little bit further about the power
4 curve.

5 ADAM SERAFIN: Did you need
6 additional information on the power curve?

7 AHMED NUR: No, you've answered it.
8 Thank you.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: I think we're kind of
10 torn about this being the first case and
11 trying to learn as much as we can because
12 we've had so many people who are so
13 experienced sitting on the other side of the
14 table and still trying to make the decision
15 and go on to the rest of our business.
16 Patricia?

17 PATRICIA SINGER: If there's no
18 further discussion, I'd like to, make a
19 motion. And that motion -- I welcome any
20 amendment to this motion. Finding that the
21 proponent's proposal project 1A or 1B meets

1 the requirements set forth in Section 11.43,
2 and further having considered all of the
3 particulars including height, color, setback,
4 use and so forth, I move that the Board
5 approve the proponent's request subject to
6 installation on or before 3/16, 2011. And
7 further, someone may want to speak to the end
8 date of the installation, but I think I would
9 prefer to leave that up to university to
10 determine when the turbine should come down.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: I'd second that.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any
13 discussion on the motion? Any amendments
14 anyone wants to propose? Tom?

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm not sure I
16 understand the reasons for the dates
17 beginning and the end dates. Why can't we
18 leave that open ended?

19 PATRICIA SINGER: Because I think
20 that if I were a member of this community, I
21 would like to see this going forward. And

1 having heard the proponent say that they are
2 weeks to the end of the study and expect that
3 the installation will come by the end of the
4 summer, putting an installation date on it
5 kind of limits the ability -- if something
6 goes so wrong that it's not installed in
7 another six months, then I'd like to know
8 what it is that's causing them to delay
9 further.

10 ADAM SERAFIN: That shouldn't be a
11 problem for us as far as installing it by
12 3/16/2011.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, my private
14 opinion on the other end date is that
15 technology will move, these sites will be
16 valuable sites and that MIT may come back in
17 five years or whenever that happens to say,
18 well, we've got something else we want to put
19 on this same site because we learned as much
20 as we can from this one and there are some
21 more things we want to learn through

1 something else. And so, when that happens,
2 another Board will address that. I think
3 it's likely that you'll find it out there 20
4 years from now. MIT isn't so much about
5 historic technology but cutting edge
6 technology.

7 Steve?

8 STEVEN WINTER: I want to very
9 respectfully ask my colleague about the
10 ending date. And I have to say this is the
11 first official move that we've made on the
12 project like this. I'm reluctant to attach a
13 date to it. And I guess I want to know what
14 my colleagues feel about that. If there's
15 not a lot of talk about it one way or the
16 other, it's not an issue to me then. But
17 I've just got this feeling that, you know, I
18 think this one needs to look right, needs to
19 act right, needs to look good all around.
20 Otherwise, I don't think I'd have a problem
21 with these dates. But in this case because

1 this is really the first of many, I just --
2 I'm not sure I see it as necessary.

3 PATRICIA SINGER: So then we are in
4 agreement? Because I recommended no end
5 date.

6 STEVEN WINTER: Oh, I'm sorry.
7 Never mind, we're all set.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Stuart, did you want
9 to make a comment?

10 STUART DASH: MIT mentioned that
11 they would work with the city in hosting
12 their bond, so they would work with that as
13 part of their recommendation.

14 STEVEN WINTER: That's good to know
15 in case the MIT ever does go belly up we have
16 that bond.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: I think the only
18 thing I would say is that Charles mentioned
19 that he had read the detail of the criteria
20 in the answers and he was satisfied. And I
21 think I had done that. Bill's done that.

1 I'd like the decision to reflect that.

2 So, therefore, on the motion, all those
3 in favor.

4 (Show of hands.)

5 (Russell, Anninger, Singer, Nur,
6 Winter, Cohen, Winters, Tibbs, Studen.)

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

8 ADAM SERAFIN: Thank you.

9 (A short recess was taken.)

10 * * * * *

11 HUGH RUSSELL: We will now hear case
12 No. 247, 22 Water Street.

13 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: Thank you. Good
14 evening. My name is Chris Kaneb. I'm with
15 Catamount Holdings, the owner of 22 Water
16 Street. We have spent sometime in front of
17 this Board before a few years ago. There are
18 some members who were participating in that
19 process and I also know there are some new
20 members.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me. Can we

1 have a show of hands for those who were part
2 of the decision three years ago?

3 (Show of hands.)

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Please
5 continue.

6 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: So that was a
7 decision to approve a proposal that we had
8 submitted for redeveloping the former
9 Mac-Gray site into residential use consistent
10 with the allowable uses and design guidelines
11 as outlined in the North Point PUD. We're
12 here again tonight to discuss the same
13 project which we re-filed a few weeks ago in
14 essentially the same format with two changes
15 which you'll hear a fair amount about
16 tonight. But we're also, because it's an
17 entirely new filing, we're going to walk
18 through the entire filing and all the points
19 about the building and answer any questions
20 that come up related to the changes or not.

21 So let me just begin by walking through

1 some initial slides and then the bulk of the
2 presentation will be done by our capable
3 team.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: How long do you
5 anticipate the presentation taking?

6 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: I would think 20
7 minutes.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Great. Thank you.

9 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: I can be brief.
10 So with me tonight is our project team.
11 Again, Catamount Holdings is the owner of the
12 property. We acquired the site in 2005 from
13 Mac-Gray. The design architect (inaudible)
14 of New York. And the executive architect is
15 Symmes, Maini, McKee of Cambridge.
16 Representing Symmes, Maini -- they're doing
17 both architecture and engineering work. And
18 tonight presenting the architecture will be
19 Greg Downs, principal of Symmes, Maini. And
20 discussing the engineering will be Brian
21 Lawlor from Symmes, Maini. Our legal counsel

1 is Debbie Horwitz from Goulston and Storrs.

2 And our traffic consultant is Vanasse and

3 Associates represented by Scott Thornton.

4 So I just wanted to start off by giving

5 some reference on some reasonably comparable

6 experiences that we've worked on and then go

7 right into 22 Water Street. The site -- I

8 don't have a pointer with me.

9 So the site we acquired is right here.

10 It's triangular in shape. It's a block in

11 from the O'Brien Highway which is running

12 this way. It is part of the North Point PUD

13 which is the approximately 50 acres total

14 over here. And we are adjacent to the

15 Hampton Inn Hotel and we're across the street

16 from the glass factory residential complex.

17 A couple of sites that we've worked on

18 over the past few years which have some

19 similarities are, one is in Charlestown.

20 This is a redevelopment of the former Hood

21 headquarters. It's a 20-acre site that we've

1 we've completed a few years ago again with
2 Symmes, Maini, this was a former industrial
3 site. It was actually a warehouse, very
4 similar to the Mac-Gray site. At very heavy
5 truck traffic in a dead end street on War
6 Street in Milton abutting the Neponset River
7 just on the other side of Boston. We worked
8 with the town to actually rezone the whole
9 site and ultimately came up with a project
10 that had 73 new units, 73 residential units,
11 7,000 square feet of commercial space and a
12 two and a half acre waterfront public park.
13 Sold out and very successful project.

14 Now, getting into our project here in
15 Cambridge. This is the design as approved by
16 the Board three years ago. And you may be
17 asking the question quite logically, why are
18 we here again? There are a few reasons and
19 I'll just outline them briefly:

20 One, is that the economy has obviously
21 been a major hindrance to redevelopment, or

1 development of any type and has definitely
2 slowed things down. You may recall actually
3 in the summer of 2008 we filed an extension
4 of the Special Permit which was granted. We
5 decided rather than re-filing for the exact
6 same extension, that we wanted to go back to
7 adjust our plans a bit based on some other
8 conditions that have occurred since that
9 time. One of which is -- relates to our
10 abutters, the North Land Company otherwise
11 known as JLL or Pan Am Railways. You may
12 recall part of that decision in 2007
13 obligated us to enter into an agreement with
14 North Point Land Company in order to secure
15 vehicular access to the building. I'm sure
16 you're fully aware that they've been in limbo
17 this whole time, any discussions with them
18 have been -- we've had a relationship with
19 them, but there are no substantive
20 discussions that they can enter into based on
21 their extreme state of flux. Nobody knows

1 when it may change hands or when it may get
2 developed. So that's one critical issue. We
3 have been left with trying to struggle with
4 how to access our building when our abutter
5 is basically a party that we can't work with.
6 Not because the interest isn't there, but
7 just legally they're not in a position to do
8 so.

9 Secondly, there has been -- on the
10 bright side there has been a lot of progress
11 across Water Street in the redevelopment of
12 the Lechmere T Station. And you'll see in
13 pretty good detail that a lot of that work
14 that will be undertaken by the T will
15 actually benefit the access to our building.

16 So, the two changes that we're looking
17 at tonight, we're going to be talking about
18 tonight have to do with the vehicular access
19 to the garage, relocating it to Water Street,
20 which is actually where we initially started
21 with a few years ago in our first concept

1 that we discussed with the Board. And then
2 we're also looking to reduce our parking
3 requirement from one space per unit to 0.8
4 spaces per unit. With that I'd like to turn
5 it over to Debbie Horwitz to begin talking
6 about some of the more technical issues.

7 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: More
8 exciting issues. Chris gets the pretty
9 picture. I'm Debbie Horwitz. I'm with
10 Goulston and Storrs. We've been working on
11 this project since its inception. I think we
12 have a really exciting slide here which I
13 won't bother to go through. I think
14 everybody here is pretty familiar with the
15 process. This is our first, we're here for a
16 few things.

17 One of the things we're here for is the
18 PUD Special Permit. So everybody here in our
19 application talks about how we comply with
20 the general requirements of Article 12 and
21 the specific requirements of our Article 13.7

1 related to North Point. This is, as
2 everybody knows I hope, our first hearing on
3 the preliminary site plan on the preliminary
4 plan. After this hearing if the Board gives
5 us a positive decision presumably with
6 conditions, we would move on to a period
7 where we respond to those conditions and then
8 a second hearing. So that's it.

9 So, the other reasons why we're here
10 and I won't go through them all in detail,
11 they are in excruciating detail in the
12 narrative that we submitted with the
13 application about how we comply with each of
14 the technical requirements for each of these
15 things. So, in addition to the PUD Special
16 Permit, we need a project review Special
17 Permit because we're building over 50,000
18 square feet of new space, and that's under
19 Article 19. That is as the Board knows
20 related to traffic issues which Scott
21 Thornton will talk about as we go forward.

1 I'm going to skip to the last one.
2 Chris mentioned that we're asking for a
3 reduction in our required parking ratio. The
4 standard requirement in the Ordinance is one
5 per unit. We're asking for a reduction to
6 0.8 per unit. Under the Ordinance there's a
7 general provision that the BZA could grant a
8 Special Permit for a reduction under 6.35.
9 And then there's a provision in Article 10, I
10 think it's 10.45. That says anything that
11 has to come before this Board for a Special
12 Permit can also be granted by this Board. So
13 we don't need to go to the BZA for a Special
14 Permit. That's new. That's in addition for
15 what we were here for last time. And you'll
16 hear both from our team and your traffic
17 department around the conversations around
18 that and how that makes sense given where we
19 are right on top of the Lechmere T Station.
20 The last thing and probably the more
21 interesting for me anyway, conversation about

1 why we're here is asking for approval of this
2 Board specifically under Article 13.792 which
3 basically says we can accept our aboveground
4 parking garage from counting towards FAR if
5 we meet some standards.

6 So, there are a few standards. The
7 first basic one is that the parking garage
8 really has to provide an acoustical barrier
9 between active rail uses and either the
10 existing neighborhood or the PUD district.
11 We actually -- so I'm going to jump the gun
12 here a little bit. We actually have this in
13 both directions. So, right now there are
14 active rail uses back here. And our garage
15 will be an acoustical barrier between those
16 active rail uses and the existing East
17 Cambridge neighborhoods. Had the T -- when
18 the Lechmere T Station is relocated, the
19 relocated tressel is going right in front of
20 the building and, therefore, our parking
21 garage will act as acoustical and visual

1 barrier between not only our residents and
2 other people in the neighborhood and the
3 North Point District and the relocated train
4 station. So we meet that test in both
5 directions.

6 Then there are a series of five other
7 specific requirements which I'll go through
8 in sort of reverse order. We were supposed
9 to have and we have submitted an acoustical
10 study which shows the beneficial effect. And
11 you will see that the study we submitted
12 concluded that the our parking garage, our
13 aboveground parking garage will provide
14 significant shielding of noise from rail uses
15 to the surrounding community.

16 Second, the structure has to be
17 screened with active uses as much as
18 possible, and you'll see as Greg walks
19 through the plans, how we've done that.

20 Third, the garage must be a quality
21 comparable to other non-garage buildings. So

1 you'll see again how we've done that. It
2 looks like a building. It doesn't look like
3 a blank wall of a garage. I'm going to leave
4 the details to Greg. It could be no higher
5 than 25 feet which we meet.

6 And here's the one we might spend a
7 minute talking about which is the parking
8 facility has to be located adjacent to the
9 Somerville boundary in order to be eligible
10 for this. When we were here the last time,
11 we talked about the fact that there were
12 various definitions of adjacent, dictionary
13 definitions otherwise which include
14 bordering, but also include near and nearby
15 and we talked about the fact that there are
16 some places in the Ordinance, in the
17 Cambridge Zoning Ordinance where when the
18 Ordinance tends to mean, you know, really
19 contiguous to and touching, it uses the word
20 abutting as opposed to adjacent. So, again,
21 just the yellow line is the Somerville,

1 Cambridge boundary or at least approximating
2 the Cambridge/Somerville boundary. And so
3 what we did is look at that and think about
4 what the purposes of the 13.79.2 is supposed
5 to accomplish. And, you know, based on these
6 various dictionary definitions and what's in
7 the Ordinance, we concluded that we are
8 adjacent to the Somerville/Cambridge boundary
9 municipal boundary and meet the other
10 standards and we ask this Board and ask this
11 Board again to approve our basically
12 excepting the above ground parking from
13 counting towards FAR.

14 I ran through that rather quickly
15 because I know we promised 20 minutes and
16 we're well into that. So I just want to stop
17 and --

18 STEVEN WINTER: It's an important
19 point and we appreciate that.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Those of us who went
21 through it in excruciating detail four years

1 ago.

2 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Don't say
3 it that way.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: I agree.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: But we can come back
6 and ask questions. Particularly people who
7 are finding this concept needing some
8 thought.

9 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Okay.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Which it does. I
11 appreciate you hitting it upfront and stating
12 it clearly.

13 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: So I'm
14 done and I'm going to turn it back to the
15 picture guys. Or the engineer.

16 BRIAN LAWLOR: Thank you, Debbie.
17 My name is Brian Lawlor, civil engineer and
18 principal at Symmes, Maini and McKee
19 Associates. I'm going to spend just a few
20 minutes to fairly quickly run through some of
21 the site-related, site design issues and try

1 and focus on some of the changes -- try to
2 focus primarily the changes from the original
3 filing and this proposal.

4 The locus plan has been discussed in
5 some detail already. The key piece I think
6 really is this is Water Street like so. This
7 is the MBTA right of way on the site of the
8 future Green Line extension. The existing
9 building on-site is here approximately 60,000
10 square feet of building. The site is unusual
11 triangular shape. 2.4 acres, approximately
12 280 feet in this dimension and just shy of
13 700 feet. So a fairly unusual shaped parcel.

14 This was the prior site plan. This
15 bass, the site plan that was approved by this
16 Board as part of the 2006/2007 process. And
17 the important things to note on this plan are
18 the showing Water Street on this side and the
19 approved roadway plan that was part of the
20 overall North Point Development and the
21 concept for the extension of Daws Street that

1 provided our proposed building access to
2 parking. The proposed plan, what we're
3 seeing here under this prior site plan, what
4 we're seeing here is the residential units
5 like so. You're seeing the green roof or the
6 roof garden on top of the parking garage like
7 so. A plaza area here, and then Water
8 Street. If you look at what's currently
9 proposed, the currently proposed site plan,
10 you see that it is essentially, essentially
11 the same plan. Very, very little difference.
12 The key change is that I instead of relying
13 on the future Daws Street to the north of the
14 site, we're now proposing to access directly
15 off of Water Street like so into the parking
16 garage. The building itself is completely
17 unchanged from what was originally proposed.
18 The limits of the aboveground parking are
19 unchanged. There are some changes to the
20 basement level parking which Greg will talk
21 about. But essentially the footprint of the

1 aboveground building so to speak is
2 unchanged. What we're also responding to
3 here is the proposed layout for the Lechmere
4 Station. And that is really an integral part
5 of this proposal. The layout as it's shown
6 here, is the plan that's currently proposed
7 as part of the DOT draft environmental impact
8 report for the station. So we are showing
9 this. We met with the T. We're trying to
10 see if there is a more -- a later plan, but
11 they have said the plan that was filed with
12 MEPA is the plan that we should in fact use
13 as part of this filing. What you're seeing
14 here is a proposal to extend Water Street, I
15 will go into this in more detail. But the
16 key piece is a similarity with the original
17 filing, the original site plan and the
18 proposed site plan.

19 The key elements of the building, of
20 the proposal unchanged at 392 units.

21 Unchanged at 45 at inclusionary units.

1 Unchanged residential gross floor area of
2 408,000 square feet. The parking is reduced
3 from the original as was mentioned earlier in
4 the one space per unit at 392 is now reduced
5 to 314 spaces at 0.8 per unit plus 12 visitor
6 spaces for a total of 326 spaces currently
7 shown within the building.

8 I want to quickly run through some land
9 use plans. And the purpose of this is really
10 to explain how the currently and proposed
11 plan, the site plan will fit into an existing
12 condition including the Lechmere Station, but
13 is also intended to still fit into the
14 eventual master plan for North Point. So the
15 key piece for the existing land use is to
16 just remind ourselves that if this is 22 Water
17 Street site, that the MBTA parcel like so,
18 also includes the section of the Water Street
19 right of way. So, Water Street is a public
20 roadway from the Monsignor O'Brien Highway up
21 to the MBTA right of way. And north of that

1 it is part of -- it is part of the MBTA
2 property. And we see here glass factory
3 condominiums like so, and then this like so.

4 The proposed site plan scale is a
5 little difficult to see, but all of this is
6 shown in a larger scale later. Shows the
7 currently proposed plan adjacent to the
8 proposed Lechmere Station. And we've
9 referred to this as an interim land use. But
10 it is the proposed site plan at this point.
11 And then we see that eventually the plan
12 still functions, the layout still functions
13 as part of a future fully developed North
14 Point.

15 I'm going to let Scott talk about this
16 a little later. This is the actual detail of
17 what's proposed.

18 So, on the site plan as proposed, the
19 other thing I just wanted to point out is the
20 limits of what it's proposed under this
21 proposal. And they include a couple of

1 things: One is the actual development of the
2 multiuse trail. So this proposal includes
3 the development of the multiuse trail on our
4 property. So from approximately this point
5 -- or I should say adjacent to our property
6 to the Water Street right of way. And
7 Catamount will be looking to develop this and
8 will be working with JLL, Pan Am for the
9 development for the ability and the rights to
10 develop and construct this as part of this
11 project. Similarly, we've been meeting and
12 working with the T. We understand that the T
13 will obviously need to develop Water Street
14 and to service that proposed station. And
15 this project proposes to extend Water Street
16 north to this, and also to construct
17 sidewalks on both sides of the street to
18 really create the pedestrian environment that
19 we would want for this building and a
20 pedestrian environment and a roadway
21 environment that really sets up for the

1 future development.

2 We've spent a lot of time, and the
3 planning and traffic department have all
4 spent a lot of time with us focusing on the
5 development of the plaza at Water Street.

6 A slightly larger view of that. What
7 we are proposing to do is to create really
8 what is quite a large space, a large
9 pedestrian plaza. This is approximately 55
10 to 60 feet from the back sidewalk to the
11 building. So to create this space, that will
12 be adjacent to the proposed cafe area. But
13 also creates a very strong pedestrian route
14 from along Water Street like so, from the
15 multiuse trail and then also back down to the
16 station on this side. So discuss a little
17 bit more about how this looks and feels, I'm
18 going to hand it over to Greg Downs.

19 GREG DOWNS: Thanks. I am Greg
20 Downs architect from SMMA. This is just what
21 Brian was just talking about which is the

1 plaza area, and it's very similar to where we
2 were when we were before you several years
3 ago. And with the exception that on the
4 left-hand side as you can see, there's
5 vehicular access to the garage. That access
6 will provide automobiles access in and out of
7 the garage where the parking occurs on two
8 levels. It also will provide access for
9 service trucks to be able to go inside fully
10 to pick up trash and then back out. Other
11 than that, the same uses apply along the
12 facade. You can see where the cafe is
13 indicated. To the right of that are some
14 service and then to the far right a large
15 entry area. As you can see, a portion of the
16 planted roof which is on the roof of the
17 garage, it provides a pretty nice pattern
18 also for the units up above which look down
19 on the south side of the building. Where you
20 can see the indication of a crossing, that's
21 the crossing where it links for pedestrians

1 to cross to the new T station and the parking
2 areas for that elevated station.

3 On the left-hand side you can see the
4 abutment of the elevated tracks. And by the
5 end of the triangle which is out of site in
6 this perspective, the tracks gradually come
7 back down to grade. So for most of the
8 length that's above the roof of our garage,
9 and toward the end of the site it drops down
10 and finally meets grade at the end of our
11 building.

12 The side you can't see the north side,
13 like this side is activated by. They are
14 residential units that are almost like town
15 houses. They can be entered from inside the
16 garage. They can also be entered from
17 outside. They have front doors which face on
18 the multiuse path and they have patios. Many
19 of you were here before. As part of the
20 process I think encouraged us rightly so to
21 try to activate the public faces of the

1 building. And this is a triangle, and two
2 out of the three faces are active -- one long
3 face with a multiuse trail and the other face
4 across from the T where we have the cafe and
5 the plaza. This is just another look of the
6 context of the whole building.

7 I'll talk a little bit about the
8 architecture. But the architecture has
9 changed very little in terms of what we're
10 talking about. But I think -- in thinking
11 about what I might say as an architect, I'm
12 more interested in how the building changes
13 which some of you know and some of you might
14 not know through the public process. So I'm
15 not going to talk a little bit about it. But
16 from my point of view, it's very interesting
17 the meeting with the East Cambridge
18 Neighborhood and with the Planning Board, and
19 in this case I'm working with a national
20 architect with a national design reputation
21 in the residential area. Our owner asked us

1 to make that association, and it was very
2 interesting to see this process go from the
3 initial design to where it is now. And I
4 feel very good about where we are now.

5 For one thing let me say that the major
6 changes from the initial building which is
7 all 15 stories, it was always three blocks
8 because of the way the triangle is shaped, it
9 was a way that fell out naturally. Instead
10 of a long rectangle, we could have basically
11 three blocks that are staggered which already
12 helped us with the scale of the building.
13 But from the outset, both the neighborhood
14 and the Planning Board were mostly asking us
15 to come down, get our feet on the ground and
16 walk around the building and activate the
17 building in terms of public life and also
18 scale. So, some of the big changes I
19 remember were going from a 15-story building
20 to 15, 14, 13, and stepping down which has
21 also a strong impact on the silhouettes that

1 are a top of the building that are seen from
2 the surrounding neighborhoods. Also,
3 insisting on life at the street which really
4 resulted in opening up those ground floor
5 residential units on towards the multiuse off
6 in Central Park which is planned for the
7 future, and along the street introducing a
8 cafe area and activating the normal traffic
9 that will be moving between the T and this
10 building. So, those are some of the things
11 that -- another more dramatic one, I have to
12 talk a little bit about the design architect
13 Rinardo Garbestia (phonetic). His
14 architectural firm (inaudible), they work on
15 different things. It doesn't have -- I would
16 say clearly stated philosophy of architecture
17 but things interest them. And one of them is
18 pattern. So a lot of people wonder why does
19 the building look the way it does? A lot of
20 that has to do with a real interest in
21 pattern. And the way this changed was the

1 first time this building was presented, it
2 was almost all red panels with variations of
3 red and grey. As it's turned out, when we
4 stepped the building down to recapture the
5 area, we added this bar which is the blue
6 element, and that was not only better for
7 scale giving, but it allowed us to give a --
8 sort of localize the color and keep the rest
9 of the building in shades of greys and
10 whites.

11 Let's talk about plan. This is the
12 first floor plan. And on the top of the
13 buildings's north side, you can see there are
14 all units along the north side. They have
15 outside patios. They don't show in the plan
16 drawing. And these are along here. This is
17 the entry to the building with a big lobby.
18 A mail room, a party room, and an exercise
19 room. There are elevators and stair cores
20 here. And down on this end, these are the
21 cafe area. And the other side is here. And

1 this is the in and out access. The truck
2 being able to pull in here to pick up trash
3 and pull out. To connect with a lower level,
4 this is a ramp down. And all of this is a
5 parking. The elevator here. Elevator there.
6 A number of bike storage areas throughout
7 both parking areas. This is the lower level.
8 Again, it's pretty straight forward parking
9 with the elevator cores here and here. A
10 large bike storage area here.

11 I'll move through these quickly but
12 they're kind of fun to watch the building
13 grow. This is up at the second floor and you
14 can begin to see the bar now. The floor plan
15 has been now connected up to the blue element
16 that you saw that kind of wraps around the
17 building. We've got the third floor, it's a
18 similar plan. The elevator core's here and
19 here.

20 Fourth through sixth you begin to see
21 this part of the building which is

1 cantilevered out in a single column here.
2 That's another area that he's interested in.
3 He calls it defying gravity.

4 Here's the roof of the barrel element
5 and the mechanical equipment behind these
6 ovular mechanical screens.

7 And now we're up to the 14th floor
8 which is this element here and that's the
9 roof of the 13th floor and so forth. And
10 these are the roofs and that's the roof plan.

11 This is the north side of the building.
12 These are the units. This is part of --
13 these are all the ones that have patios.
14 This is the area. The entrance comes from
15 this direction, the building and these are
16 the associated condominium rooms, larger
17 rooms and spaces. This is the blue element
18 with a recalled piece down here.

19 Another thing that was added, you can
20 see them here and also when you look at the
21 model, was balconies were added at the

1 request of the Planning Board which were
2 pushing hard to find a way to let everyone
3 know this was a residential building and
4 trying to find the scale that would do that.
5 This is the new entrance to the garage.
6 Otherwise elevations are unchanged and the
7 most other things in the building.

8 This is from the south side. And
9 you're seeing the garage element here which
10 abuts the elevator rail. And that's planted.

11 And this is the narrow end of the
12 triangle moving way to the west.

13 These are two sections which are kind
14 of interesting. Knowing that the sites are
15 triangle and cutting sections from north to
16 south. The section here, if this is the
17 elevated train track, the section here is
18 right up against the plaza that we're
19 building in the entrance, to the entrance to
20 the building. The section here is where
21 you're at the narrowest part of the triangle.

1 The block just steps back. You can see where
2 the sections cut these are the other end of
3 the two blocks stepping.

4 Scott is going to talk on traffic.

5 SCOTT THORNTON: Scott Thornton with
6 Vanesse and Associates to present traffic.
7 We submitted a TIS update memorandum dated
8 February 17th and it was attached to your
9 letter from the Traffic Department to the
10 Planning Board. I want to address three
11 major parts, three major points.

12 First, the original TIS certification
13 is still valid.

14 Second, that based on the collection of
15 some new data, area Cambridge apartment
16 complexes that the parking supply could be
17 reduced from one space per unit to 0.8 spaces
18 per unit.

19 And lastly, that the Lechmere
20 relocation plan is going to improve access to
21 and from the project.

1 And initially in 2006 we were looking
2 at the North Point project relocating the
3 Lechmere Station and the project would be
4 able to take advantage of that improvement.
5 Now, it's Mass. DOT and formerly EOT that's
6 making that improvement. But, again, the
7 project is still able to benefit. So, those
8 are the three main points from that memo. I
9 am -- I'll talk about those. I also wanted
10 to talk about some other key points.

11 Specifically that the project is a
12 redevelopment of the existing industrial use.
13 The Mac-Gray site has about 100,000 square
14 feet of building space, it was an industrial
15 use, part industrial, part warehouse. That
16 use really depended on a lot of truck trips,
17 servicing the laundry operations that were
18 going on there. And they had seven loading
19 docks that were there. So, it's not an
20 undeveloped site. It's a formerly, up until
21 2007 it was an active use with up to 100

1 employees generating traffic and a lot of
2 that traffic was truck driving.

3 So, the project impacts as it relates
4 to the 2006 original analysis really haven't
5 changed. What we've seen is that the
6 2009/2010 traffic volumes have decreased
7 significantly over the passed few years due
8 to the economic climate. We looked at some
9 traffic patterns over on O'Brien Highway,
10 over by Water Street, and in some cases
11 traffic movement has dropped between 15 and
12 20 percent. In some cases they've dropped
13 about half of a percent. But in any event,
14 they haven't increased. So if we were to do
15 the same analysis that was done previously,
16 we'd come out with the same result. And most
17 likely of the 94 Special Permit indicators
18 that were reviewed, the project didn't exceed
19 any of them. And those are the indicators
20 related to trip generation, level of service
21 and intersections and pedestrian level of

1 service.

2 So there's that issue. Also, the
3 project site is still -- the project is still
4 392 units. That hasn't changed. And then
5 the circulation again is proposed to be
6 improved through the DOT plan of the Lechmere
7 Station relocation. And just to go over some
8 of the finer points of this plan. Again,
9 this is from the Environmental Impact Report.
10 As I mentioned, this is the latest and
11 greatest plan for the station relocation.

12 So here's Water Street, O'Brien
13 Highway. And a traffic signal's proposed at
14 Water Street along with a break in the median
15 and pedestrian phasing to get pedestrians
16 across O'Brien Highway. There's also the
17 extension of First Street through the present
18 location of the station. You come up to
19 north First Street, signalized intersection.
20 And, again, with pedestrian phasing that's
21 proposed. The bus routing. The busses will

1 make a left turn in Water Street, come up and
2 park in these layover areas and then come
3 through, exit back over on the North Street
4 and continue right. That's where the
5 majority -- that's the traffic pattern for
6 the majority of the busses. The Water
7 Street, 22 Water Street site is right up in
8 here. So it really is just a crossing, walk
9 across the street to get to the new Lechmere
10 Station. And traffic that was before
11 proposed to come out to Daws Street I
12 believe, you come up in this area, come down
13 north, First Street will now be able to come
14 through what's really effectively the
15 extension of Industrial Park Road which
16 continues up into the back of -- or actually
17 the front of the North Point site. But
18 traffic intending to turn left to head into
19 Boston can still do that with this plan.

20 So, another point is that this location
21 ensures alternative transportation use by

1 residents. Brian identified the multiuse
2 path that's going to be constructed.
3 Eventually it will connect to existing -- or
4 to proposed parks for the North Point Park.
5 Portions of that Central Park have been
6 constructed. And this slide I think is good
7 because it shows that, you know, from 22
8 Water Street bicyclists or pedestrians can
9 continue up Industrial Park Road underneath
10 the Gilmore Bridge and can actually continue
11 all the way up to the North Point Park and
12 then there's -- we've already started
13 construction of the North Bank Ridge, one of
14 three foot bridges going over the Charles
15 River to get to the Boston side. That
16 contract was let in November and construction
17 is supposed to be done by 2012. So that and
18 the transit is again, right across the street
19 really indicates the usage of these
20 alternative transportation modes.

21 And that just dovetails in with the

1 need to supply less parking. We've completed
2 a parking study where we looked at eight
3 sustained Cambridge apartment complexes. And
4 they're shown on this plan. And as you can
5 see, they're highlighted in the start areas.
6 They all have some proximity to transit.
7 There's the North Point site up on the right.
8 There's the four city residential complexes
9 down in University Park. It's near bus
10 service, not really near any rail rapid
11 transit. There's the ones off of Third
12 Street. The third square water mark, Kendall
13 Square. It's pretty close to Kendall Square
14 but not on top of it. The only one that's
15 really close or as close as 22 Water Street
16 is the Archstone Cambridge Park site up near
17 Alewife. And that, again, is at the end of a
18 rapid transit line. And you've probably got
19 another 20 minutes until you get down into
20 this area. But at these sites, at
21 specifically at the Archstone North Point,

1 the Third Square Site, the Archstone Kendall
2 Square site, and the Archstone Kendall Park
3 site, we had a parking ratio based on actual
4 counts of the parking spaces being used
5 between 0.64 and 0.68 spaces per unit. So
6 that tells us that if those developments have
7 that low of a parking usage then a site
8 that's right on top of transit, on top of a
9 subway line like 22 Water Street would be
10 should have much -- should have at least
11 similar parking ratios. And I think the
12 combination of these parking rates or the
13 transit, the alternative transportation, the
14 alternative such as ZipCar and just a general
15 urge to get out of for lack of a better word,
16 divorce yourself from the responsibility of a
17 personal vehicle is all going to have an
18 effect in and require less parking for this
19 project.

20 That's what I have. I'll hand it over
21 to Chris.

1 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: So just to
2 conclude. I just wanted to walk through
3 points about the project benefits of the
4 proposal as stood originally and is unchanged
5 as to what we have today. But then also some
6 of the benefits of the changes that we're
7 talking about tonight.

8 The basic proposal which again was
9 approved and we're seeking to have it -- to
10 receive approval for again, is addition of 45
11 conclusionary housing units. Construction
12 jobs, probably several hundred construction
13 jobs. In excess of a million dollars in tax
14 revenues every year. The construction of the
15 new utility, traffic infrastructure and also
16 a highly sustainable and energy efficient
17 building. Again, it's -- you have to
18 remember that this is a redevelopment of an
19 industrial site which in fact you know had
20 been, you know, a very heavily traffic site.
21 Seven truck bays, continuous truck traffic

1 throughout the day. And this is now
2 consistent with the North Point PUD.

3 In terms of the changes that we've
4 talked about for the project, these are
5 benefits that we are comfortable with. One
6 is that this is going to be a project -- it
7 will be a catalyst for North Point. And I
8 say that because we're now, by adjusting the
9 location of the garage access, we'll no
10 longer be relying on our abutters for all
11 vehicular access to the garage. We'll have
12 independence to be able to develop either
13 concurrently with them or ahead of them.
14 They're a much larger preacher that they're
15 going to have their own issues and we'll be
16 able to make decisions more quickly and won't
17 be tied down into their own internal problems
18 whether it's legal or otherwise.

19 By approving a reduction in parking for
20 the city's commitment for transit-oriented
21 development, Scott's study shows that the

1 data is there to support it. This would be a
2 poster child frankly for transit development
3 and the city would be proud to have this as
4 an example of how the economics actually
5 work. And in fact how it would be compatible
6 with the development goals. As Brian
7 mentioned, that we will be building the
8 multiuse trail as part of the development.
9 And we're also going to work with the city
10 and the Department of Transportation to
11 ensure that the design and construction both
12 of Water Street and the new Lechmere T
13 station and parking area is coordinated.
14 It's just as important to us. It's at least
15 as important to us to make sure that access
16 and that circulation is done properly. I
17 know it's extremely important to the city.
18 So, and the master plan for the
19 transportation and MBTA has been sympathetic
20 to our discussions so far. So, with that, I
21 think we can wrap it up and turn it over to

1 the Board.

2 Thank you very much.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. So
4 I just want to talk about what our process is
5 going to be. Because of the PUD permit and
6 the requirement that there be two hearings,
7 we've been through this a couple times
8 recently. So our job tonight on the PUD
9 permit is to make a list of questions that
10 need to be addressed for the final submittal.
11 I would propose that we focus on that task
12 only tonight. It doesn't really exclude any
13 subject for discussion. And that when we get
14 the second, as long as we go through all the
15 Special Permit questions at that time, I
16 don't know when you might be back for the
17 second hearing.

18 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: That's
19 partly dependent on what the Board does
20 tonight.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. If we did

1 nothing, you could go forward quickly so you
2 can get on our agenda. Does that make sense
3 as a general strategy?

4 (All in Agreement.)

5 HUGH RUSSELL: So, does anyone want
6 to ask a question at this time before we go
7 to public? Ted?

8 H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. Where is
9 the space that you're saving from the 60/70
10 parking spaces in the building and what is it
11 going to be used for now?

12 GREG DOWNS: The area is being
13 reduced from the --

14 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Can you use the
15 microphone?

16 GREG DOWNS: Sorry.

17 Essentially the area that's taken out
18 of the parking was area that's outside the
19 footprint of the first floor. In other
20 words, the first floor area stays the same.
21 The parking spaces that were removed were

1 taken out of this level and they were
2 essentially parked under the sidewalk or the
3 plaza, and in the wedge areas on the north
4 side of the building. So the parking -- the
5 numbers worked out with the 0.8.

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you use the
7 pointer and show me?

8 GREG DOWNS: Yes.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Here's the plan from
10 three years ago.

11 GREG DOWNS: Previously the
12 basement. This area was squared off as were
13 these areas here. The footprint is smaller
14 in the basement by that area. Otherwise the
15 area is all the same. The addition of an
16 internal ramp was required, because in the
17 previous design we were accessing on the
18 lower level and the upper level and this end
19 of the site. So an internal ramp was not
20 required. So we've added a ramp here on this
21 floor.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: And where the
2 entrance is proposed now on Water Street,
3 what had that been in the earlier plan?

4 GREG DOWNS: We had an electrical
5 room in that area.

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Charles.

8 CHARLES STUDEN: I'm not sure I'm
9 reading the figures in the packet that you
10 submitted to us clearly. I had a question
11 about the Water Street entrance to the
12 garage. In the interim site plan you showed
13 of course on Water Street that's what's
14 before us tonight. There's also a drawing in
15 here that is entitled, "Proposed land use,"
16 that shows I think the ultimate development
17 of the North Point property if that comes to
18 be. But it shows the extension of Daws
19 Street. I think it's Daws Street, and then
20 it shows the entrance to the building on that
21 end at that point. Are you proposing to

1 change it to the building at that point?

2 GREG DOWNS: I think the idea was in
3 the interim we needed the access here in the
4 service here. But we wanted to be able if in
5 the future it were to be developed and the
6 land were to call for that extension, we
7 could, if it was preferred at that time or
8 seemed to be more functional, we still can
9 come in from that end of the building.

10 CHARLES STUDEN: And that's I guess
11 that's my question. You designed it in a way
12 that you could do it either way?

13 GREG DOWNS: Yes.

14 CHARLES STUDEN: Thank you.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So let's go on
16 to public testimony. I have a list of six
17 people who want to speak. The first person
18 is Nancy Steining.

19 NANCY STEINING: Steining.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Would you come
21 forward and give your name and spell your

1 last name.

2 NANCY STEINING: I shall do that.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: The time keeper
4 reminds me to ask you to speak for only three
5 minutes.

6 NANCY STEINING: That's fine. I was
7 hoping not to speak, but I'm the only person
8 here from ECPD tonight. There are too many
9 other things going on tonight. I think -- my
10 name is Nancy Steining, S-t-e-i-n-i-n-g and
11 I'm at 75 Cambridge Parkway. And we met --
12 you have a letter from us which was very late
13 in getting here and I addressed it to
14 Mr. Tibbs because I did not realize that you
15 had taken over, Mr. Russell. So
16 congratulations to you both.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: That's fine. We're
18 both here.

19 NANCY STEINING: Well, my apologies
20 for that. I should have looked it up and I
21 didn't.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: No problem.

2 NANCY STEINING: ECPD in general is
3 opposed at the moment to the reduction to the
4 number of parking spaces in large expensive
5 residences. Whether people use every day --
6 public transit for every day use or not, they
7 are probably going to want to own a car and
8 they are going to expect to have a space for
9 it in the building. And, you know, we do
10 understand that developers are looking for
11 ways to cut costs. And we agree that it's
12 very important to encourage residents to seek
13 other means of transport. But just merely
14 eliminating parking spaces is not going to
15 solve that problem. Those people are still
16 going to have cars. And we know now that
17 where they go now is they go to East
18 Cambridge which is so crowded that we can't
19 deal with it. The parking studies or the
20 statistics that you gave us for buildings
21 with reduced parking, were they rental units

1 or condo units?

2 SCOTT THORNTON: They were all
3 apartment units.

4 NANCY STEINING: Okay. I have to
5 tell you that I know in the Watermark
6 Building specifically those are, those are
7 rental units which means the landlord may
8 charge extra for the use of the parking space
9 in that building. I know of eight or nine
10 people who just use their city parking
11 sticker and park on the streets in East
12 Cambridge. They do not use that garage.
13 It's too expensive on top of their rent. And
14 that, I think is something that you have to
15 take into consideration because they haven't
16 yet determined whether these will be condos
17 which would have a deeded space required or
18 rental units.

19 I did look at the Zoning Code Article
20 Section 6.35.1 exceptions for providing off
21 street parking and the reasons for it are the

1 availability of surplus off street parking
2 elsewhere and/or MBTA proximity. Neither of
3 these things exists right now. The only
4 excess parking available is in East Cambridge
5 and people are very unhappy about that. And
6 the MBTA may be completed in 2014, it may not
7 be. And I have to say if somebody can put a
8 roof over that platform, it would be very
9 nice because the design of the station is
10 rather bare and cold.

11 Anyway, we would ask that you --

12 PAMELA WINTERS: Your time is up,
13 excuse me. Do you want to just wrap it up in
14 a sentence or two?

15 NANCY STEINING: I would say East
16 Cambridge team voting unanimously for a
17 variety of reasons, some are in the letter
18 some of which you will hear from other people
19 that at the moment until you sort out this
20 problem throughout the whole city, don't make
21 a decision on this one until you look at it

1 all over. Because I think it's going to be a
2 city-wide problem and it needs to be
3 addressed properly.

4 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

5 NANCY STEINING: And thoughtfully.
6 Thank you.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Next is Ivy Turner
8 and on deck is Charlie Marquardt.

9 IVY TURNER: My name is Ivy Turner.
10 I'm a condominium owner and resident of the
11 Glass Factory Condominiums. I do hope that
12 the developer of this project will decide to
13 come and make a presentation to the residents
14 and owners of the building. That has yet to
15 occur and, therefore, many people in the
16 building are entirely unaware of how large
17 this project is. They have not seen the
18 design and do not realize how much it will
19 impact us. So I hope that there will be a
20 meeting soon.

21 Next, I do believe that we do need one

1 space per unit. I think that my house is
2 typical in that there are two of us in it and
3 we're both required to have cars for work. I
4 would like to take the T but it is a
5 necessity to have two cars. I take the T
6 when I can. And as Nancy said, many people,
7 particularly at the income levels that will
8 be needed for this building, do have cars
9 even if they don't use them all the time. In
10 the Glass Factory Condominiums we have 94
11 spaces plus or minus a couple, and 104 units.
12 All of those parking spaces are full and we
13 have a considerable number of people,
14 particularly renters who choose to park on
15 Water Street in all the empty spaces. Once
16 those spaces are gone when this building goes
17 up, those people will have no place to park
18 which would indicate that the proper ratio
19 for your building would have been one to one.
20 We will fill that many spaces. Of course
21 those people when displaced from Water Street

1 will go off into the East Cambridge and
2 exacerbate the parking problem there.

3 Next, the place I park in is off of
4 Water Street. And I've noticed an increase
5 in traffic there lately between all the
6 people parking informally at the Hampton Inn
7 and our building, and I'm concerned how we
8 will handle additional traffic on that
9 street. The beginning of the street off
10 O'Brien Highway is very narrow and we can't
11 really move the buildings that are making it
12 narrow to make it wider. And I know right
13 now when I turn off O'Brien Highway, I need
14 to do it pretty darn quickly to get
15 clobbered. And when I think about more than
16 300 additional people parking there plus all
17 the visitors come in, moving vans and
18 everything else, and the possibility of
19 turning off of O'Brien and not being able to
20 pull forward is really a scary one. We
21 really can't handle that much traffic on that

1 street. And I wonder when the Mac-Gray
2 studies were done, were there as many people
3 living at the glass factory? No, of course
4 not. It wasn't sold out yet. So there's far
5 more traffic now coming from the glass
6 factory. And I've noticed an increase in
7 traffic from the Hampton Inn. So I don't
8 think we can handle this traffic safely.

9 Last I'd like to say that I'm concerned
10 about the design of the building. I
11 understand that maybe it's picking up a
12 certain look that was consistent with the
13 other North Point building here in Tango.
14 But we've now seen that those really have
15 been a failure and they've not been accepted
16 in the marketplace, they kind of look
17 abandoned and we don't see people rushing
18 over to move to North Point because they love
19 the look of it. And I'm concerned that
20 people will now say where do you live? And I
21 will say next to the big ugly blue building,

1 I hope that something can be done to revisit
2 that design. I would like this to be a
3 catalyst for North Point, but from what I've
4 seen I'm kind of skeptical. And I wouldn't
5 want to see three buildings that are hard to
6 fill.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

8 IVY TURNER: Thank you.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Charlie
10 Marquardt. And on deck John Baehrend.

11 CHARLIE MARQUARDT: Charlie
12 Marquardt, and that's M-a-r-q-u-a-r-d-t.
13 Cambridge Street. A couple of quick things.

14 One, I think we understand whether this
15 is going to be condos or apartments. We've
16 seen one place where they've flipped back and
17 forth in Cambridge. We all recall the
18 (inaudible) terms of bad relations with the
19 potential buyers in the city.

20 Second, we want to talk about traffic.
21 Traffic study. I didn't see any Alexandria

1 from car. PUD come through recently. I also
2 look at the picture and you see right here
3 loading dock they say all the trucks are
4 going to go in there for deliveries. Mail
5 room is on the other side of the floor. How
6 are we going to get in Fed Ex, UPS, the mail,
7 flowers and Edible Fruits and all that other
8 fun stuff down there on that big circle down
9 there without congestion? And that leads me
10 to a concern for safety. We see fire and
11 other safety equipment needs to get to a
12 place pretty quickly. I don't know how they
13 can get to a building quick enough for say.
14 We saw a fire just this 100 Landsdowne which
15 is by definition a very brand new building.
16 I'm trying to go quickly to cover your time
17 limits.

18 I also want to make sure we're covering
19 noise. I didn't hear any mention about
20 noise. You looked at the roof and it looks
21 really nice. But we had a big discussion

1 about noise with the wind turbines. I wish we
2 had a big discussion about noise here.

3 And I also saw retail and how we wanted
4 to bring people into retail and we keep
5 saying retail come here from the exclusions
6 for the retail thing. Rent is expensive. I
7 didn't hear any mention about what can we do
8 to bring in all that retail that we want to
9 do and to encourage it. Is there any subsidy
10 from the developer? You just heard they're
11 saving a bunch of money. They haven't told
12 us much about beautifying by way of North
13 Point or to help subsidize the retail. And
14 that would be something we want to take a
15 look at that.

16 And finally just an interesting tid-bit
17 that we use adjacent two different ways in
18 this discussion. We started off talking
19 adjacent as near to it and then coming back
20 to being adjacent just outside the property
21 line by touching so I hope we can get through

1 that and understand what adjacent is if we
2 have to rewrite the code let's rewrite the
3 code instead of having to do mental gymnast
4 particular.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

6 John Baehrend and Christopher Park.

7 JOHN BAEHREND: I'm John Baehrend
8 and I'm a resident at the Glass Factory
9 Condominium.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Spell your name.

11 JOHN BAEHREND: I thought it was
12 interesting that it was presented that in
13 support of the T system they're electing to
14 have fewer parking units because that means
15 that more people will need to take the T and
16 so therefore they're supporting the T by
17 having fewer units. I thought that was an
18 interesting comment. I think it's all about
19 cost and development. And you have the
20 decision to decide how much you want to help
21 these folks maximize the profit from this

1 property. Obviously if they meet your
2 requirement of one space per unit, they are
3 going to extend the garage beyond the
4 perimeter of the building, that's expensive.
5 And that's down in the subterranean, that
6 means the edge of the building is going to
7 have the extra supports and it's going to be
8 an expensive requirement for this. The other
9 thing of course they can deal with the one on
10 one is to reduce the number of units 20
11 percent. Instead of that, have 300 and
12 whatever it would be instead of closer to
13 400. That might mean that the building one
14 floor less tall in order for you to meet the
15 requirements for what you have in the city.
16 So I mean a part of what you have to think
17 about, I think, is how much you want to help
18 maximize the profits of the developer by
19 allowing them to -- not requiring them to add
20 space to the parking below or reduce the
21 number of units in the building. And I think

1 that's something you should give
2 consideration to.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

4 Next is Christopher Park.

5 CHRISTOPHER PARK: My name is
6 Christopher Park. I'm a resident of the
7 glass factory at 169 Monsignor O'Brien
8 Highway. My name is spelled P-a-r-k as in
9 parking is a bad idea. So basically I'll
10 keep this short. I pretty much echoed the
11 sentiments of my fellow neighbors here. On
12 originally every single point the only thing
13 I really want to embellish here that hasn't
14 been brought up a lot of these plans that
15 have been discussed or presented is largely
16 conjecture on what the north -- the new
17 proposed Lechmere sayings is going to be. We
18 don't know that. The DOT doesn't know that.
19 There are still in design phase so it's
20 important to keep in mind that a lot of this
21 is simply conjecture on what it's going to

1 look like some of the pathways and things
2 like that. And from one additional point is
3 that the parking at the glass factory if the
4 unit owner doesn't have a car okay, which is
5 very rare indeed, they're going to rent the
6 space. Okay? That's how it works. So weep
7 in mind that all those spots will in fact be
8 utilized and there will be additional 76 cars
9 out there in the neighborhood looking for or
10 lurking for spots. So that's all. Thank
11 you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

13 STEVE KAISER: And my name is Steve
14 Kaiser on Hamilton Street. And earlier I
15 spoke, I had two pluses and one minus on the
16 MIT project. This one I'm more mixed. It's
17 three pluses and three minuses so we'll see
18 how it comes out.

19 The architecture I think I can see from
20 the picture, pictorial that was presented it
21 looks too much like buildings S and T. I

1 think it's another bad architectural effort
2 at North Point. And on the issue that hasn't
3 been discussed very much is the extra height
4 in FAR. As I recall it was related to the
5 active rail line that was adjacent to the
6 building. And that's the non-used Green
7 Line. So I am opposed to any extra height
8 and FAR in the structure. I think it's ugly
9 enough. So that's a minus. The other
10 interesting one that I come out positive on
11 is a parking garage. This is first proponent
12 in the North Point area that understands the
13 mistake we made by extending the Green Line
14 as an elevated line rather than a tunnel.
15 Because it goes passed their project
16 elevated, up in the air, they have no choice
17 except as to use that parking garage to
18 shield their site from noise. And I think
19 the design they've come up with is quite
20 suitable. The above grade parking garage is
21 not nominating from the street so I think

1 that's a legitimate request. The problem is
2 being adjacent to the Somerville boundary
3 because nobody knows where the boundary is.
4 They showed a yellow line up there and I
5 checked every boundary and that's a new one
6 for me. The latest one that Cambridge is
7 trying to sell is a very squiggly line take
8 your choices as to where the boundary line is
9 if you can find it. The next item which I
10 think is a plus is the restoration of the
11 original access to the site off the Water
12 Street. Great improvement over this long
13 back road access to the site through the
14 adjacent B&M North Point territory. I could
15 not believe at the time that traffic and
16 parking would make such a recommendation.
17 And I could not believe that this Board would
18 accept it to force one land owner to go
19 through the property of another lands owner
20 particularly when it is as difficult a
21 neighbor as B&M. So that's history thank God

1 and we've improved the project and the
2 proposal.

3 Now, the one thing I would note here is
4 I did appeal to this Board that request for
5 the back door access. And I'm sure that
6 stunned many members of the Board. I think
7 one member even asked well, do I represent
8 the developer? And I most certainly do not.
9 I was very critical of the development, but I
10 thought that this developer deserved the
11 right of access and he was denied it and
12 that's where my protest. So that's why I did
13 that.

14 A couple of few last points really
15 quickly. I'm aware of that.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

17 CHRISTOPHER PARK: I hope you
18 enforced the 20 minute rule on the
19 presenters. The urban ridge went down Water
20 Street. There is still an urban interface
21 access road proposed, so watch out for that

1 coming through the area. There is still a
2 proposal for a multiuse trail but that is
3 very shaky too. You need to keep your eyes
4 open on that. I support a 0.8 parking space
5 request contrary to all residents who
6 complained they want more parking in
7 Cambridge. We have too much. So I think the
8 0.8 is verified by most uses in the City of
9 Cambridge and is entirely valid.

10 Thank you.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. This is the
13 end of the list. Is there anyone else left
14 who would like to speak at this time?

15 (No response).

16 HUGH RUSSELL: I see nobody's --
17 yes, you want to speak? Come forward and
18 give us your name.

19 TROY SOPER: Hi. My name is Troy
20 Soper, S-o-p-e-r. I'm a resident of the
21 glass factory. I have a quick question. If

1 the Board decides to grant the Special Permit
2 for not including the parking spaces as part
3 of FAR, what is the design intent for that
4 additional FAR for this actual project given
5 that there will be more space available?

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe I can just
7 answer that. What the relief they're asking
8 for allows them not to count the space in the
9 upper level of the garage as floor area, so
10 it doesn't change the project at all except
11 that if we didn't grant it, they have to take
12 44,000 feet out of the building whatever that
13 floor area is. So that's not the simplest
14 concept, but --

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: It would be a
16 smaller project if that were done.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

18 Is there anyone else who wants to
19 speak?

20 (No response).

21 HUGH RUSSELL: I would suggest that

1 we close this hearing for oral testimony.
2 Leave it open for written testimony. Is that
3 agreeable?

4 (All in Agreement.)

5 HUGH RUSSELL: And maybe we --

6 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: I'm
7 sorry, did you want to hear from the Traffic
8 Department?

9 BETH RUBENSTEIN: We'll get to that.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So I think
11 that is a good question. Sue is sitting in a
12 different chair and I haven't spotted her.

13 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Sorry, I moved to
14 the other side of the room.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Would you like to
16 discuss the issues in particular with the
17 parking?

18 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So, we can talk
19 about parking. We did give you a memo from
20 the Traffic Department.

21 PAMELA WINTERS: Sue, a few of us

1 did not receive your memo unfortunately.

2 Sorry.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't think any
4 of us did.

5 STEVEN WINTER: I have it.

6 CHARLES STUDEN: I did.

7 LIZA PADEN: I sent it
8 electronically and I said I'd have copies if
9 you needed it.

10 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So I'll maybe go
11 a little bit slower than I was planning to.
12 I'm sorry if people didn't get it.

13 We did accept the recommendation from
14 the proponent and from Vanesse to use the
15 traffic study that they had done for their
16 first permit which we felt was reasonable.
17 As Scott Thornton said, I think throughout
18 the city we're seeing reduced trips because
19 of the economy. Therefore, it's in this case
20 useful to have a slightly older Council
21 looking at it. It's a more conservative

1 estimate. And the project neither when it
2 first came now exceeds any of the Planning
3 Board criteria.

4 We are recommending that and are
5 appreciative of the fact that the design
6 would allow for the alternate access from the
7 building at some future point of the North
8 Point Development when and if that is
9 possible. The reason that we have
10 recommended that relocation to access off the
11 other end was a part of trying to make sure
12 that Water Street itself and the uses along
13 Water Street were as pedestrian friendly and
14 as positive an environment for the people who
15 are using that area. So we would recommend
16 that the access off Water Street be, you
17 know, be seen as an interim operation.

18 We have talked with the proponent some
19 about the Water Street design which is made
20 up of a small section of city street and MBTA
21 property. And also wanting to make sure, as

1 I think they described tonight, that the
2 multiuse path and the road connect well. And
3 I think those are minor details. It's
4 unknown what the sequence of events will be
5 between work the MBTA may be doing and this
6 project. So we have recommended that in
7 whatever order things happen, that if the
8 MBTA has not done work to make Water Street a
9 functioning and normal street (inaudible).

10 In terms of the parking I think we have
11 been feeling very comfortable with the 0.8
12 parking. It's slightly more than what some
13 of the surveys have shown. This is a
14 location in which you can get to the Green
15 Line and we'll get to the future Green Line
16 very easily. And I think that it's from all
17 of the work that's been done. And we have
18 looked at the work that Vanesse has done
19 looking at these various projects, that this
20 is a reasonable way to be proceeding in terms
21 of parking ratio for a building this close to

1 transit. We've seen many locations close to
2 transit that even have an even smaller ratio.
3 So I think this is reasonable.

4 The issue with the multiuse path,
5 although not on their property, I think is
6 fabulous as a way of trying to make that
7 connection which hopefully in future efforts
8 will go in both directions. But with the
9 projects currently on the drawing boards, it
10 looks like it's going east at a more rapid
11 rate than it is west towards Somerville. But
12 I think it will be ongoing efforts along the
13 next couple of years along that path to make
14 a connection. And I think there are more and
15 more movements in this area that start to
16 make me think that we're going to see some
17 very positive pathways that allow you to get
18 to the river, to cross the river, to get
19 through Somerville and get down to the
20 Alewife and to the Minuteman and, you know,
21 continues to piece by piece look very, very

1 positive. And I think this is, again, a
2 small but very symbolically very significant
3 effort to try to get those pieces in place.

4 And then we have listed some basic
5 transportation demand management strategies
6 that are appropriate for residential
7 buildings. So that's really the sum of what
8 was in the letter you didn't get. So I'm
9 happy to answer any questions if people have
10 them.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

12 PAMELA WINTERS: I think we did get
13 the letter electronically actually, Sue. We
14 just didn't print it out. Thanks.

15 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you, Sue.

16 Sue, I want to talk about the interim
17 vehicular access comments, and I want to
18 really understand what your recommendations
19 are. And I also would like to understand
20 whether or not these discussions have been
21 held with the proponent by the staff at the

1 Traffic and Parking or Community Development.
2 You're indicating that yes, fine, we can put
3 the access on Water Street now, but later it
4 should be moved. You're not saying it could
5 be possibly. You're saying I'd like to see
6 it moved?

7 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

8 STEVEN WINTER: Okay. And what's
9 the date that tells you that has to be done?

10 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I think it's the
11 issue that we had talked about with the first
12 permit as well, which is what is the
13 character of the plaza area and of Border
14 Street along that project there. And then
15 what is the design that makes that the most
16 and the strongest area. And I think Water
17 Street, you know, has a fair amount of
18 activity. Hopefully Mass. DOT's going to
19 come up with a much better design than
20 Lechmere shown on that plan in terms of its
21 interface with Water Street. But trying to

1 have that street, you know, really a nice
2 street.

3 STEVEN WINTER: Okay. That's clear
4 and I appreciate that. I'm with you in
5 saying I regret that we use the word
6 hopefully when we're talking about the
7 expectations of Mass. DOT on what we want
8 them to do and how we want them to come
9 forward with the plans to come forward there.
10 I'm sorry that we have to use words like
11 hopefully. I don't think that's acceptable.

12 And another thing I want to point out
13 is just that -- and I know we're saving
14 questions, but it's the issue of how some
15 citizens are coming to the hearings and
16 saying, you know, we need one parking space
17 for one home or one apartment or whatever.
18 And yet, there's the other, the dawning
19 awareness of the green era and the
20 sustainable use of urban environments. And
21 it just seems there's a very interesting

1 disconnect particularly in a town of
2 Cambridge where the sensibilities like that
3 are fairly high and fairly informed and yet
4 we have a lot of people coming to these
5 hearings saying no, no, don't cut the cars
6 down. Well, I feel the cars -- we ought to
7 not have room for the cars. So I know you've
8 been saying that for a long time, too. I
9 want to say it's an interesting disconnect
10 and I'd like to do whatever we can do to work
11 with you, whether it's an education or
12 expectations for the public. I don't know
13 what it is, but it's an interesting
14 disconnect I think.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Pam.

17 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

18 Sue, I have a question about the
19 visitor parking spaces and the Zip cars. And
20 I'm just wondering if there's 400 units here
21 and is there going to be a charge for parking

1 for the parking spaces do you know?

2 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: As rental units
3 they would be sold.

4 PAMELA WINTERS: So then that would
5 motivate people to park in the street I
6 guess. But of the 15 visitor parking spaces,
7 if two people out of the almost 400 units
8 decide to have parties on a Saturday night,
9 you know, I mean, that's like, you know, it
10 doesn't seem like there's enough visitor
11 parking spaces to me.

12 And I guess the ZipCar thing is an
13 issue, too. I don't see any, or at least I
14 didn't hear any plans for a ZipCar spaces.
15 So that's sort of, you know, I'm sort of
16 concerned about that.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So, if I could
18 suggest that rather than trying to answer all
19 these comments tonight, we treat these as
20 comments as things we need, we want to see
21 answers for when they come back to us.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. And may I
2 make one more comment? And this is not about
3 parking. Very little was said about the
4 additional 30 feet. Are you requesting
5 additional 30 feet; is that correct? Or did
6 I misread this?

7 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Yes.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: And so are the
9 photo sims that you have in here, is that
10 including those 30 feet extra?

11 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Yes, yes.

12 PAMELA WINTERS: They are? Okay.

13 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: And that
14 is what we got a Variance for from the BZA
15 which is currently still valid.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you very
17 much.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Bill.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: I'm usually
20 amendable to reducing the parking to the --
21 particularly to the 80 percent, but I have my

1 reservations. So I think I want to talk
2 about a few things to make me feel a little
3 more comfortable about it. Just back to what
4 you said, Steve, people coming in. I think
5 it's a practical issue. And I think until we
6 as a city have better understanding of the
7 practicalities of how the parking works. I
8 think it's not just people being unaware, but
9 I think it's just practical relative to
10 visitor spaces as well, and the East
11 Cambridge community in general has always
12 been very, very concerned about, you know,
13 these developments coming in, people parking
14 on the streets. And so I think until we get
15 a better handle on that, I think we just have
16 to, you take it a project by project. We did
17 that in Central Square for the Blessed
18 Sacrament Church and that was very helpful
19 because we did a study just to see. That was
20 helpful.

21 As far as I too am concerned about

1 visitor's parking. I'm always concerned
2 about visitor's parking. Not just this
3 project, but a project this size always has
4 visitors. And where this site is somewhat
5 isolated, it really doesn't have a lot of
6 opportunities for people to go anywhere if
7 it's not on the site, but off the site. So,
8 I mean there's not a space available on the
9 MBTA property. So I think it's something
10 that I'm very interested in what your
11 thoughts are and your approach to there. I
12 think the parking study should address
13 potential queues on Water Street. I think
14 one of the people who spoke was concerned
15 about that. The study looked at other queues
16 in other intersections in our standard wait.
17 I think this is a localized condition because
18 there is traffic turning on and potential
19 backup on Water Street. So I wanted to get a
20 better understanding how is Water Street
21 working with the T there, and with your

1 number of cars turning in and out and the
2 service vehicles trying to get into that one
3 area. So I see that as a more localized look
4 at how it's working as opposed to a very
5 generalized look that the traffic study tends
6 to do.

7 I also think that it's probably a good
8 idea to -- I agree with and support the idea
9 of looking at the various developments around
10 the city and looking for that 80 percent
11 ratio, but again, this is such a specific
12 area and localized, I'm just interested in
13 more locally around there. What is reality?
14 We obviously have some residents right
15 next-door where that doesn't work. I'm
16 interested in how is Grey Landing working?
17 And so things that are, and more of the
18 recently built projects that we're currently
19 doing. But I think if I can understand that
20 and see that in a more localized context, I
21 can understand if this wasn't such an

1 isolated -- again, yes, it's right by the T
2 so I think that's very reasonable. And I
3 think that as you're doing that utilization
4 study, whether or not it's condo or rental
5 really does make a difference in terms of
6 what people's expectations are. So just
7 understanding that dynamic, I think would be
8 helpful. So I think if you can, when you
9 come back, if you can address some of these
10 things, it will help me feel more or less
11 comfortable with this 80 percent, which as I
12 said, I'm usually amenable to but this
13 particular site I want to get some more
14 information.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

16 H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a
17 quick follow-up question with what Bill was
18 talking about. Which is, again, the issue of
19 visitor parking. And does anyone know what
20 the plans are for the Lechmere Station
21 parking? It may be that visitor parking

1 would be available there on weekend evenings
2 and weekends during the day which is
3 presumably when most of the visitors would
4 be. I mean, we assume that the T folks it
5 will be worked.

6 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The current
7 lot closes at ten p.m.

8 H. THEODORE COHEN: The lot will
9 close.

10 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The current
11 lot that serves that area closes at ten p.m.

12 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: We've been in
13 discussion with the T about that.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Again, we're
15 trying to --

16 H. THEODORE COHEN: Questions.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: These are questions
18 we want to follow up on. Ahmed.

19 AHMED NUR: I'd just like to say I
20 was not here for the original approval of
21 this proposal, but if it is what we approved

1 and the only changes that is the reduction of
2 the parking from one to a 0.8 and the
3 residents of the glass factory spoke and said
4 it's 100 percent full in their parking, you
5 know, I just like to ask for you to think
6 about it and see what it is you can come up.
7 Maybe compromise and go up 10 percent with
8 the parking and go up 0.9 and see how that
9 works out. I don't see any other problems.
10 I like the project. It looks great. I think
11 that area is deserted, it needs it. And I
12 like the benefits that you have shown us,
13 including hundreds of jobs. That's what we
14 need to get this economy going. Thank you.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: I'm just going to
16 follow up on that. It seems to me first I
17 think you should include the glass factory,
18 Thomas Grey Landing, and the project between
19 First and Second Street on Cambridge Street.
20 I don't know what the current name of it is.

21 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: One first.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Still is. In
2 your calculations, for example, the number of
3 spaces cited in the testimony for glass
4 factory, I don't believe is correct because I
5 drew the plans for that building and I
6 believe there are only 81 parking spaces for
7 that building. But I think to actually go
8 and find out what's there, find out how it's
9 being used, and I think you have to listen
10 very carefully to the comments about what
11 happens to people in rental and how they make
12 decisions. How -- it's different for condos.
13 You're going to have to drill down more
14 deeply to understand this phenomenon. I
15 think, because as we say here, this is a
16 special site that's a little different than
17 most of the other sites. There aren't many
18 options. Personally I'll tell you that I
19 occasionally drove to the glass factory
20 during construction and I learned I could
21 never find a parking place in East Cambridge,

1 during the day anywhere. And so I stopped
2 trying to drive there. And I don't think
3 things are much better today even though it's
4 15 years later.

5 I think it would be courtesy to meet
6 with the glass factory owners, and once
7 you've drilled that into this parking
8 numbers, I'd like you to sit down with the
9 East Cambridge planning team and try to
10 really get to the bottom of it to really
11 understand what's going on. Because I don't
12 think we know yet. And I think they're very
13 keen observers and very thoughtful about
14 development so they represent a good resource
15 in the city.

16 Personally I didn't fully understand
17 the grading arguments about the need to raise
18 the grade of Water Street. And so if you
19 could explain that better at a later date
20 with maybe a longer, more information about
21 what the T is requiring you to do, that would

1 be useful. And the water supply option
2 section was again very difficult to
3 understand. I don't know whether there will
4 be any progress on that to report, but maybe
5 we could, I don't know, have something from
6 the city engineer in conjunction with you
7 that would show that you did have water
8 supply options and that the city was willing
9 to work with you on. I read it and I just
10 could not understand how that decision was
11 going to be made, whether there was a real
12 problem there or not.

13 Okay. I know other people want to --
14 Tom.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Just a few things
16 just focusing on what's changed as opposed to
17 what we had before, what we've gone through
18 before.

19 First on this rental and condo, I must
20 have missed something. I thought these were
21 condos period. Did I get that wrong?

1 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: We permitted it
2 as condos originally, but we have not changed
3 that plan. But I also have to point out that
4 when asked that the market for condos right
5 now is extremely difficult.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: My question is how
7 do you deal with 0.8 with condos. Does that
8 mean some condos get parking spaces than
9 others do?

10 CHRISTOPHER KANEB: Yeah.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess how do you
12 decide who gets them and who doesn't? It
13 depends on the --

14 HUGH RUSSELL: If you can maybe
15 explain that.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes. Explain --
17 you don't want an answer tonight. But I want
18 to understand how you allocate the 0.8 to 80
19 parking spaces for 100 units. How do you do
20 that? I know there are more units than that.
21 I'm just using the 80 percent.

1 The loading switch actually seems to
2 make sense to me. I think I'm with
3 Mr. Kaiser on this one or very close to it
4 anyway, the distance is enormous to go all
5 the way around and to the back. It's really
6 very substantial. It's quite a drive around
7 the building. And so I've always been a
8 little bit weary of that. I don't agree with
9 Sue Clippinger's asking of you which is a
10 mandatory switch. I would think that maybe
11 we can consider some sort of a taking stock
12 at the time, if that ever becomes a
13 possibility, of just what Water Street looks
14 like and maybe perhaps coming back to us and
15 having a good conversation over whether such
16 a switch would make sense. That to me would
17 be more in realtime kind of an analysis. And
18 I wouldn't mind your reaction to that. But
19 I'm going to guess -- I'm not sure how you
20 come out on that.

21 The thing that confused me when I

1 looked at the original plan is where the
2 location of the new -- you keep talking about
3 the new Lechmere Station. I don't know --
4 I'm never quite sure when you say new
5 station, whether you mean new coming across
6 the street as new or new because it's not
7 where it was in the plan that we had
8 approved, but it seems to have moved. There
9 are buildings S and T and your 22 Water
10 Street, there's not only a Lechmere Station
11 but there's Q and R. What's happened to Q
12 and R? Have they somehow disappeared from
13 the plan?

14 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Do you want an
15 answer to that? I can give you a quick
16 answer.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right. Looks
18 like Beth wants to answer that one.

19 BETH RUBENSTEIN: We can answer
20 pretty quickly is what I was going to say.
21 The T was originally in a partnership with

1 the developers of the other part of North
2 Point to do it all together. But that
3 partnership ceased to be seen. The T needed
4 and needs to go ahead because they're under a
5 legal obligation to extend the Green Line and
6 move the station. So they do have a new plan
7 without Q and R which folks have referred to
8 as a paired down, less elegant looking
9 station.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: But that doesn't
11 preclude the T from at a later date seeking
12 development proposals for the air rights
13 above their parking lots.

14 BETH RUBENSTEIN: That's absolutely
15 right.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: So Q would be a
17 parking lot?

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: It is.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Under the T plan?

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Under the T plan.

21 And what happens to R?

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Same.

2 BETH RUBENSTEIN: Same.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Above ground
4 parking lot?

5 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Surface.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Wow, I'm really
7 disappointed to hear that. Okay. Those were
8 my questions.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, Steve.

10 STEVEN WINTER: I did have a couple
11 of things that I'd like to hear about. And
12 the first one is I'd really like to hear from
13 the proponent your own options about how you
14 would feel about moving the entrance and the
15 vehicular entrance from one side of the
16 building to the other from Water Street to
17 the other. How would you make that decision?
18 What kind of criteria are important to you?
19 What kind of costs are involved to you as a
20 proponent? I'd like to hear more about that
21 about where you are with that. I'd also like

1 to -- I'd like to have some kind of -- Sue, I
2 don't know if you have this already, but I'm
3 still concerned that the pedestrian crossing
4 across O'Brien Highway remaining an issue,
5 and I don't know if the neighborhood has
6 commented on that and I didn't see anything
7 from the bicycle pedestrian committee. But I
8 would just like to know where that is and if
9 people are satisfied with that configuration
10 of how it looks.

11 That's it, thank you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: So, are there other
13 points that we want to qualify our -- I'm
14 assuming we would vote for a preliminary
15 determination on the PUD with some very
16 specific language that I've never gotten into
17 my head, but it's in the Ordinance so maybe
18 somebody can help us with it, exactly the
19 action we are taking. You know, there are
20 other questions and conditions that we need
21 to put into that.

1 Ahmed.

2 AHMED NUR: If you've considered
3 regarding hours of operation during the
4 construction for the sake of the hotel
5 next-door, what's the distance between the
6 hotel and the building, the proposed building
7 and hours of operation and as well as the
8 residents?

9 Thank you.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We got
11 everything on the table?

12 PAMELA WINTERS: One more thing to
13 piggy back on your comment, Ahmed. Somebody
14 raised the issue of rooftop mechanicals and
15 noise. You might want to address that, too.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So nobody else
17 has found the language. I'll have to look it
18 up. It's 13.7 or something like that.

19 LIZA PADEN: The language for the
20 preliminary determination is Article 12.

21 12.53.

1 whole list of things.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: So, my sense is we
3 can't easily make these findings because we
4 have already granted a permit for
5 substantially the same building. And the
6 items that are changing, we have a lot of
7 questions about and they're on the list. So
8 could somebody perhaps make a motion? And
9 then there are a few other bells and whistles
10 because of the other planning districts.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: You'll have to
12 help me with that. But I think what we're
13 talking about is voting on a motion that I
14 would like to make to approve what the
15 Ordinance calls the development protocol and
16 what we for sure call the preliminary
17 proposal. I won't cite all of the items that
18 Liza just cited, but I will defer. I would
19 like to defer to our previous decision which
20 addressed all of the previous plan which is
21 identical to this one, with two major

1 exceptions; the entrance and the reduction in
2 parking. And for those I believe we have a
3 number of questions and conditions that have
4 been mentioned by my colleagues, and I would
5 like those to be part of the analysis for the
6 final development plan.

7 I think for the rest I'm not sure
8 what's missing.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: I think that there
10 was -- well, I think part of what Liza
11 mentioned was consistency with the North
12 Point policy plans and the East Cambridge
13 plans all of which were founded in that
14 previous decision.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's what I'm
16 trying to do is wrap around and incorporate
17 all that we've previously done so that what
18 we're trying to do here is not start de nova,
19 but to address those things that have changed
20 since the last time we saw this proposal.
21 And I think we can vote on the preliminary

1 subject proposal subject to the questions on
2 the changes and the new developments that we
3 still need to address in detail.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I hear that,
5 and a motion being made. Is there a second?

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Discussion on the
8 motion? All those in favor?

9 (Show of hands.)

10 (Russell, Anninger, Singer, Nur,
11 Winter, Cohen, Winters, Tibbs, Studen.)

12 HUGH RUSSELL: I believe that
13 completes our business for the evening.

14 LIZA PADEN: I have two more things.
15 Before you leave I have your packages for the
16 final public hearing for Alexandria. There's
17 two extensions that's been requested. One is
18 an extension, one is a schedule
19 clarification. One is extension for One
20 Canal Park. They're still reviewing their
21 proposal for the ground floor retail and

1 they'd like an extension on the public
2 hearing requirement for the second public
3 hearing.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: All those in favor of
5 the extension?

6 (Show of hands).

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

9 LIZA PADEN: The way the month of
10 March falls, there are five Tuesdays. So
11 when following for the Alexandria hearing
12 process, when you follow the timeline along,
13 their second submission is due on a
14 particular date and their second public
15 hearing was due on April 5th, but that's a
16 Monday. So I scheduled it for Tuesday, a
17 regular night. So I'd like you to accept
18 that that is fine for you.

19 BETH RUBENSTEIN: 70 days instead of
20 69 days?

21 LIZA PADEN: It would be 70 days.

1 It's an internal clock on the process.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: You need a vote?

3 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: All those in favor of
5 extending that for one day?

6 (Show of hands).

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

9 LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: We're adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, at 10:40 p.m., the
12 meeting adjourned.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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 ^ day of ^ 2010.

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.**