

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

PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, June 5, 2012

7:08 p.m.

in

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

- Hugh Russell, Chair
- Thomas Anninger, Vice Chair
- H. Theodore Cohen, Member
- William Tibbs, Member
- Steven Winter, Member
- Pamela Winters, Member
- Ahmed Nur, Associate Member

Community Development Staff:

- Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development
- Liza Paden
- Roger Boothe
- Stuart Dash
- Jeff Roberts
- Taha Jennings

Court Reporter: Megan M. Castro

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD
617.786.7783/Fax 617.639.0396
www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X

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

GENERAL BUSINESS

PAGE

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1. | Board of Zoning Appeal Cases | 3 |
| 2. | Update, Brian Murphy, Assistant City
Manager for Community Development | 10 |
| 3. | Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s) | 12 |

PUBLIC HEARING (continued):

City Council Petition to create a new Section 5.54 "Special Regulations for Municipal Elementary and Middle (K-8) School."	13
---	----

CJUF III NorthPoint LLC Petition to amend the Zoning Ordinance Article 13.700	73
--	----

PB#26, 125 CambridgePark Drive amendment, et al.	171
---	-----

GENERAL BUSINESS

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 4. | PB#231A, 159 First Street, Design
Review | 212 |
| 5. | PB#141, 675 West Kendall Street,
adoption of "Squeaky Beaker" Fast
Order Food Establishment | 206 |

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

2 - - -

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a 19:08:37
4 meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. 19:08:38

5 The first item on the agenda is review of 19:08:40
6 Zoning Board of Appeal cases. 19:08:44

7 LIZA PADEN: These the BZA cases that are 19:08:47
8 going to held on June 14th. The first one on the 19:08:49
9 agenda, 350 Main Street, you saw before, which is 19:08:54
10 the proposed hotel expansion. I do have a set of 19:08:55
11 plans if you wanted to look at them. 19:08:59

12 But what happens is the private street 19:09:01
13 that is perpendicular to the existing hotel would 19:09:03
14 be used to construct this addition. And the 19:09:08
15 street would still have access for utilities and 19:09:14
16 maintenance and things like that. 19:09:21

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. It seems to me at 19:09:27
18 the time that it would be best for this owner and 19:09:30
19 MIT to work jointly to come up with a better 19:09:36
20 plan. I think we said that to them, we said that 19:09:41
21 to MIT, and I guess MIT is not taking the bait. 19:09:45

1 intact. It makes a terrific presence on the 19:13:16
2 avenue. 19:13:18

3 And what I wanted to do is make sure that 19:13:19
4 I did concur with the changes they were going to 19:13:21
5 make. But also, I feel like it is important to 19:13:24
6 say, if they are going to the Zoning Board, to be 19:13:26
7 able to say that this is a good corporate 19:13:28
8 citizen, and they have really done a tremendous 19:13:30
9 job so far of maintaining this asset for 19:13:33
10 Cambridge. 19:13:35

11 LIZA PADEN: So the plans that I put in 19:13:37
12 front of you, Steve, show in the shaded area the 19:13:38
13 area that is going to be worked on. So it is not 19:13:42
14 the actual facade on Mass. Avenue; it tends to be 19:13:45
15 on the side and in the rear of the building. 19:13:48

16 STEVEN WINTER: It is back, yes. 19:13:50

17 LIZA PADEN: You will be able to see it 19:13:53
18 from Mass. Ave. 19:13:55

19 STEVEN WINTERS: Right. There is an 19:13:57
20 addition back there now. 19:13:57

21 LIZA PADEN: Right. This is going to 19:13:59

1 continue on that addition. 19:14:00

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone object to 19:14:02

3 sending a message along the lines that Steve has 19:14:04

4 suggested? I think it is, again, an important 19:14:10

5 historic structure, important for it stands for 19:14:12

6 the way there were many houses like this on Mass. 19:14:17

7 Ave. I think somebody stepping up to preserve 19:14:21

8 it, and they want to make some minor changes that 19:14:25

9 don't affect that as a way of helping preserve 19:14:29

10 the building. 19:14:34

11 LIZA PADEN: Are there any other cases? 19:14:39

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: 10265, what is 19:14:42

13 2269 Mass. Ave.? 19:14:47

14 LIZA PADEN: How do you say it? It is 19:14:48

15 the corner of Dover Street -- no. It is not 19:14:51

16 Dover Street. Cafe Barada. So what they are 19:14:53

17 proposing to do is to increase the indoor and the 19:15:01

18 outdoor seating. If you are familiar with the 19:15:04

19 restaurant, you know that part of their building 19:15:07

20 is set back from the property line, and they 19:15:09

21 would like to have that seating. What they don't 19:15:11

1 have is the associated parking they would need 19:15:13
2 with the increase in the seats. So they are 19:15:16
3 looking for relief on the public parking or the 19:15:19
4 accessory parking. 19:15:26

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Is this generally in 19:15:28
6 conformance with the new Mass. Avenue, the 19:15:30
7 proposal? 19:15:32

8 LIZA PADEN: I haven't looked at it 19:15:32
9 specifically. But one of the criterias of the 19:15:32
10 new Mass. Ave. overlay district would support 19:15:32
11 this, especially for the seasonal. Some of the 19:15:32
12 increase in these seats is for indoor seating, so 19:15:41
13 it is not all for outdoor seating. The total 19:15:42
14 that they are going to is 49 seats. 19:15:51

15 HUGH RUSSELL: I just think it might be 19:15:57
16 good to remind the Zoning Board that there is 19:15:59
17 this proposal that -- 19:16:04

18 Did we file it, I think? 19:16:06

19 LIZA PADEN: Yes. 19:16:08

20 HUGH RUSSELL: So we filed a proposal 19:16:10
21 that would allow for seasonal seating without 19:16:11

1 additional parking requirements, which is part of 19:16:17
2 what they are proposing to do. 19:16:21

3 LIZA PADEN: Okay. 19:16:25

4 HUGH RUSSELL: And this is within that 19:16:25
5 district, I think. 19:16:29

6 LIZA PADEN: Yes, the business A2. 19:16:30

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Liza, I just got a look 19:16:34
8 at the photo for 1734 Mass Avenue, and I just 19:16:36
9 want to concur with what Steve said. I realized 19:16:36
10 it is right next to the Simon's Coffee Shop. 19:16:40

11 LIZA PADEN: Yes. 19:16:42

12 PAMELA WINTERS: But I think that those 19:16:44
13 were good comments, and I would like to concur 19:16:46
14 with that. 19:16:50

15 LIZA PADEN: Okay. Are there any other 19:17:08
16 comments? 19:17:09

17 (No voice heard.) 19:17:10

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you. 19:17:12

19 LIZA PADEN: There are some 19:17:13
20 telecommunication antennas that are on the agenda 19:17:17
21 for the Board of Zoning Appeals in July, and 19:17:20

1 didn't know if you wanted -- I don't think that 19:17:21

2 Mr. Sousa came this evening. I don't see him. 19:17:24

3 Did you want to hold these until it next meeting? 19:17:28

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Why don't we see if we 19:17:31

5 have a hole in this meeting between the 7:30 19:17:33

6 hearing and the 8:30 hearing. 19:17:41

7 LIZA PADEN: Okay. Thank you. 19:17:43

8 HUGH RUSSELL: The next item is an update 19:17:45

9 from Brian Murphy. 19:17:47

10 BRIAN MURPHY: Thank you. 19:17:48

11 So tonight, you have got a few items on 19:17:49

12 here. We have got the school zoning petition and 19:17:53

13 the NorthPoint petition, as well as planning 19:17:54

14 board number 270 for 160 Cambridge Park Drive, 19:17:59

15 with a possible decision. And then for general 19:18:02

16 business, you have got 159 First Street design 19:18:04

17 review for residential and Planning Board 231A. 19:18:07

18 With regard to both the school zoning and 19:18:10

19 NorthPoint building, one thing I would just bring 19:18:10

20 to the Board's attention is that the City Council 19:18:15

21 last meeting, before breaking for the summer, 19:18:18

1 will be June 18th, because June 25th is a 19:18:21
2 roundtable. So if the board wants to have its 19:18:24
3 thoughts weighed by the Council prior to them 19:18:30
4 possibly making a decision on both schools and 19:18:34
5 NorthPoint, I would suggest the board, if at all 19:18:37
6 possible, to make a recommendation on both those 19:18:39
7 matters tonight. I think that based on the City 19:18:42
8 Council hearings that -- the ordinance committee 19:18:45
9 hearings that took place, I would say it is 19:18:48
10 likely that the Council is going to want to take 19:18:50
11 action on both the schools and NorthPoint on 19:18:52
12 their June 18th meeting. 19:18:55

13 June 19th, you have got a public hearing 19:18:57
14 for a Trolley Square/Mass Ave. res C-2A, the 19:18:59
15 continuation of the public hearing for the four- 19:19:05
16 city zoning proposal. July 17th under general 19:19:07
17 business, your Novartis gate design will come 19:19:15
18 back to you. And on August 7th, we expect to be 19:19:16
19 bringing the bike parking petition to you as 19:19:20
20 well. 19:19:23

21 So that is sort of the highlight of 19:19:23

1 HUGH RUSSELL: All those in favor? 19:20:23

2 (Show of hands.) 19:20:25

3 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in 19:20:27

4 favor. 19:20:30

5 So we will go on to the first public 19:20:31

6 hearing, a City Council petition to create a new 19:20:31

7 Section 5.54 Special Regulations for Municipal 19:20:31

8 Elementary and Middle (K through 8) Schools. 19:20:40

9 Who is going to present that? 19:20:44

10 RICHARD ROSSI: Good evening, 19:20:47

11 Mr. Chairman. Richard Rossi, deputy city manager 19:20:51

12 for the City. I am joined by Jim Maloney, who is 19:20:52

13 the chief operating officer for the Cambridge 19:20:55

14 public schools; Michael Black, who is a 19:20:56

15 construction site manager; and John Pears, from 19:21:01

16 the architectural firm of Perkins Eastman. 19:21:02

17 So approximately two years ago, the mayor 19:21:06

18 at that time, Mayor Marr, convened a group of 19:21:09

19 committees to look at the new educational agenda 19:21:13

20 for the City's public schools. At that time, the 19:21:16

21 various committees were broken down for the 19:21:20

1 different tasks, and we were asked to look at 19:21:25
2 facilities. 19:21:27

3 And as the school department was going 19:21:28
4 through its process in determining how they would 19:21:31
5 reuse facilities, we were looking at the zoning, 19:21:34
6 and at the time, felt that it would be 19:21:38
7 appropriate to recommend changes in zoning to 19:21:42
8 give the community more flexibility; meaning that 19:21:45
9 I think if we are to effect changes in some of 19:21:49
10 these older facilities, which are quite 19:21:53
11 constrained -- I mean, Cambridge as a community 19:21:56
12 is not a real-estate-rich community. There is 19:21:58
13 not a lot of public spaces. So it is not a 19:22:02
14 simple task for us to say, We are doing to close 19:22:06
15 this school down, and we are going to just go 19:22:08
16 over to this facility and build on it. I mean, 19:22:09
17 in doing that, the only thing you would be able 19:22:12
18 to do is build on public open space, which the 19:22:14
19 City does not want to do. 19:22:16

20 So if we are going look at these older 19:22:18
21 buildings, we want to be able to rebuild them in 19:22:20

1 a way which is more beneficial to the community, 19:22:23
2 particularly those that abut it. And we think we 19:22:26
3 need to make some changes in the zoning that will 19:22:29
4 allow that flexibility. And we have worked along 19:22:32
5 with the CD staff to try and guide us through 19:22:35
6 that. 19:22:38

7 Jim Maloney would be pleased, if you felt 19:22:39
8 it necessarily, to talk to you briefly about the 19:22:41
9 agenda, so you might get an understanding of 19:22:43
10 which buildings we are talking about. So I would 19:22:46
11 ask him to do that now, and then maybe we can 19:22:49
12 hear from the staff. 19:22:50

13 JIM MALONEY: Good evening. A year ago, 19:22:58
14 the school committee approved the 19:23:03
15 superintendent's recommendation for a program 19:23:07
16 that was called the innovation agenda. After 40 19:23:09
17 years of on-again/off-again discussions about the 19:23:12
18 middle grade sections of the Cambridge Public 19:23:17
19 Schools, and after two years of intense debate 19:23:20
20 and discussion in the community, the school 19:23:24
21 committee, in approving the recommended 19:23:26

1 innovation agenda, created four upper schools for 19:23:29
2 grades 6, 7, and 8. Those upper schools will be 19:23:32
3 fed by, in three cases, by three K-to-5 schools, 19:23:36
4 and, in one case, two K-to-5 schools. 19:23:43

5 I think one of the things that is very 19:23:44
6 unique with Cambridge is our partnership with the 19:23:49
7 nonprofits. They are co-tenants in our 19:23:55
8 buildings. We are trying to redesign and rebuild 19:23:58
9 the schools so that they meet the 21st century 19:24:02
10 needs of upper schools for the grades 6, 7 and 8, 19:24:06
11 spatially, technologically, recreationally, 19:24:10
12 socially. 19:24:13

13 And one of the things that we are finding 19:24:15
14 as we go through all of this is very interesting, 19:24:16
15 because we have a true partnership here in 19:24:19
16 Cambridge with the schools and the city. And we 19:24:22
17 find ourselves oftentimes having to make 19:24:26
18 decisions, is it an educational piece or is it a 19:24:28
19 civic piece? Our partners are community schools, 19:24:31
20 the department of human services and its 19:24:36
21 after-school and preschool programming. We have 19:24:38

1 nonprofit partners in our schools that provide 19:24:40
2 after-school programming: The East End House, 19:24:43
3 the Agassiz neighborhood, the Linnaean Street 19:24:46
4 neighborhood, just to name a few. There are 19:24:52
5 others that share our buildings. 19:24:55

6 And we find ourselves wanting to be in a 19:24:57
7 position in working with the city to have the 19:24:59
8 flexibility to be able to house these educational 19:25:02
9 programs. And we are going to be housing two 19:25:05
10 programs in one building. Those four buildings 19:25:07
11 that house an upper school will be a K-to-5 19:25:09
12 school as well as a 6-to-8 school. And that 19:25:11
13 requires, in some cases, differences in space. 19:25:15
14 Programming requires, in some cases, two gyms. 19:25:19
15 It requires a little bit larger library than you 19:25:22
16 might have. It requires a little bit more social 19:25:26
17 space than you might have in the schools. 19:25:29

18 So we are hopeful that, in combination 19:25:31
19 with the city manager and the city councils, a 19:25:34
20 very generous and inclusive discussion last year 19:25:37
21 in the passing of the innovation agenda, to be 19:25:43

1 able to begin the renovation. 19:25:45

2 And we are actually in design right now, 19:25:47

3 in our feasibility studies, for the King building 19:25:47

4 on Putnam Avenue. That will be followed in order 19:25:53

5 by the King Open building on Cambridge Street and 19:25:55

6 the Tobin building on Vassal Lane. There are two 19:25:55

7 other buildings that have been identified. That 19:26:02

8 would be the Graham and Parks building on 19:26:06

9 Linnaean Street, and the Robert F. 19:26:08

10 Kennedy/Longfellow building on Spring Street. 19:26:10

11 So I think that is a brief overview. And 19:26:14

12 I thank you for your time. 19:26:16

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 19:26:18

14 RICHARD ROSSI: Just one other point I 19:26:19

15 want to add. So as we look at these new 19:26:23

16 buildings, we are trying to think about ways to 19:26:24

17 make these certainly more energy efficient. And 19:26:28

18 you know, we have, I think, done a good job with 19:26:31

19 creating lead certified buildings in the City. 19:26:34

20 And in this particular case, we are actually 19:26:37

21 trying to look at a net zero building. And the 19:26:40

1 part of that which becomes interesting is how we 19:26:47
2 create the orientation of the building on the 19:26:50
3 site to maximize whatever value we are going to 19:26:52
4 get from solar. 19:26:56

5 And I think, again, we are trying to be 19:26:57
6 flexible. We are trying to create a better 19:26:59
7 neighborhood environment when we are done with 19:27:02
8 the project. So I think this zoning change would 19:27:03
9 allow us to be able to do that and be more 19:27:07
10 responsive to the community and, I think, produce 19:27:11
11 better buildings and better schools. I am going 19:27:13
12 to ask the staff to talk about that. 19:27:16

13 JEFF ROBERTS: Hi. Jeff Roberts with the 19:27:20
14 community development department. And again, it 19:27:23
15 is my pleasure to walk you through a tour of some 19:27:26
16 zoning mechanics. This is some the result of 19:27:30
17 some work that we have done over the course of a 19:27:33
18 few months, in collaboration with Mr. Rossi and 19:27:36
19 the school department and their design team. 19:27:40

20 I did send around a memo. We sent a memo 19:27:46
21 in advance, which I think briefly lays out some 19:27:48

1 of the issues. I think if you go to page 2 of 19:27:52
2 that memo, there is a table, kind of a 19:27:57
3 spreadsheet. 19:28:00

4 I wonder if everyone has that. 19:28:06

5 HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think I have seen 19:28:09
6 that. 19:28:10

7 JEFF ROBERTS: Okay. We will just go 19:28:12
8 ahead without it, then. You can picture it in 19:28:20
9 your mind, and then hopefully a copy will appear. 19:28:22

10 So the major issue really is that if you 19:28:26
11 look across Cambridge's elementary and middle 19:28:31
12 school sites, they are located in residential 19:28:35
13 zoning districts that are zoned for moderate 19:28:40
14 density houses, or low density houses at a height 19:28:45
15 of 35 feet. All but two of the schools already 19:28:49
16 exceed, as they currently are built to allowed 19:28:55
17 floor area in those districts. All but, I 19:28:59
18 believe, three of them exceed the height that is 19:29:03
19 allowed in those districts. Most of the school 19:29:05
20 sites are in the range of three to four stories. 19:29:08

21 And for a school-type building, even a 19:29:10

1 three-story building will exceed the 35-foot 19:29:13
2 height limit and approach more of a 45-foot 19:29:18
3 height, somewhere in that neighborhood. 19:29:23

4 And setbacks are an issue that, as you 19:29:24
5 might imagine, are very difficult for a school 19:29:31
6 site. We have in those districts, formula 19:29:33
7 setback requirements. As an example that I was 19:29:37
8 just looking at today, if you think about the 19:29:40
9 building that is across the street, which some of 19:29:42
10 you are very familiar with, a building of that 19:29:44
11 size, if you applied the formula setback 19:29:47
12 requirements, a yard setback on that could be 50. 19:29:50
13 It could be required to 50 to 60 feet. The 19:29:55
14 building there, as I looked at it, is more of the 19:29:57
15 range of 20 feet of setback. 19:30:00

16 And parking is also one of the zoning 19:30:02
17 issues that is a complication in most cases. The 19:30:05
18 existing school sites, the parking that is 19:30:09
19 provided on those sites is below what the minimum 19:30:12
20 requirements would be under zoning. 19:30:16

21 So in looking ahead to, as we discussed, 19:30:18

1 and as you heard about with the school 19:30:23
2 department, looking at future capital investments 19:30:25
3 to these school sites, we tried to devise a set 19:30:29
4 of zoning regulations that would provide a degree 19:30:32
5 of flexibility that would apply only to those 19:30:34
6 sites that are currently Cambridge public 19:30:38
7 schools, K through 8 schools, and are intended to 19:30:43
8 continue to be used as K through 8 public 19:30:46
9 schools. 19:30:49

10 So the zoning language itself, which I 19:30:49
11 believe you have, is structured in two basic 19:30:53
12 parts. The first part deals with an as-of-right 19:30:57
13 scenario. A brief way to describe that approach 19:31:02
14 would be to say that what exists on the site is 19:31:07
15 what the limitations would be. So in terms of 19:31:13
16 FAR, the maximum floor area would be what exists 19:31:16
17 on the site. In terms of parking, the minimum 19:31:20
18 parking would be what exists on the site. But 19:31:24
19 there would be allowances to adjust parts of the 19:31:28
20 building, to tear down, reconstruct, and 19:31:31
21 reconfigure as the needs of that particular 19:31:35

1 program might be. 19:31:38

2 For new parts of the building, the 19:31:39
3 proposal is to have a maximum height as of right 19:31:41
4 now of 45-foot, which I mentioned before, puts us 19:31:46
5 somewhere around the neighborhood of 19:31:48
6 three stories. It might be more a mix with 19:31:49
7 two stories with some higher elements to it. If 19:31:53
8 you looked around schools, and we have looked 19:31:57
9 around at some of the sites, there is a variety 19:31:59
10 in the types of spaces that might be needed to 19:32:04
11 accommodate the program. And flexibility in 19:32:06
12 height is a major issue. 19:32:11

13 In terms of setback, the proposal is to 19:32:13
14 waive the setback requirements in the formula 19:32:16
15 setback requirements, or the ones that exist in 19:32:20
16 the district, and to impose simply a 10-foot 19:32:23
17 setback where a school site abuts a right-of-way 19:32:26
18 and a 15-foot minimum setback where it abuts 19:32:30
19 other lots. 19:32:36

20 That in a nutshell -- I can certainly 19:32:37
21 answer questions about the details -- is what 19:32:40

1 would be allowed under the proposed zoning as of 19:32:43
2 right. 19:32:43

3 The second component of the zoning 19:32:47
4 establishes a mechanism where the planning board 19:32:49
5 would have the ability to waive any zoning 19:32:53
6 regulations that may constrain the redevelopment 19:32:59
7 of a school site, with some very specific 19:33:06
8 limitations. And the one limitation is a 19:33:10
9 floor-area ratio up to 1.25 for the lot. 19:33:14

10 If you look -- and I think maybe you have 19:33:17
11 the memo now -- that would provide some 19:33:20
12 flexibility for a modest expansion on some more 19:33:24
13 than half of the school sites -- I think about 8 19:33:30
14 of the 13 school sites -- if they were being 19:33:32
15 reconfigured could have some flexibility to bump 19:33:35
16 up their floor-area ratio. 19:33:38

17 The height could be allowed up to 55 19:33:40
18 feet, or portions of the building could be 19:33:44
19 allowed up to 65 feet. And those portions at 19:33:46
20 65 feet would need to be set back at least 50 19:33:49
21 feet away from abutting lot lines. That would 19:33:53

1 allow some flexibility to build buildings of 19:33:55
2 four, maybe a partial fifth story. 19:33:58

3 And in terms of parking, the limitation 19:34:02
4 is that the parking could not be waived 19:34:04
5 specifically under this provision, as you are 19:34:11
6 aware. 19:34:14

7 And this is as a special permit that the 19:34:15
8 board has granted in the past. There is a 19:34:18
9 general special permit provision that could be 19:34:20
10 sought. There are particular criteria that are 19:34:22
11 associated with that. But besides that 19:34:25
12 mechanism, there wouldn't be a mechanism to bring 19:34:28
13 the parking on the site lower than what is 19:34:32
14 currently registered. 19:34:35

15 So that I think covers most of it 19:34:37
16 briefly, and I would like to leave time for 19:34:42
17 questions and comments. 19:34:45

18 I did want to note one issue we had the 19:34:47
19 hearing at the ordinance committee on this 19:34:51
20 position a couple of weeks ago. And one of the 19:34:53
21 issues that was raised was how municipal school 19:34:58

1 lots will be treated where are there adjacent 19:35:04
2 open spaces. In some cases, these school lots 19:35:06
3 are adjacent to playing fields or other 19:35:09
4 recreational space. And in some cases, the 19:35:13
5 school program uses it to some degree, but also 19:35:17
6 the general public uses it to some degree. And 19:35:21
7 that has raised some issues that we ultimately 19:35:25
8 decided we would want to look at more closely. 19:35:30
9 And so we may be working on some suggested 19:35:31
10 alternatives that would address those types of 19:35:38
11 scenarios and would detail how those scenarios 19:35:41
12 would be treated. 19:35:45

13 I am happy to answer any immediate 19:35:52
14 questions. 19:35:54

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you explain the 19:35:55
16 process of your last statement? We had something 19:35:56
17 before us. Are you going to alter it? Change 19:35:58
18 it? Do it after? You are suggesting that this 19:36:01
19 be acted on? 19:36:05

20 I am just trying to get a sense of 19:36:06
21 procedurally, this open space thing you just 19:36:09

1 mentioned. 19:36:15

2 JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And I can 19:36:16

3 certainly go a little bit more into detail in 19:36:18

4 terms of what we were thinking. We don't have 19:36:21

5 new language created at this point. But we 19:36:23

6 suggested to the ordinance committee that we 19:36:26

7 would go back and look at that issue and that we 19:36:29

8 may have alternate language to suggest. 19:36:32

9 We are happy to forward that to the 19:36:35

10 Planning Board. If the Planning Board does not 19:36:36

11 forward a recommendation tonight, we would be 19:36:38

12 happy to provide that before the next Planning 19:36:41

13 Board meeting, to be incorporated into your 19:36:44

14 discussion. Otherwise, we would provide it to 19:36:47

15 the ordinance committee or directly to the City 19:36:51

16 Council for their consideration. 19:36:54

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: And again, not to belabor 19:36:56

18 this, but you didn't say we had to; but you are 19:36:58

19 saying that if we wanted -- for timing reasons, 19:37:01

20 it might be good for us to act on this tonight. 19:37:04

21 So I am still trying to get a sense of how that 19:37:06

1 is going to work. 19:37:08

2 BRIAN MURPHY: Right. Unfortunately, 19:37:11
3 because the City Council did decide not to have 19:37:12
4 the 25th meeting, we do now find ourselves with a 19:37:14
5 City Council deadline of June 18th. So I think 19:37:17
6 maybe it may make sense just to go into greater 19:37:20
7 details of what the concepts are that we are 19:37:25
8 thinking of so that the Planning Board can at 19:37:25
9 least further evaluate that. 19:37:27

10 But I think, again, I think I would 19:37:28
11 expect that the Council will vote on this on the 19:37:30
12 18th. So I think that whatever recommendation 19:37:34
13 you have, for it to be more meaningful, would 19:37:36
14 have to come tonight. 19:37:36

15 I think, Jeff, if you can elaborate. 19:37:40

16 JEFF ROBERTS: Sure. I would be happy 19:37:45
17 to. 19:37:46

18 There are sort of two different parts of 19:37:46
19 this approach of our thinking about open space. 19:37:49
20 One specifically deals with sites where a portion 19:37:53
21 of the City-owned lot is zoned open space. So 19:37:57

1 there are many cases: The King Open School, the 19:38:02
2 Peabody School on Rindge Ave., the Tobin School. 19:38:08
3 There are some schools where adjacent to the 19:38:11
4 school building there is a playing field which 19:38:13
5 has an open space zoning designation. 19:38:15

6 We would want to clarify that the 19:38:17
7 provisions -- or we would look to clarify that 19:38:22
8 the provisions in this language would apply only 19:38:25
9 in zoning districts that are not zoned open 19:38:28
10 space. 19:38:29

11 Now open space zoning districts do allow 19:38:31
12 limited development of a very limited scale and 19:38:34
13 limited type. One of the types that is allowed 19:38:38
14 is municipal use. But I think we would want -- 19:38:40
15 for instance, in the special permit provision, 19:38:44
16 where we would allow an increased floor-area 19:38:47
17 ratio to 1.25, we wouldn't necessarily envision 19:38:50
18 that that 1.25 would be applied across a school 19:38:57
19 lot and an entire adjacent playing field. So 19:39:00
20 that would help to correct that. That 19:39:03
21 clarification that doesn't apply to open space 19:39:07

1 districts, would help to correct that. 19:39:10

2 We would also look to potentially add 19:39:12
3 some language where there is an adjacent 19:39:17
4 playground or recreational space to the school 19:39:23
5 that is typically open to the general public for 19:39:26
6 use after school hours, that we would place 19:39:31
7 provisions that would require that that space be 19:39:33
8 maintained in some way, could be reoriented or 19:39:36
9 shifted on the site. But we would include 19:39:40
10 provisions, and we discussed this, to make sure 19:39:44
11 that wouldn't be -- we would want to find a way 19:39:48
12 to craft this that it wouldn't be too disruptive 19:39:52
13 or too constraining to any future renovation 19:39:57
14 plans to the schools. So we would have some 19:40:00
15 mechanism to the preserve that open space, 19:40:04
16 whether it is in its current place and current 19:40:08
17 configuration, or is changed to a different 19:40:11
18 location and a different configuration. 19:40:15

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: This is on the site, on 19:40:18
20 the actual school site? 19:40:20

21 JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. On the actual school 19:40:21

1 site. 19:40:23

2 And one of the difficulties of the 19:40:24

3 process, or one of the challenges that we face in 19:40:27

4 this process is that the school sites are all 19:40:29

5 very different. Just the style, the size of the 19:40:33

6 building, the type of building, how the open 19:40:36

7 space is treated on the lot, is very different on 19:40:41

8 a school-by-school basis. 19:40:46

9 But we are hoping to create a set of 19:40:48

10 provisions that would provide essentially the 19:40:52

11 same degree of flexibility across all the sites, 19:40:57

12 or at least as many as possible, or as necessary. 19:41:01

13 HUGH RUSSELL: So is it fair to 19:41:06

14 characterize your open space proposals to sort of 19:41:09

15 preserve open space with whatever rules are for 19:41:14

16 open space on those sites, to try preserve the 19:41:20

17 public use, in addition to the school use? 19:41:24

18 And sort of in line with what Mr. Maloney 19:41:27

19 was telling us, that it is a complicated set of 19:41:30

20 interrelationships, and this would just establish 19:41:34

21 those principles in writing so that there 19:41:36

1 wouldn't be a question about them. That seems 19:41:38
2 very straightforward. 19:41:46

3 Are we ready for the public hearing 19:41:52
4 portion? 19:41:57

5 Okay. So at this time, we will take 19:41:58
6 public testimony. The way that works, there is a 19:42:03
7 sign-up sheet. We start by going through the 19:42:08
8 sign-up street. 19:42:11

9 LIZA PADEN: Nobody signed up. 19:42:12

10 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Never saw it 19:42:16
11 before. 19:42:17

12 HUGH RUSSELL: So the next part is, I 19:42:20
13 will ask if people wish to speak, and I will 19:42:21
14 recognize people in whatever order I see them. 19:42:33
15 And when you are recognized, if you can come 19:42:36
16 forward to the microphone, give your name, spell 19:42:41
17 your name, if there is any possibility that the 19:42:44
18 person recording might need assistance in getting 19:42:47
19 it absolutely correct, and speak for no more than 19:42:49
20 three minutes. And Pam is our timekeeper, so she 19:42:52
21 will signal you when your time is up. 19:42:57

1 Who wishes to speak? The first hand I 19:43:00
2 saw was back there. Yes, you. 19:43:04

3 JULIET STONE: I am not very prepared, 19:43:09
4 because I just heard everything. I haven't 19:43:11
5 really read it. My name is Juliet Stone. 19:43:14

6 Do you need to know where I live and all 19:43:20
7 of that? 19:43:21

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, please. 19:43:22

9 JULIET STONE: 29B J Street, Cambridge. 19:43:23

10 I apologize. I am not totally prepared, 19:43:29
11 and just responding to what I heard. And I have 19:43:31
12 several concerns. One you just had mentioned 19:43:37
13 that had to do with the existing shared use of 19:43:42
14 the public open space. And if I could give an 19:43:46
15 example, that the King School on Putnam Avenue 19:43:50
16 has a play space with a long play structure and 19:43:56
17 lots of open space in the back, as well as a City 19:44:00
18 Sprouts program. Were you to redesign that for 19:44:06
19 middle school use, and have two gymnasiums in the 19:44:10
20 building, what would happen to the public use, if 19:44:14
21 we don't really consider not only flexibility but 19:44:18

1 values and criteria, in terms of the square 19:44:23
2 footage of public open space that is shared, as 19:44:29
3 well as the square footage within that building? 19:44:31

4 I would like to raise that as a question 19:44:33
5 for quality of life for not only the children, so 19:44:35
6 they can be outside, but also for the public and 19:44:40
7 for the rest of us, as it is a community 19:44:43
8 resource. 19:44:48

9 The height is a second issue I would like 19:44:48
10 to bring up, because height does affect 19:44:53
11 vegetation. It affects shade. It affects a 19:44:56
12 variety of other natural phenomenon. If the 19:45:00
13 building is lead certified, that doesn't 19:45:05
14 necessarily mean that, in balance, that, even 19:45:07
15 though it may be a green building, per se, that 19:45:14
16 in fact the green effect may be out of balance, 19:45:17
17 if it goes up that high, and it shades, and trees 19:45:21
18 come down, et cetera. 19:45:24

19 If we could look at the building as well 19:45:28
20 as the public open space, and really look at our 19:45:29
21 values around quality of life for both the 19:45:33

1 children as well as the community, and really 19:45:37
2 value their outdoor running space, not just their 19:45:40
3 indoor time, in this innovation. 19:45:43
4 Okay. Thank you. 19:45:46
5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 19:45:47
6 Who else wishes to speak? I see your 19:45:48
7 hand. 19:45:57
8 CAROLYN SHIPLAY: Thank you very much. 19:45:57
9 Carolyn Shiplay, S-H-I-P-L-A-Y, 15 Laurel Street, 19:46:01
10 Cambridgeport. 19:46:04
11 When I read the petition, I found it too 19:46:05
12 open-ended myself. And it mentions grammar 19:46:10
13 schools and upper school. Middle school, it 19:46:13
14 mentions. It doesn't use the words, "upper 19:46:15
15 school." 19:46:18
16 And I began to wonder, what is the plan? 19:46:18
17 It is not clearly spelled out. Is the plan to 19:46:24
18 build? And up until it is not -- we never 19:46:26
19 know -- is the plan to build a separate middle 19:46:30
20 school, and turn one of these 8 out of 13 schools 19:46:32
21 that are going to be renovated into just a middle 19:46:38

1 school? That is not answered. 19:46:40

2 I mean, I really find the petition 19:46:41

3 open-ended, too loose, and not defined. So that 19:46:44

4 is one of my concerns. 19:46:52

5 In view of the fact that our school 19:46:56

6 population is going down, and it has been going 19:46:58

7 down, I believe, in the last 10 or 15 years, 19:46:59

8 because we don't have two- and three-bedroom 19:47:02

9 houses anymore, and people with families move 19:47:04

10 out -- we get more than one or two children, you 19:47:06

11 have to move out. It is just not like what is 19:47:09

12 used to be. So why are we building bigger 19:47:14

13 schools, when we have less population? Do we 19:47:16

14 have any projections on school population? That 19:47:20

15 is the question I would ask. 19:47:22

16 Solar was mentioned, and then a 55-foot 19:47:25

17 height was mentioned. And I am concerned that if 19:47:28

18 you have solar, you are going to have to get rid 19:47:31

19 of the trees around the building so that you can 19:47:33

20 receive sun. I can't have solar in my house 19:47:36

21 because I have this fantastic 100-foot honey 19:47:38

1 locust tree in the back corner of my house. I 19:47:42
2 would love to be able to generate my own 19:47:44
3 electricity, but I can't. 19:47:48

4 I wanted to give you a little history of 19:47:51
5 one building that is already on the Planning 19:47:53
6 Board, so to speak, the King, Martin Luther King 19:47:55
7 on Putnam Avenue. There were meetings with 19:47:59
8 school people and some parents whose children go 19:48:02
9 to that school. But the neighborhood was not 19:48:04
10 invited to any meetings. And we had to ask. And 19:48:07
11 the neighborhood association, Riverside 19:48:11
12 Neighborhood Association, was not invited, and 19:48:13
13 the community school neighborhood counsel was not 19:48:15
14 invited to meet with the architects and planners. 19:48:18

15 So Lawrence Atkins is now back in town. 19:48:22
16 He was in Vermont with FEMA. And he asked the 19:48:26
17 various officials to come and meet with the 19:48:28
18 neighborhood this week, on Thursday. So I 19:48:30
19 believe that the architects are going to come, 19:48:33
20 and some City officials to tell us, the 19:48:35
21 neighborhood, about the building. I mean, people 19:48:39

1 whose children go to that school don't 19:48:42
2 necessarily live in that neighborhood. So it was 19:48:46
3 the neighborhood people who felt that they had 19:48:47
4 not been invited to the table, and the community 19:48:49
5 school people, per se. 19:48:51

6 So I just want to let you in on what is 19:48:54
7 happening with the first school that is on the 19:48:57
8 drawing board, and how this is being handled. 19:48:59
9 And I find it, as a resident of the 19:49:03
10 neighborhood -- I am just 10 feet from the border 19:49:07
11 of Riverside, and I have a lot to do with the 19:49:10
12 Riverside -- I just found it was not acceptable. 19:49:13

13 And we are concerned about the size, the 19:49:18
14 fact that we are losing some of the playground, 19:49:21
15 maybe; they wanted double parking. 19:49:23

16 And so there are a lot of concerns, I 19:49:24
17 think. But the most important thing to me is 19:49:27
18 that this petition is too open-ended, too loose. 19:49:30

19 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you. 19:49:35

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Who else wishes to speak? 19:49:36

21 Yes, ma'am. 19:49:38

1 OLGA PELENSKY: Olga Pelensky, 19:49:40

2 P-E-L-E-N-S-K-Y, 108 Kinnaird Street. I just 19:49:48

3 want to thank you for your time in this. 19:49:51

4 I would like to begin by speaking a 19:49:58

5 little bit about historically by the King School, 19:50:00

6 since that is the one that will be impacted 19:50:03

7 immediately, I believe, or first on the list, as 19:50:07

8 Carolyn Shiplay mentioned, is there was open 19:50:10

9 space and open lot at Putnam and Kinnaird, which 19:50:14

10 construction was taking place on it. And there 19:50:21

11 were community meetings. And one of the promises 19:50:24

12 that was made was to restore that lost space by 19:50:28

13 going to the side of the King School and, for 19:50:32

14 example, having community gardening, and allowing 19:50:37

15 children in the school to use that space which 19:50:40

16 they had lost, and also the community. 19:50:42

17 There had been originally at least 16 19:50:47

18 buildings on that particular side before the King 19:51:00

19 was built. And those houses were taken down in 19:51:04

20 the community, and pine trees were put up and 19:51:08

21 greenery put in. Some time ago, those trees were 19:51:11

1 taken down without notice to the neighborhood. 19:51:15

2 Some spindly tree were put in reluctantly, and 19:51:19

3 asphalt put in, and that whole side has been 19:51:24

4 taken over as a de facto parking lot by the 19:51:25

5 school. 19:51:28

6 I counted nearly 100 cars parked in and 19:51:29

7 around land that belongs to the school, even 19:51:34

8 though I was told there is a core faculty of 45. 19:51:37

9 There was a fence that was put up next to an 19:51:41

10 elder gentleman who told me that they put it 19:51:45

11 higher than they said they would. They promised 19:51:46

12 to restore the bushes; they didn't. 19:51:48

13 So now, one of the plans is to double 19:51:50

14 that parking lot on that side on Kinnaird Street, 19:51:54

15 which is a neighborhood. And it is at the bottom 19:51:58

16 of a sloping hill where exhaust can get trapped. 19:52:00

17 The reason that I mention all of this is 19:52:05

18 because historically, what the neighborhood has 19:52:07

19 been promised has not come to be, and all of that 19:52:14

20 has just been treated as public commercial 19:52:17

21 parking, almost. So I would hesitate really to 19:52:20

1 give the school department carte blanche on 19:52:25
2 zoning, without some sort of oversight, and just 19:52:29
3 reiterate what has been stated, which is to have 19:52:32
4 something much more concrete, school by school, 19:52:35
5 to be examined by the Board here. 19:52:38

6 Thank you very much for your time. 19:52:44

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does anyone 19:52:46
8 else wish to speak? 19:52:49

9 ELIZABETH DURAISINGH: My name is 19:52:51
10 Elizabeth Duraisingh, which I will spell, 19:53:01
11 D-U-R-A-I-S-I-N-G-H. I live at 190 Putnam 19:53:03
12 Avenue, the building that is directly adjacent to 19:53:10
13 the King School. 19:53:13

14 I actually am not really passing a 19:53:14
15 comment. I would like a clarification. I have 19:53:16
16 been to the two meetings that have been held at 19:53:19
17 the school regarding the architect's proposed 19:53:21
18 designs for the school. And it wasn't clear to 19:53:26
19 me, because I haven't noted down the exact 19:53:28
20 measurement, whether the architects -- and I see 19:53:31
21 that one gentleman is here tonight -- whether 19:53:33

1 they knew about this proposal when they designed 19:53:36
2 the plans, and whether the proposal to raise the 19:53:38
3 school by a story, which would raise the height 19:53:41
4 quite significantly, or to move it closer to the 19:53:45
5 back of our property considerably, whether that 19:53:48
6 was taken into account, whether those would be 19:53:51
7 passable plans with the 55-foot or 65-foot height 19:53:53
8 that is going to be 50 feet away from the lot 19:53:59
9 sign. So that is kind of clarifying question I 19:54:00
10 would like. 19:54:03

11 And then the second thing is that we 19:54:04
12 would really appreciate it if there was a bit 19:54:07
13 more available information on the website or 19:54:10
14 something. Because I have got lots of neighbors 19:54:12
15 that can't make these meetings, and I try to 19:54:14
16 report back to them. But without being able to 19:54:16
17 show them plans -- I believe there was going to 19:54:18
18 be a link to the Cambridge city website. I have 19:54:21
19 been unable to find it, if it is there. I just 19:54:24
20 think having the information available to people 19:54:26
21 to access remotely, instead of at meetings, will 19:54:26

1 allay some fears and would be more equitable for 19:54:33
2 people who can't be here at these meetings. 19:54:35

3 Thank you. 19:54:38

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 19:54:38

5 STEVE KAISER: Yes. My name is Steve 19:54:47

6 Kaiser, K-A-I-S-E-R. I live at 91 Hamilton 19:54:51

7 Street. 19:54:51

8 I have read through the zoning, and I did 19:54:55

9 submit a letter. But I also wanted to hear all 19:54:57

10 of the public comments before testifying, because 19:54:59

11 I too share concerns about the waiver provisions 19:55:03

12 in the draft amendments. 19:55:06

13 I realize there are conditions. And the 19:55:10

14 way I read it is, it provides for a waiver of any 19:55:13

15 part of the zoning, which is much too broad. I 19:55:16

16 think it sets a bad precedent. Somebody else is 19:55:19

17 going to come in and say, "We want to do the same 19:55:22

18 thing." 19:55:23

19 I also think the way it is structured, it 19:55:23

20 may add significantly to the load burden, the 19:55:26

21 work burden on the Planning Board. There will be 19:55:31

1 a lot of requests coming in for variances and 19:55:33
2 waivers and this sort of thing. I think we 19:55:36
3 should avoid our zoning that is complicated in 19:55:38
4 that manner. I would also note that the planning 19:55:42
5 board may also have to recognize its Chapter 91, 19:55:45
6 Section 18 obligations to deal with title land. 19:55:50
7 So that might be another burden. 19:55:53

8 So one thing I did hear here tonight, 19:55:55
9 which I think is the excellent, is the idea to 19:55:59
10 protect open space, and see that that is not 19:56:00
11 built on with new structures. So if that 19:56:04
12 amendment could be included, I think that would 19:56:06
13 be a good idea. 19:56:08

14 And I think some of the concerns of the 19:56:09
15 neighbors were about planning, as opposed to the 19:56:12
16 actual zoning. And the theory here is, it is 19:56:14
17 good to have a plan first, and then you do the 19:56:17
18 zoning. So there is a sense, and I certainly 19:56:20
19 have it, that the plan is not out there for us to 19:56:22
20 understand. 19:56:25

21 Finally, I would just like to note that I 19:56:27

1 am a former teacher. I taught for eight years in 19:56:29
2 Catholic school, in five different schools. And 19:56:33
3 the best schools were older schools, 1916 to 1929 19:56:34
4 vintage. The worst ones were in the 1960s. And 19:56:41
5 every time I go to the Tobin School, I have a 19:56:42
6 sense that we were going in the wrong direction, 19:56:48
7 in terms of utility for the teacher, in an 19:56:50
8 architectural setting. So I would just suggest 19:56:53
9 that the goal is good education, and not mere 19:56:57
10 construction. 19:57:00

11 Thank you. 19:57:00

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 19:57:02

13 Does anyone else wish to speak? 19:57:03

14 I see no one. 19:57:06

15 Now I will go on to the deliberation 19:57:15

16 portion of the meeting. 19:57:17

17 I guess I would like to start out with a 19:57:23

18 disclosure: I am an abutter to the Longfellow 19:57:26

19 School, which blocks most of the sun my house 19:57:28

20 receives or would receive in the winter. I have 19:57:32

21 lived there for 31 years. And I was astounded at 19:57:36

1 what good neighbors city schools are. The school 19:57:44
2 has gone through different programs, different 19:57:48
3 tenancies. Strangely, the worst tenant was the 19:57:50
4 public library, which is my favorite, because I 19:57:54
5 like to have it next door, but they made more 19:57:59
6 noise early in the morning, and there was the 19:58:00
7 custodian who used to go out at 6:30 and greet 19:58:07
8 every teacher personally in a loud voice under my 19:58:12
9 bedroom window. 19:58:14

10 But by and large, because schools are not 19:58:16
11 occupied most of the time I am home, the noise 19:58:19
12 and business of a school is simply not much of an 19:58:25
13 issue to the abutters. 19:58:29

14 I wouldn't like to see two stories added 19:58:32
15 on to the school. It would block out my summer 19:58:36
16 sun. But I think the provisions of this section 19:58:39
17 call for the board to evaluate those kinds of 19:58:44
18 questions. And in the case of what is called the 19:58:47
19 former Longfellow School on this list, the floor 19:58:55
20 area is already well above what is permitted 19:58:59
21 under the new proposal, so that new additions 19:59:05

1 would not be planned, or might be changed. Who 19:59:08
2 knows what is going to happen to that building. 19:59:13

3 There is a great deal of educational 19:59:22
4 planning that started that will go on and will go 19:59:24
5 on in the future. And this board is not 19:59:27
6 generally part of that plan. What the purpose of 19:59:32
7 this amendment is is to give some general rules 19:59:38
8 to make that planning process have some limits. 19:59:45

9 Right now, the way the present zoning 19:59:50
10 works is, you basically can do almost nothing 19:59:55
11 with any existing buildings; so I have to assume 19:59:59
12 that you are going to go and you have to make 20:00:02
13 changes and you have to get a variance. And at 20:00:05
14 that point, there are no limits. 20:00:07

15 What this proposal proposes is several 20:00:09
16 processes, several sets of limits, and a way to 20:00:14
17 deal with things. So as a designer comes and 20:00:17
18 says, "Well, gee, I am dealing with King School. 20:00:21
19 Yes, I could add, with a special permit, a little 20:00:26
20 bit to that school, but I can't add very much." 20:00:30
21 And so that sort of start s it. And then there 20:00:34

1 is the height, general criteria. That sets up 20:00:37
2 the value structure in making the decisions. I 20:00:40
3 think that is a good thing. 20:00:49

4 I am a little concerned when I hear 20:00:51
5 people from the King School area, and they say, 20:00:53
6 well, the process is a little rocky now, and it 20:00:58
7 is just getting started. And I wouldn't like the 20:01:01
8 Planning Board to be involved in the day-to-day 20:01:08
9 management or review of those processes. And I 20:01:14
10 think that under the new zoning, we will get more 20:01:21
11 involved. 20:01:27

12 Let's just assume that the second option 20:01:28
13 of the zoning applies to a school project. The 20:01:31
14 school department will have a proposal; they will 20:01:37
15 have people who I trust would have vetted it, by 20:01:39
16 the time it gets here, for the special permit 20:01:46
17 with all the interested parties; and there may 20:01:48
18 still be some disagreements. 20:01:51

19 I remember sitting on a city committee 20:01:54
20 that was appointed when the public library was 20:01:59
21 being changed, and there were many meetings. 20:02:05

1 There were many proposals. There was a lot of 20:02:10
2 listening. And but ultimately, some hard 20:02:12
3 decisions had to be made, and they were made. 20:02:17
4 And I think that, from my point of view, to have 20:02:20
5 a building that last year was awarded the most 20:02:24
6 beautiful building in Boston, and is a wonderful 20:02:27
7 facility, these things can have positive 20:02:30
8 outcomes. 20:02:33

9 So I don't have any real changes that I 20:02:33
10 wish. I think what Jeffrey described in terms of 20:02:43
11 clarifying how the open space adjacent to the 20:02:47
12 school would be treated is very important, and 20:02:50
13 the direction he described seems like the right 20:02:53
14 direction to take. 20:02:56

15 Do other members want to comment on this, 20:02:58
16 or ask questions? 20:03:02

17 AHMED NUR: Jeff, I think that the GFA 20:03:06
18 that is not in parentheses are in two schools; in 20:03:18
19 other words, the Morse School and the Peabody 20:03:20
20 School -- or, the Morse School and the King Open 20:03:24
21 School are the only two schools that are close to 20:03:25

1 3,500 square feet under what they are allowed. 20:03:29

2 The rest of them are. 20:03:32

3 So with the exception of the Tobin -- 20:03:35

4 that is 30. Peabody School -- no. The Tobin 20:03:39

5 school could go up another five feet in height 20:03:42

6 allowed, so it is a little lower than what is 20:03:48

7 allowed. 20:03:51

8 So aside from those three schools, I 20:03:51

9 wondered, everything else seemed to be above and 20:03:54

10 beyond what allowances are for the current. So I 20:03:56

11 guess for those three schools, especially the 20:04:01

12 Morse and the King Open, are there any plans? I 20:04:04

13 guess for the neighbors, the question that I 20:04:07

14 would ask, are there any plans of expansion? And 20:04:10

15 if so, obviously, we would have to consider all 20:04:13

16 of the variances that we normally do. Or do we 20:04:16

17 not? 20:04:20

18 HUGH RUSSELL: You want to respond? 20:04:21

19 RICHARD ROSSI: Morse School was just 20:04:26

20 completed maybe back about seven years ago, so I 20:04:28

21 don't believe there are any plans at all at the 20:04:32

1 Morse School. 20:04:35

2 The King Open is a school that, as 20:04:36

3 Mr. Maloney said, would be the next school that 20:04:39

4 we would visit in this plan. 20:04:41

5 AHMED NUR: Did you say the next school 20:04:45

6 that we would visit? 20:04:48

7 RICHARD ROSSI: Would be the King Open. 20:04:50

8 HUGH RUSSELL: So the next one that would 20:04:51

9 go into the planning process. 20:04:53

10 AHMED NUR: Would be the King Open? 20:04:55

11 RICHARD ROSSI: Yes. 20:04:56

12 AHMED NUR: Okay. Thank you. 20:04:58

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: First I would like to 20:04:59

14 say, in terms of what you are trying to do, I 20:05:06

15 don't have any real problem with. I am still 20:05:08

16 trying to just understand the mechanisms, I 20:05:16

17 guess, so help me out. I guess this is to you, 20:05:18

18 Jeff. But help me out as I go through this. 20:05:22

19 Basically what you are saying is that in 20:05:29

20 the existing situation, with the existing 20:05:32

21 building, what it is is as-of-right, in the sense 20:05:34

1 that it is grandfathered. So whatever the base 20:05:34
2 zoning says it is, that is only the zoning for 20:05:34
3 that. And I understand that one. 20:05:45

4 But the two pieces, C and D, which says 20:05:46
5 "any new structure, addition, or existing 20:05:49
6 structure." So if you put a portion of it on, 20:05:51
7 then the stuff -- even the as-of-right stuff 20:05:57
8 doesn't apply within the restrictions that you 20:06:01
9 give it, say, for instance, in the setbacks, 10 20:06:05
10 feet from the street and 15 feet from the 20:06:10
11 adjacent property line. 20:06:12

12 And then this special permit process is 20:06:13
13 something that you would only come to us if you 20:06:22
14 wanted to increase the FAR to 1.25 or if you 20:06:27
15 wanted to increase from 45 to 55, the height. 20:06:32

16 So I guess I am just trying to get a 20:06:36
17 better sense of just the mechanisms of how this 20:06:39
18 works. Particularly the first part is very clear 20:06:41
19 to understand. If existing, what is there is as 20:06:46
20 of right. But if, in doing the renovation, they 20:06:52
21 want to put on an addition or do anything -- as 20:06:57

1 you say, new structure, additions, or existing -- 20:07:01
2 that doesn't apply. So you have, now have these 20:07:06
3 two pieces. 20:07:06

4 I guess traditionally on special permits 20:07:11
5 it is very clear that you are giving some relief 20:07:15
6 for something, to go through this special permit 20:07:21
7 process, which idealistically may be something 20:07:25
8 that gives you something better in the end. And 20:07:27
9 so I am not quite sure, given that, particularly 20:07:30
10 for these two pieces, the 45-foot height and the 20:07:33
11 10-foot and 15-foot setbacks, I am not quite sure 20:07:39
12 how the special permit piece works. I know it is 20:07:45
13 a little confusing. But as you can see, I am a 20:07:49
14 little confused. 20:07:49

15 JEFF ROBERTS: I will try to explain it. 20:07:52
16 I will try to go about it this way. 20:07:53

17 So assume all these schools buildings are 20:07:56
18 non-conforming. Now under current zoning, the 20:07:59
19 rules say that if you are making an addition to a 20:08:03
20 non-conforming building, you need to seek a -- in 20:08:06
21 most cases, you need to seek a variance. So even 20:08:11

1 if you were now, looking at these school 20:08:14
2 buildings, if you were going to renovate or 20:08:17
3 restore or tear down and rebuild some portion of 20:08:21
4 the building, you are then putting yourself in a 20:08:24
5 situation where you are making an alteration to a 20:08:26
6 non-conforming building, and you are at the BZA. 20:08:30

7 The purpose of that first set of 20:08:33
8 regulations is to say that the building that is 20:08:40
9 there now, for the purposes of any work that you 20:08:41
10 might plan to do to the building, the existing 20:08:43
11 structure that is there now, is conforming. 20:08:46

12 So if you are taking half of a building, 20:08:49
13 say you want to tear down half of a building, and 20:08:54
14 you want to rebuild it, because you are 20:08:54
15 reconfiguring it to be a middle school, and there 20:08:59
16 are different space considerations that need to 20:08:59
17 be taken into account; what this mechanism would 20:09:02
18 say is that the part of the building that you are 20:09:05
19 not doing anything with, that you are not tearing 20:09:07
20 down, is fine. Consider that conforming. 20:09:09

21 And then the part that you are 20:09:13

1 rebuilding, you are limited to the existing floor 20:09:15
2 area of the building, you are limited to the 20:09:19
3 45 feet in height, and you are limited to 10-foot 20:09:22
4 setback from a street or 15-foot setback from an 20:09:25
5 another abutting property. 20:09:31

6 Otherwise, even if you are making a 20:09:32
7 conforming addition, you may need to -- even if 20:09:37
8 the addition you are making to the building is 20:09:40
9 conforming, if the part of the building you are 20:09:41
10 not dealing with is not conforming, then you 20:09:44
11 would need to seek relief. 20:09:47

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, just help me to 20:09:52
13 understand this. 20:09:52

14 So really, the existing FAR in your first 20:09:54
15 part, the existing FAR is the control? 20:09:57

16 JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. 20:10:01

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Because I am looking at 20:10:02
18 something like the Morse School, which is very 20:10:03
19 low. 20:10:05

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Except for the King Open, 20:10:07
21 which has some development density. 20:10:08

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: No. That is exactly what 20:10:11
2 I am trying to get at. It is the control. I 20:10:13
3 brought up Morse as an example. It is low. It 20:10:16
4 is not tight on its site, even though it takes up 20:10:19
5 a lot of its site. 20:10:19

6 So on the Morse School perspective, you 20:10:27
7 could tear down a piece of it. You could build 20:10:30
8 something new. The new piece could be up to 20:10:33
9 45 feet high, the new piece can be 10 feet from 20:10:36
10 the public street, and it can be 15 feet from a 20:10:39
11 property line, which I don't think is, Morse 20:10:43
12 School has one. 20:10:46

13 But unless you go for the special permit, 20:10:46
14 existing FAR is the control there, meaning that 20:10:51
15 you would still have to stay within the FAR 20:10:57
16 there, regardless if you are kind of 20:10:59
17 redistributing this stuff on the site. So was 20:11:01
18 that the intent, or do I have that right? 20:11:04

19 JEFF ROBERTS: In this case, you have the 20:11:07
20 intent right. 20:11:09

21 But in this case of the Morse School, 20:11:09

1 that is one of the rare examples where there is 20:11:12
2 residual floor area that could be built. So that 20:11:15
3 is a case where, under the proposed zoning, you 20:11:18
4 could expand the building within those limits of 20:11:21
5 45 feet of height and 10 feet from a street 20:11:26
6 setback. You could expand the building from its 20:11:32
7 current FAR of, I think, .4 or .5, to .75, but 20:11:34
8 under the constraints that are here in this first 20:11:41
9 section. 20:11:45

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: I have got you. 20:11:47

11 JEFF ROBERTS: Or, if you were going 20:11:49
12 beyond that, you could seek a special permit. 20:11:50

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: You are basically saying 20:11:50
14 that the base zoning allows it to have more than 20:11:53
15 it currently has. 20:11:55

16 JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And that is rare. 20:11:55

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: So to restate my 20:11:57
18 question, then you are saying that the base FAR 20:11:57
19 or the existing is your control point? Because 20:12:04
20 that is the piece I was having a hard time -- I 20:12:06
21 just wanted to make sure that just by tearing 20:12:08

1 something down, you are not kind of willy-nilly 20:12:10
2 allowing stuff to happen. But that is a control, 20:12:14
3 so that you can't. 20:12:18

4 And it is not until you say for whatever 20:12:19
5 reason, for design purposes, you want to design 20:12:22
6 something that is either higher than 45 or 55, or 20:12:25
7 to go to the 1.25 FAR, that then you would go the 20:12:29
8 special permit process to exceed either the base 20:12:33
9 zoning or the building. And obviously there, as 20:12:37
10 you look at the chart, there is many buildings 20:12:39
11 here that sort of exceed those already. 20:12:41

12 JEFF ROBERTS: Right. 20:12:44

13 Just to add to that, just another 20:12:45
14 consideration for going into the special permit 20:12:47
15 piece is that it is primarily dealing with the 20:12:49
16 expansion of the buildings or expanding the floor 20:12:53
17 area, expanding the height. But it also includes 20:12:56
18 a little bit of a catch-all of saying the 20:12:58
19 Planning Board can grant additional waivers as 20:13:00
20 well. 20:13:04

21 An example that I think has come up with 20:13:05

1 the board a few time is parking. There are rules 20:13:07
2 about parking within a required setback. So if 20:13:10
3 you have a situation where you may find -- for a 20:13:13
4 school site, they tend be unusually shaped and 20:13:15
5 sized lots. You may find that when all is said 20:13:19
6 and done, and the school is sort or designed and 20:13:22
7 configured, the parking, where it is placed, may 20:13:24
8 technically fall within a setback, or may be 20:13:27
9 determined to fall within some area. 20:13:31

10 And so the idea behind this is that there 20:13:34
11 wouldn't be those surprise situations that would 20:13:37
12 get sent back to the BZA, but that the Planning 20:13:40
13 Board could handle any of those types of waivers 20:13:44
14 within the purview of the special permit. 20:13:49

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. Just a couple of 20:13:52
16 other questions. On B, you said for areas that 20:13:53
17 are located atop the roof that are used for 20:13:55
18 playground or outside educational uses. 20:13:58

19 How many of those do we currently have? 20:14:02
20 And is that a feature that is anticipated in 20:14:05
21 future renovations? 20:14:07

1 JEFF ROBERTS: I think it is something 20:14:09
2 that is being considered for future projects. 20:14:12

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do we have any existing? 20:14:17

4 JEFF ROBERTS: I believe there are some. 20:14:20
5 It is hard to tell, because you can't always see 20:14:21
6 them. But I believe that at the Haggerty School, 20:14:23
7 there is a rooftop play area. I am looking over 20:14:26
8 to see if there is any other areas. 20:14:29

9 RICHARD ROSSI: Yes. 20:14:33

10 JEFF ROBERTS: As I think the board has 20:14:34
11 seen, with situations like roof terraces and roof 20:14:36
12 decks, that above a certain height, when you have 20:14:39
13 an outdoor recreational space, that it counts as 20:14:42
14 part of gross floor area. 20:14:46

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Then in part C, where you 20:14:48
16 talk about 15 feet from an abutting lot line, 20:14:50
17 does the space that is next door, that you 20:14:52
18 mentioned earlier in your thought process, the 20:14:57
19 space that is next door that is zoned open space, 20:15:01
20 is that considered an abutter lot line? 20:15:04

21 JEFF ROBERTS: In most cases, I think it 20:15:08

1 wouldn't. It depends, on some instances, where 20:15:11
2 the lot line is. 20:15:13

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Because the lot line 20:15:17
4 might not correlate? 20:15:18

5 JEFF ROBERTS: It doesn't always 20:15:20
6 correlate with the open space lot. 20:15:21

7 So in a case where the lot actually spans 20:15:21
8 beyond the open space district, then that 20:15:23
9 wouldn't apply. It could go right up to the open 20:15:25
10 space district. 20:15:28

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: But it would apply if it 20:15:29
12 did, if it went right up to the open space 20:15:31
13 district, if the lot line and the open space 20:15:33
14 zoning line coincided? 20:15:35

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Would it depend on -- who 20:15:38
16 owns the schools? The City in general? And they 20:15:40
17 own the open space. So under the rules of the 20:15:42
18 zoning ordinance, it is a single lot. 20:15:46

19 JEFF ROBERTS: Right. It could be 20:15:46
20 designated as a single lot. So right. In those 20:15:46
21 scenarios where it is all City owned, then that 20:15:55

1 is all considered a lot. 20:15:56

2 So again, we are looking at making the 20:15:58

3 open space zoning districts not applicable to 20:16:02

4 this provision. But for purposes of the setback 20:16:06

5 provision, really the intent of the 15-foot 20:16:10

6 setback is to provide distance from abutting 20:16:14

7 residential properties. It would necessarily 20:16:16

8 apply the same way with parks and open space. 20:16:20

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you. 20:16:22

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: My question is this: 20:16:25

11 Many of these rules are somewhat abstract for me. 20:16:38

12 And because we have never, at the Planning Board, 20:16:42

13 really developed any kind of experience or 20:16:45

14 expertise with schools, I have trouble 20:16:50

15 understanding how they apply, so I don't fully 20:16:53

16 understand how they were developed. 20:16:58

17 So my question is really, how did you do 20:17:01

18 this? Was there planning first for a number of 20:17:04

19 these new middle schools, and then you took the 20:17:08

20 rules and tried to make them work for those 20:17:13

21 situations? Or did you do the zoning first, and 20:17:15

1 everybody said, oh, yes we can live with that? 20:17:20

2 Did the zoning come first, or did the planning 20:17:26

3 come first? I can't quite tell. 20:17:28

4 JEFF ROBERTS: I would characterize it as 20:17:31

5 a discussion, with give and take, and things 20:17:35

6 developing sort of in parallel and with a lot of 20:17:38

7 communication. It started, at least for -- and I 20:17:42

8 am sure the school department can discuss how it 20:17:48

9 started before this. 20:17:51

10 But we started by looking at the existing 20:17:52

11 school sites, and doing the zoning analysis, to 20:17:56

12 see what the current zoning provides in terms of 20:17:59

13 flexibility, which was not a lot. We looked at 20:18:04

14 what the existing buildings are like now, and 20:18:05

15 tried to make some characterizations and 20:18:08

16 judgments as to what how a typical school 20:18:11

17 building tended to perform, in terms of height, 20:18:15

18 in terms of floor area, in terms of setbacks, and 20:18:19

19 parking. 20:18:23

20 And then I think that in looking at those 20:18:26

21 issues, we tried to start by crafting a set of 20:18:30

1 provisions that would allow flexibility, if work 20:18:35
2 were being done, that would result in a building 20:18:42
3 that was not too different from the type of 20:18:45
4 school building, in terms of zoning, in terms of 20:18:49
5 scale, as to what exists now. 20:18:54

6 And then we also continued to work with 20:18:55
7 the school department, with their design team 20:18:58
8 going back and forth on what some of the zoning 20:19:01
9 mechanisms we were thinking of were, and then 20:19:07
10 some responses to what some additional items that 20:19:09
11 they were thinking of. 20:19:14

12 For instance, I think that the rooftop 20:19:15
13 play area piece of it was something that the 20:19:17
14 school department brought through their design 20:19:19
15 team to us to incorporate. But there was some 20:19:21
16 back and forth testing as to whether the 20:19:25
17 mechanisms that we had proposed really would 20:19:27
18 provide that kind of framework that would work, 20:19:30
19 given the capital priorities and plans. 20:19:34

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: I suppose the waiver 20:19:39
21 set of rules, that second set, gives you the 20:19:41

1 flexibility, in case you didn't get it, right? 20:19:43

2 JEFF ROBERTS: Right. The idea is that 20:19:47

3 that would provide some additional flexibility. 20:19:49

4 The first set would be to deal with scenarios 20:19:52

5 where the school was remaining at the type of 20:19:56

6 scale that you would characteristically expect a 20:20:01

7 school building to be at. And then the Planning 20:20:04

8 Board, the special permit waiver, would be to 20:20:07

9 look at issues that may need closer attention, if 20:20:09

10 the scale of the building were to go beyond that 20:20:14

11 basic framework that we set forward in the 20:20:19

12 as-of-right. 20:20:23

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: What kind a public 20:20:24

14 process is there for the as-of-right process, so 20:20:26

15 that neighbors such as the ones who came forward 20:20:33

16 tonight can participate in that? 20:20:36

17 JEFF ROBERTS: That is one that maybe I 20:20:40

18 will have either Mr. Rossi or the school 20:20:41

19 department talk about. 20:20:44

20 RICHARD ROSSI: So in this case, we 20:20:47

21 identified all the addresses of the abutters. We 20:20:52

1 actually worked with the CD staff to get the 20:20:54
2 addresses. And we mail out notices of public 20:20:56
3 meetings. And we are anticipating many public 20:21:01
4 meetings along the way in this process. 20:21:04

5 And I think, as your Chair spoke about, 20:21:05
6 we did it for 10 years with the library. And we 20:21:08
7 did it and did it and did it. 20:21:11

8 And the idea here is not to just build a 20:21:13
9 school and walk away. The idea here is to give 20:21:16
10 the community -- the whole community, not only 20:21:19
11 the school community, but the abutters and the 20:21:21
12 people who live in the neighborhood, a better 20:21:24
13 place. 20:21:27

14 So we don't intend on minimizing open 20:21:27
15 space. We want to build everything that that 20:21:30
16 woman spoke about, that people are accustomed to 20:21:33
17 on that site. We want to recreate it. We want 20:21:36
18 to create in a better way. We want to create it 20:21:38
19 with sensitivity towards the abutters. 20:21:41

20 And the way you do that is, you are going 20:21:43
21 to do the work and work through meetings. And 20:21:45

1 that is our intention. I have been doing that in 20:21:47
2 the city for many, many years. And I can tell 20:21:50
3 you that it works. And I think that the kinds of 20:21:53
4 projects that we do today are much different than 20:21:59
5 when this one was built in the late '60s. And I 20:22:01
6 think we consider them more like a total public 20:22:07
7 works project. 20:22:10

8 So there will be new sidewalks. There 20:22:10
9 will be trees. There will be a better organized 20:22:12
10 site. There will be a greater consideration for 20:22:15
11 school bus parking, where people drop their kids 20:22:18
12 off. All of that. But we will listen to people 20:22:20
13 about notice issues and congestion and what they 20:22:25
14 would like to see. 20:22:28

15 So that will get worked out, and that 20:22:30
16 takes a long time. But that is how we will do 20:22:31
17 it. 20:22:34

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I will close my 20:22:34
19 comment. I think I am convinced that this makes 20:22:40
20 sense. To me, it is an appropriate approach to 20:22:44
21 the issue. It sounds like a lot of thought has 20:22:50

1 gone into it. And I really think that we are in 20:22:53
2 a position, that least I am, to give a favorable 20:22:56
3 recommendation to the Council of what is being 20:23:00
4 done here. I see no minor adjustments, or even 20:23:02
5 major ones, that I would suggest making here. 20:23:06

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Pam? 20:23:10

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. So overall, I am 20:23:12
8 in favor of this petition. And as a teacher for 20:23:16
9 21 years -- in fact, I did my student teaching at 20:23:20
10 the Martin Luther King School on Putnam Avenue -- 20:23:23
11 I really, I think, like the idea of there being 20:23:28
12 more space for after school programs. I think 20:23:31
13 that is essential. 20:23:33

14 And also, society has changed. I did my 20:23:37
15 student teaching in the mid-'70s. And I think 20:23:42
16 that certainly the schools can use an update. 20:23:43

17 And also, Mr. Rossi just answered my 20:23:46
18 question. My other concern were the neighbors' 20:23:50
19 concerns: The shared use of open space, the 20:23:55
20 question about the school population going down, 20:24:00
21 the parking at the King, the website being more 20:24:03

1 easily accessible. 20:24:08

2 I think that all of these questions can 20:24:09

3 be clarified and settled to the neighbors' 20:24:11

4 satisfaction by more neighborhood meetings. So 20:24:16

5 you answered that question, Mr. Rossi. 20:24:18

6 So those are the two comments that I 20:24:21

7 wanted to make. 20:24:23

8 STEVEN WINTER: Just to follow up on what 20:24:24

9 was said already, this is sort of a very well 20:24:28

10 coordinated municipal effort, municipal school 20:24:33

11 department effort. And I am very impressed with 20:24:36

12 that, with how well that is functioning and how 20:24:38

13 well that is working. And it shows, because it 20:24:41

14 is a good project. 20:24:43

15 This board really is charged with making 20:24:46

16 defensible decisions. That is what we do all the 20:24:48

17 time. That is always our goal. And with the 20:24:50

18 criteria that we have, we are still going to be 20:24:54

19 making defensible decisions, we are still going 20:24:57

20 to be interpreting community values, and we are 20:24:59

21 still going to be having public hearings. So 20:25:01

1 really, I don't think that we are doing -- there 20:25:04
2 is nothing rash happening here. I think 20:25:07
3 everything is under control. 20:25:09

4 I also want to comment that the outcomes 20:25:11
5 that we are looking for, which is to provide a 20:25:14
6 more enriched educational atmosphere for our 20:25:21
7 children -- this is an extremely important piece 20:25:25
8 of work -- that we get into the science, the 20:25:27
9 technology, and that we provide the kinds of 20:25:30
10 school sites where our children can learn these 20:25:32
11 things and participate in 21st century economies. 20:25:35
12 That is going to keep us strong here in 20:25:38
13 Cambridge. So I am ready to move ahead. I think 20:25:41
14 this is looking good. 20:25:45

15 AHMED NUR: I just wanted to add one 20:25:47
16 comment. I had two kids graduate from Maria 20:25:49
17 Baldwin, and one kid attends now, actually, just 20:25:53
18 starting. The first floor of the preschool has 20:25:56
19 an outdoor terrace area. I wonder, is that 20:26:03
20 included in this GFA that they are exceeded? As 20:26:08
21 well as there is a playground across the street 20:26:11

1 on Sacramento that is public use as well, that 20:26:15
2 after school and before school, all the kids use 20:26:17
3 on break time. 20:26:19

4 I ask not that be compromised for 20:26:20
5 additional buildings or whatnot, and just sort of 20:26:25
6 would like something being included, saying that 20:26:31
7 these areas, if they are included, cannot be 20:26:33
8 eliminated, in order for a new wing to be added 20:26:36
9 to, or something of that sort. 20:26:40

10 HUGH RUSSELL: So right now, the Baldwin 20:26:44
11 School is way over the 1.25 limits. I mean, it 20:26:52
12 goes practically to China and down. That was how 20:26:59
13 they managed to do it, was to go down and down 20:27:03
14 and down, and put a lot of facilities 20:27:06
15 underground. But the additional flexibility here 20:27:09
16 would not allow an addition onto that building. 20:27:14

17 Yes, maybe at some point in time, 20:27:21
18 somebody might come up with a proposal saying, I 20:27:24
19 want to demolish one point and want to build on 20:27:26
20 the special feature you like. And then we will 20:27:29
21 start implementing the criteria for making those 20:27:33

1 kinds of changes that are listed in this. They 20:27:37
2 are very clear in principle. 20:27:45

3 So does someone wish to make a motion on 20:27:47
4 this? 20:27:52

5 AHMED NUR: Move. 20:27:56

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: I would like to move, 20:27:58
7 since this is a zoning petition, that we 20:27:58
8 recommend to the City Council that they approve 20:28:02
9 the petition as presented to us, and that, at 20:28:07
10 least in concept, we agree with the direction 20:28:13
11 that the staff was going to deal with the open 20:28:18
12 space issue, even though we haven't seen the 20:28:22
13 details of it. I don't know if that is adequate. 20:28:24

14 AHMED NUR: Second that. 20:28:28

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Any discussion on the 20:28:29
16 motion? All those in favor? 20:28:31

17 (Show of hands.) 20:28:34

18 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in 20:28:34
19 favor. So we have made a recommendation. 20:28:36

20 RICHARD ROSSI: Thank you very much. 20:28:41

21 HUGH RUSSELL: The next item on our 20:28:46

1 agenda is the public hearing on NorthPoint. We 20:28:51
2 will take a quick break. 20:28:51

3 (Recess taken at 8:28 p.m.) 20:28:51

4 (Recess ended at 8:38 p.m.) 20:37:29

5 HUGH RUSSELL: We are going to take up 20:38:37
6 the next item on our agenda, which is a petition 20:38:38
7 by CJUF III NorthPoint LLC, petition to amend the 20:38:41
8 zoning ordinance article 13.700. 20:38:46

9 So who is going to present this issue? 20:38:52

10 TOM O'BRIEN: Good evening. My name is 20:39:07
11 Tom O'Brien. I am with the HYM Investment Group. 20:39:15

12 I wonder if I could just begin by 20:39:18
13 introducing members of our group. I am going to 20:39:20
14 be the principal presenter. I won't confuse you 20:39:21
15 by having people jump up and down. But in case 20:39:24
16 there are questions or things that are best 20:39:27
17 answered by folks along the way, I just want to 20:39:28
18 make sure that I point them out ahead of time. 20:39:31
19 So I am going to work from your left to my right. 20:39:32

20 Richen Rudman, from the law firm of DLA 20:39:36
21 Piper, is one of our attorneys. He is an 20:39:39

1 attorney. 20:39:43

2 Phil Kingman of PanAm Rail. You may know 20:39:44

3 PanAm also as B&M, Boston & Maine or Guilford 20:39:47

4 Rail. They are known as PanAm Rail. Phil is our 20:39:53

5 partner. I will talk more about that in a 20:39:57

6 moment. 20:39:59

7 Doug Manz, who is also with HYM and our 20:40:01

8 partner. 20:40:03

9 Another of our attorneys, Anthony 20:40:05

10 Galluccio, who needs absolutely no introduction 20:40:09

11 in this room. 20:40:09

12 David Bracken is here with me, who is the 20:40:09

13 guy who does all the work in our office, and is 20:40:09

14 here relegated to moving slides. 20:40:16

15 And then Rich Kosian, who is with the 20:40:18

16 firm of Beals and Thomas, who will help us with 20:40:24

17 any technical issues on orders and drawings and 20:40:24

18 things like that. 20:40:26

19 I would like to begin and just direct 20:40:27

20 your attention. I am going to work off this 20:40:27

21 screen, if I could. 20:40:31

1 You will recall that we were here two or 20:40:32
2 three months ago to give you an update. It was 20:40:34
3 very late at night, so I don't expect that you 20:40:36
4 will remember all of the things that we talked 20:40:38
5 about. We did identify a number of goals that we 20:40:40
6 have gone after. So we are back here tonight to 20:40:43
7 talk to you about what we have been doing and 20:40:46
8 where we have been over the last two or 20:40:48
9 three years. So if we could just go the first 20:40:51
10 slide, David. 20:40:53

11 Just to remind everybody what we are 20:40:55
12 talking about, the site is known as NorthPoint. 20:40:57
13 But of course, everybody understands that 20:41:00
14 NorthPoint has a region and encompasses a lot 20:41:02
15 more than just our site. We will talk more about 20:41:05
16 this. But the site itself is characterized as 20:41:07
17 45 acres. It is a terrific and large site, and, 20:41:10
18 we believe, well located, centrally located, in 20:41:14
19 East Cambridge, and also very close to some of 20:41:18
20 the key job creators in downtown Boston, and 20:41:20
21 really is poised to take great advantage of a 20:41:23

1 number of key infrastructure pieces that are in 20:41:25
2 place, and more infrastructure pieces that are 20:41:28
3 coming. 20:41:28

4 Those that are in place include the 20:41:32
5 existing Orange Line, which many people forget 20:41:33
6 now, through NorthPoint, can be connected to 20:41:37
7 Cambridge. And we consider that to be a real 20:41:39
8 backbone of the MBTA's system, and a wonderful 20:41:40
9 opportunity for us to make that connection. I 20:41:44
10 will talk in a moment about how we will connect 20:41:45
11 the Gilmore Bridge with our first project down to 20:41:46
12 the site; and so right off the bat, make a 20:41:49
13 connection between that Orange Line station at 20:41:52
14 Community College, right onto NorthPoint, which 20:41:52
15 we are very pleased about and excited about. 20:41:56

16 I also would like to point out, these 20:41:57
17 parks along the Charles River have been 20:42:01
18 completed, as many of you know. They are 20:42:03
19 wonderful. And they will be further connected 20:42:05
20 over to complete the full basin connection around 20:42:07
21 the Charles River by this pedestrian bridge, 20:42:11

1 which is almost done. Maybe in a few weeks or 20:42:13
2 so, will be done. That is quite beautiful, 20:42:16
3 actually. 20:42:18

4 The Green line, which I am happy to talk 20:42:19
5 endlessly about, has been undergoing a really 20:42:22
6 good new initiative with the MBTA. The Green 20:42:25
7 line, as you know, has evolved from being a 20:42:28
8 terminus project that would end at Lechmere to 20:42:30
9 one that is now an extension of the Green Line. 20:42:33

10 The Commonwealth's plan, through the 20:42:36
11 MBTA, is to build the first three stations. The 20:42:38
12 Commonwealth has publicly stated that they plan 20:42:40
13 to pay for those out of Commonwealth funds. And 20:42:41
14 the first of those stations, the Lechmere 20:42:46
15 station, should deliver around the end of 2016. 20:42:47
16 And they will build two other stations, at Union 20:42:50
17 Square and at Brickbottom. We feel confident 20:42:52
18 that things have gone well. We have enjoyed a 20:42:55
19 good working relationship with the folks at the T 20:42:57
20 on that work. 20:42:59

21 Just to reiterate, this is, again, that 20:43:00

1 same site. 44 to almost 45 acres. I just point 20:43:06
2 out on this slide to be really careful and make 20:43:10
3 sure that people remember, you have seen in 20:43:14
4 recent months, 22 Water Street, which is another 20:43:17
5 residential project. While located in the same 20:43:21
6 zoning district, that is not our project, as you 20:43:23
7 know. That is a different sponsorship. We are 20:43:26
8 working closely with those folks to make sure 20:43:29
9 that what they need from us to make sure that 20:43:31
10 they can move forward is something that we 20:43:33
11 cooperate with them on. And we are hopeful that 20:43:37
12 they will begin in 2012, as you folks know. 20:43:40

13 In addition to that, this piece of the 20:43:42
14 parcel is owned by Archstone. As you folks know, 20:43:45
15 the first of the Archstone buildings is 20:43:49
16 completed. And we are certainly aware that the 20:43:51
17 second Archstone project, which includes this 20:43:53
18 older building here, may begin this year, which 20:43:57
19 we are again very excited about. 20:44:00

20 And frankly, from our perspective, and 20:44:04
21 you will hear this from me over and over again, 20:44:04

1 the planning objectives of creating a community 20:44:06
2 here which include a number of residences to 20:44:09
3 bring people to the site, that is something that 20:44:12
4 we firmly embrace. So from our perspective, as 20:44:14
5 people, our surrounding abutters, plan to begin 20:44:19
6 their residential projects, that is a good thing. 20:44:23
7 The more people, the better, for us. So we are 20:44:23
8 applauding that. 20:44:23

9 And again, on this slide, you will note 20:44:27
10 the green space which we are quite excited about. 20:44:28
11 This is all pretty active today. If you are down 20:44:31
12 there, on particularly a nice Saturday in June, 20:44:32
13 all that green space on the Charles River is 20:44:35
14 quite active these days, which is great. 20:44:37

15 So again, to review, we did of course 20:44:38
16 talk about this a little while ago. And members 20:44:42
17 of this board -- certainly, many of you have been 20:44:45
18 on the board for a number of years, and 20:44:46
19 participated in the original master planning 20:44:50
20 process of this site. And as we said, there was 20:44:51
21 quite of bit of work put into it. And we think a 20:44:56

1 really interesting plan came out of it, a plan 20:44:59
2 that we embraced and basic objectives to be 20:44:59
3 embraced. 20:44:59

4 What we are going to talk about tonight 20:45:05
5 are some minor tweaks to that plan. But to 20:45:06
6 review, the plan was first approved and in 2003. 20:45:10
7 There is a 25-year permit, so we are a few years 20:45:14
8 into a 25-year process. It does involve the full 20:45:16
9 45 acres of the site. The site was permitted for 20:45:20
10 a little more than 5.2 million square feet in 20:45:24
11 total. The majority of it, over 3 million square 20:45:26
12 feet, is projected to be residential. We embrace 20:45:31
13 that. And approximately 2 million square feet of 20:45:32
14 that is also projected to be commercial or lab 20:45:37
15 space. And in the original plan, there was about 20:45:41
16 9 acres of open space as well. 20:45:45

17 I will just note a little bit, in the 20:45:46
18 plan as put together, you will note that the 20:45:48
19 wonderful open space, the central park -- and we 20:45:48
20 will talk about this in a second -- has already 20:45:48
21 been completed. But I do also want to also point 20:45:58

1 out that one of the objectives that we have tried 20:45:58
2 to follow is the need for perhaps some additional 20:46:01
3 open space, to break up some of these blocks 20:46:04
4 deeper into the site, and also to focus on a 20:46:06
5 concentrated retail square, which is really 20:46:10
6 important. We think making sure that, in 20:46:12
7 addition to bringing bodies to the site, people 20:46:14
8 who live there, we want to make sure that it is 20:46:16
9 an attractive place for people to visit and to be 20:46:19
10 there to work, live, and play. So having a 20:46:20
11 concentrated and successful retail area is going 20:46:25
12 to be important for us as well. 20:46:25

13 So again, we have overlaid what has been 20:46:26
14 completed to date. And as you well know, these 20:46:31
15 two condo buildings, Sierra and Tango, have been 20:46:35
16 completed. Approximately 330 units. Those were 20:46:38
17 completed with an investment by PanAm rail. And 20:46:42
18 PanAm at the same time completed this portion of 20:46:48
19 the park. 20:46:48

20 I like to say that approximately 85 to 20:46:50
21 90 percent of the park has been 100 percent 20:46:54

1 completed. So this portion of the park is 100 20:46:56
2 percent completed. All of the drainage, the 20:47:01
3 basic work underneath the park, was all 20:47:04
4 completed. So the railroad used a great deal of 20:47:06
5 foresight in building the park out. It does not 20:47:10
6 need to be touched. 20:47:11

7 And I know that Chris Matthews is here, 20:47:13
8 who we have worked with extensively in the last 20:47:15
9 year as part of the planning team. But I know 20:47:17
10 that Chris and his firm played a role in 20:47:20
11 designing that park. And we think it is really 20:47:24
12 starting to come into its own, particularly this 20:47:25
13 year. It looks quite beautiful. It has gotten 20:47:27
14 even more use, ever more use each year. If you 20:47:30
15 stand there for a portion of the day, you will 20:47:33
16 get people walking their dog, people going out, 20:47:35
17 people who just want to be there. And frankly, 20:47:38
18 the fact that it is well connected to this open 20:47:40
19 space in the Charles River is great as well. So 20:47:42
20 we are excited about it. So as you move through, 20:47:46
21 these pieces have been completed, another 20:47:49

1 overhead. 20:47:52

2 And just a quick update on these two 20:47:53

3 condo buildings: Approximately 60 percent of the 20:47:56

4 units have now been sold. And the pace is 20:47:57

5 picking up with the economy improving. And 20:47:59

6 frankly, I think with the new activity we have 20:48:01

7 brought to the site, people feel confident. So 20:48:03

8 the pace is picking up to a good number of sales 20:48:06

9 per month. 20:48:09

10 So again, just to update you, we have got 20:48:09

11 a new team and new momentum. We closed on the 20:48:13

12 site in August of 2010. I don't have to tell you 20:48:16

13 folks how frustrating it was, I know, for 20:48:20

14 everybody has who watched this site for a long 20:48:21

15 time sort of languish in some of the issues that 20:48:23

16 existed before we came along. I think frankly 20:48:28

17 that we bring a very unique group. The issues 20:48:30

18 that existed on the site that had to do with the 20:48:33

19 litigation, that had to do with some of the 20:48:37

20 permits, that had to do with some of the 20:48:39

21 infrastructure, all those pieces, I think frankly 20:48:41

1 our group and experience, our deep experience in 20:48:43
2 the region and our relationship with all the 20:48:45
3 different people involved, have made us the 20:48:47
4 unique and the perfectly appropriate group to buy 20:48:52
5 this site. 20:48:53

6 So we are the HYM Investment Group. 20:48:54
7 Again, pointed out Doug. We are group that is 20:48:57
8 involved in a number of other projects in town, 20:48:59
9 including the redevelopment of the Government 20:49:02
10 Center garage in downtown Boston, another 20:49:05
11 difficult and not very pretty existing building. 20:49:07
12 And we are also involved in project in the 20:49:11
13 Seaport District that begins in about a week or 20:49:13
14 so, and a large apartment building. 20:49:16

15 We brought the capital to the site in the 20:49:20
16 form of Canyon Johnson Urban Fund, a 20:49:21
17 multi-billion-dollar California-based fund group, 20:49:24
18 and Atlas Capital Group, which is a 20:49:27
19 New York-based fund group. And then I have 20:49:29
20 talked about Pan Am. Group of us own the site. 20:49:35
21 PanAm contributed the land. We contributed to 20:49:37

1 the capital, and we are working together to move 20:49:39
2 it forward. New agreement, new momentum. And 20:49:44
3 all of the old issues have been completely put 20:49:44
4 away and are deeply in the past. 20:49:47

5 As I said, we closed on the site in 20:49:52
6 August of 2010. And we have been engaged in a 20:49:53
7 very methodical -- not always very loud, but that 20:49:57
8 is purposeful on our part. We really want to 20:50:00
9 make sure that we lined things up well -- but a 20:50:03
10 very methodical process to go through a plan for 20:50:04
11 the first 24 months of so. 20:50:08

12 The first of these is to really engage 20:50:10
13 the community in a number of different 20:50:13
14 stakeholder meetings. And we have spent a lot of 20:50:14
15 time with the East Cambridge planning team, with 20:50:16
16 what we call the NorthPoint working group, which 20:50:19
17 was established with the assistance of 20:50:20
18 Counselor Toomey's office, as well as with the 20:50:22
19 East Cambridge business association. So we are 20:50:25
20 really heavily involved, I think, with the East 20:50:28
21 Cambridge stakeholders. 20:50:30

1 And now as we start to move forward, we 20:50:31
2 have started to work through a broader coalition, 20:50:34
3 obviously, Cambridge-wide people. We understand 20:50:39
4 the importance of this site, not just to East 20:50:40
5 Cambridge, but to all of Cambridge. So we are 20:50:42
6 really trying to engage with a full group of 20:50:44
7 people. 20:50:44

8 We have also spent a lot of time with a 20:50:48
9 variety of Cambridge officials, both elected and 20:50:51
10 appointed officials. I know we spent a lot of 20:50:51
11 time with Brian and Roger and his staff, also 20:50:56
12 with the City manager and his staff, and also a 20:51:00
13 great deal of time with each of the members of 20:51:05
14 the City Council. 20:51:07

15 We did have our first meeting of the 20:51:08
16 rules and ordinance committee just a few weeks 20:51:11
17 ago. We were fortunate on that, by unanimous 20:51:14
18 vote, that that committee did refer our zoning 20:51:18
19 petition on to the City Council. So we feel very 20:51:21
20 pleased about the work and the outcome of the 20:51:23
21 work so far with the City Council and with all 20:51:25

1 the Cambridge officials with whom we have had 20:51:28
2 contact. 20:51:30

3 As I said, we have done a lot of 20:51:30
4 coordinating with the MBTA. This is probably the 20:51:33
5 quietest multi-million dollar, large 20:51:37
6 infrastructure project that is going on right now 20:51:41
7 in the Northeastern part of the United States. 20:51:42
8 The first stage of it, those first three 20:51:44
9 stations, is probably a \$250 million project. 20:51:46
10 And as you know, Gilbane and HDR, a private 20:51:49
11 group, is working with the MBTA to move the 20:51:54
12 project forward. 20:51:54

13 They actually have a design package for 20:51:56
14 the first three stations on the rail out on the 20:51:57
15 street right now. And their schedule is 20:51:59
16 publically posted. All three stations are due to 20:52:03
17 be delivered by the beginning of 2017, and 20:52:05
18 Lechmere, as I said, is due to be delivered by 20:52:09
19 the end of 2016. I will talk about where we are 20:52:10
20 on all the basic infrastructure around the 20:52:14
21 station in a second; but we have really enjoyed a 20:52:16

1 good working relationship with the MBTA. 20:52:18

2 We also completed a site-wide 20:52:20

3 environmental characterization. There had never 20:52:25

4 been a site-wide environmental characterization 20:52:28

5 of the site which, in the absence of information, 20:52:28

6 legend sort of grows up. So we really attacked 20:52:32

7 it and said, We have got to find out what is 20:52:35

8 here. And we were pleasantly surprised to find 20:52:35

9 that there is no ground water contamination, 20:52:38

10 nothing that requires any immediate DEP action. 20:52:40

11 So we feel very good about our ability to move 20:52:43

12 forward on the site. 20:52:45

13 So again, here is the permitted master 20:52:46

14 plan. We will use this as sort of a comparison 20:52:52

15 as we start to move forward and think through 20:52:55

16 some of the things that we want to do. 20:52:56

17 We would like to begin with the 20:52:58

18 residential buildings. This is really important 20:52:58

19 to us. Certainly, the market, I think, is 20:53:00

20 signaling to us that it is important to consider 20:53:07

21 residential buildings. This would be an 20:53:08

1 apartment building located here at parcel N. And 20:53:10
2 this is the schematic of it. Our architects from 20:53:13
3 CBT will be back before you, hopefully in the 20:53:16
4 next 30 days or 60 days or so, whenever we can 20:53:19
5 fit onto your very busy agenda, to begin the 20:53:22
6 design review process for this building. 20:53:24

7 We are quite excited about it. It would 20:53:26
8 be a 19-story building, approximately 350 units 20:53:28
9 of housing. The parking, which I will talk about 20:53:32
10 in a second, will be above grade. And we feel 20:53:36
11 very good about it as a first project. 20:53:39

12 I will just point that the project will 20:53:41
13 be built, and this is purposeful on our part, on 20:53:44
14 the other side of the park. So if you stand on 20:53:47
15 that park today, you can feel pretty good about 20:53:49
16 the maturity of the park and sort of this little 20:53:51
17 intersection here at Sierra and Tango. 20:53:54

18 But you look out, and you say, boy, this 20:53:57
19 is still kind of urban wild on this side. Right? 20:53:59
20 So you have got to get something going on the 20:54:01
21 other side of the park, and start the process of 20:54:03

1 building this infrastructure on this side. So we 20:54:05
2 are very purposeful in focusing on this building 20:54:07
3 as our first building. 20:54:10

4 The building itself will have 40 20:54:12
5 affordable units. This is a rendering of what 20:54:15
6 the first floor will look like. A couple things 20:54:16
7 that I want to make sure I point out: We want to 20:54:18
8 make sure that there is ample retail on the first 20:54:21
9 floor. I will talk about this in a second. But 20:54:23
10 this is the landing spot for the stairway 20:54:27
11 connection that we will make up to the Gilmore 20:54:29
12 bridge. That will be here. And this corner, you 20:54:32
13 will see in a moment, becomes extremely important 20:54:34
14 to us. We want to make sure that this is very 20:54:37
15 animated. So this retail space is important to 20:54:37
16 us. We will talk about more retail opportunities 20:54:40
17 sort of part way down this important staircase 20:54:42
18 for us. 20:54:45

19 The parking entrance will be under the 20:54:45
20 Gilmore Bridge. I will talk about this in a 20:54:47
21 second. But I think all of us know that the 20:54:50

1 Gilmore Bridge is not a very pretty place today. 20:54:52

2 The parking will back to Gilmore Bridge. But the 20:54:54

3 building itself will be surrounded, not just with 20:54:57

4 those first floor uses of retail and entry points 20:55:00

5 on the first floor, but also with this is the 20:55:03

6 second and the third floors of the building with 20:55:07

7 units as well. So the parking will not be 20:55:09

8 visible at all from any of the inhabited areas. 20:55:12

9 And then this is the fourth floor, which 20:55:15

10 completely covers the parking garage. This is 20:55:18

11 our amenity floor. You will see the fitness 20:55:20

12 center. We have actually elected so far to 20:55:20

13 include a half court basketball court, which I 20:55:24

14 have seen done in a variety of newer communities, 20:55:26

15 and it has worked out well. As things move 20:55:29

16 forward, we need to offer some really interesting 20:55:32

17 amenities and make it a great place for people to 20:55:35

18 live. 20:55:35

19 You will also see on this slide, this is 20:55:36

20 where we will build the staircase which is 20:55:38

21 located here. We think of this as a really grand 20:55:40

1 staircase. We have not quite euphemistically 20:55:43
2 named it the Spanish Steps. I know the world 20:55:48
3 already has one set of Spanish Steps. But we 20:55:49
4 aspire to create something that really would be 20:55:52
5 very interesting and a very good public space. 20:55:54
6 So we think of this as being very green, and to 20:55:57
7 have an important landing area here about partway 20:56:00
8 down. 20:56:01

9 And as this building, building H, gets 20:56:02
10 built, we think there is a really strong 20:56:04
11 possibility that at that partway point, there 20:56:06
12 should be another cafe, sort of coffee spot, to 20:56:08
13 really animate that space and make it also a 20:56:11
14 terrific landing spot here in this corner. 20:56:15

15 We will begin the process as well. This 20:56:17
16 is the tower. The tower rises out of the base 20:56:23
17 from there. Very clean building, very efficient 20:56:23
18 building, and hopefully a cost effective building 20:56:27
19 to build. 20:56:31

20 And we will also include a stack of 20:56:31
21 three-bedroom units. We frankly think, and the 20:56:34

1 community very much asked us to include 20:56:38
2 three-bedroom units as kind of family style 20:56:39
3 units, which we are happy to do. We think that 20:56:42
4 three-beds are relatively underrepresented in the 20:56:43
5 marketplace. We see that as an important thing 20:56:46
6 to be included. 20:56:48

7 And then in addition to that, we will 20:56:49
8 build this public green. So we will build 20:56:54
9 another park. I will talk about this in another 20:56:56
10 slide, just a couple up here. But this is a much 20:56:58
11 larger part than what was originally envisioned 20:57:00
12 in the original plan. We think of this as a 20:57:02
13 great public space. So again, for people 20:57:05
14 arriving from the Orange Line or arriving on this 20:57:07
15 stair, we really want to change the character of 20:57:11
16 what Gilmore is today. 20:57:12

17 Quite a few people -- if you stand on the 20:57:13
18 site today in the middle of the day, even on a 20:57:15
19 rainy or cold day, quite a few people are coming 20:57:17
20 off the Orange Line and making this walk down the 20:57:19
21 Gilmore Bridge. Not a nice walk. I have seen 20:57:22

1 quite a few people do it. So there are people 20:57:24
2 who are already there. But we want to completely 20:57:25
3 change the character and really connect this to 20:57:27
4 the Gilmore Bridge in a way that makes it a 20:57:30
5 popular place for people to be. And coming down 20:57:33
6 here and being part of this public green, this is 20:57:34
7 a really big opportunity for us to start to 20:57:38
8 change people's perception of this side of the 20:57:40
9 NorthPoint site. 20:57:42

10 Here is some sense -- obviously, no color 20:57:45
11 yet, and no sense yet of exactly all the -- we 20:57:48
12 just started with landscape design. When we are 20:57:53
13 back before you, we will be here to talk about 20:57:55
14 landscape design here, materials of the 20:57:58
15 buildings, windows, and the like, all the things 20:58:00
16 that we will all care so much about, to make sure 20:58:02
17 that this is a special building; but that is the 20:58:05
18 sense of it. 20:58:06

19 So this is like a horror film, where all 20:58:07
20 of a sudden you switch to the scary picture. 20:58:11

21 This is the picture of today, of the area 20:58:12

1 under the Gilmore Bridge. And as you can see, 20:58:16
2 there are two bays. So you can actually -- you 20:58:18
3 can make this a place where people can drive. 20:58:22

4 Now just in terms of ownership, the 20:58:25
5 partnership owns the fee interest of the land 20:58:28
6 here. The Commonwealth, of course, has an 20:58:31
7 easement to run this bridge. And we have no 20:58:33
8 interest in telling the Commonwealth how to run 20:58:36
9 the bridge or what to do with the bridge, 20:58:39
10 although we have been working closely with the 20:58:40
11 Commonwealth about how the bridge maintenance is 20:58:43
12 carried forward and how that will go on in the 20:58:46
13 future. 20:58:49

14 But we put this picture in just as a way 20:58:50
15 to show you. I am about to get into our zoning 20:58:52
16 requests. And what you can see is, there is 20:58:55
17 really nothing else that can be built beneath 20:58:59
18 here except above-grade parking. There is 20:59:02
19 certainly no residential unit or retail spot or 20:59:04
20 office use that could be built in this area from 20:59:09
21 the edge of the bridge down to grade. And that 20:59:12

1 is an important piece to note. 20:59:16

2 So here is the first of our -- there is 20:59:17

3 two pieces, two categories of pieces that we are 20:59:21

4 requesting as tweaks in the zoning. And the 20:59:27

5 first of them is these: Above-grade parking. 20:59:27

6 Above-grade parking is an allowed use in 20:59:31

7 the zoning, all the way around the edges of the 20:59:33

8 side. Okay? It is an allowed use, and does not 20:59:35

9 count against FAR in the blue section here 20:59:39

10 against Somerville. It is an allowed use, but 20:59:42

11 does count against FAR in the Boston section, and 20:59:46

12 then back in Cambridge and along Gilmore Bridge. 20:59:47

13 Our suggestion is that, because there is 20:59:51

14 no other use that can go here, that it should be 20:59:54

15 both allowed and should not count against FAR. 20:59:57

16 So really what we are asking for is the 20:59:59

17 continuation of the treatment of above-grade 21:00:01

18 parking from this portion of the site all the way 21:00:04

19 around to the rest of the site. Pretty simple. 21:00:06

20 Pretty straightforward. 21:00:08

21 And again, this is just highlighting it. 21:00:10

1 So here is our parcel. So the parking would be 21:00:15
2 buried in the building against the Gilmore 21:00:16
3 Bridge, below the lip of the Gilmore Bridge, and 21:00:18
4 all the way down to street grade. 21:00:20

5 So now I am getting into the second 21:00:22
6 general category of our requests. These have to 21:00:25
7 do with master plan enhancements that we have 21:00:28
8 working pretty closely with the community on for 21:00:30
9 a while now, probably a 15-month process. One of 21:00:33
10 the first things that we focused on, and you 21:00:38
11 might remember in the original plan, First Street 21:00:40
12 comes into the site directly, and continues 21:00:42
13 straight on into the site. And I suppose it was 21:00:45
14 considered an important entry as a straight-on 21:00:49
15 entry point. 21:00:52

16 But our thought is that when we first 21:00:53
17 come into it, what that really yielded was not a 21:00:55
18 very interesting entry point from the T. So that 21:00:59
19 if the T is to be built here, the original plan 21:01:01
20 for that was that there was almost a 6- or maybe 21:01:05
21 a 7-foot sidewalk here at the base of the T where 21:01:07

1 additional people were coming in. We looked at 21:01:11
2 that and said, with this important piece of 21:01:13
3 infrastructure coming in. There really should be 21:01:14
4 a great entry point, a grand entry point. And 21:01:17
5 frankly, we thought this park was so beautiful 21:01:19
6 that pulling back building R a bit and allowing 21:01:22
7 people to really be drawn into the park almost 21:01:23
8 immediately, as soon as they hit the site, is an 21:01:26
9 important planning goal. 21:01:27

10 And on top of that, we said to ourselves, 21:01:28
11 well, there really should be a strong retail 21:01:30
12 center here in the middle part of the site. So 21:01:33
13 therefore, we said, well, perhaps the realignment 21:01:35
14 of North First Street is warranted. And 21:01:38
15 sometimes, some of the best results come from the 21:01:41
16 simplest ideas. So we really are pleased with 21:01:42
17 the fact that, if we realign this, we end up with 21:01:47
18 a very nice retail plaza here, and really a great 21:01:50
19 entry into the park and into the site. It draws 21:01:53
20 people more effectively into the site, we think. 21:01:55
21 So that is one of our first pieces. 21:01:57

1 But what that then allowed us to do was 21:01:59
2 to create a cohesive retail square that we think, 21:02:01
3 frankly, should run to both sides of Monsignor 21:02:04
4 O'Brien -- I am not going to say "Highway," I am 21:02:07
5 going to say "Boulevard" -- Monsignor O'Brien 21:02:07
6 Boulevard -- that really, at the end of the day, 21:02:12
7 this will be a great retail square on this side. 21:02:13
8 But the retail square needs to spill out across 21:02:16
9 Monsignor O'Brien and really start to come to 21:02:19
10 this side as well. So we think of this as a 21:02:21
11 cohesive retail square here in this space. 21:02:23
12 This is a rendering that we prepared. So 21:02:27
13 you are at the NorthPoint side of Monsignor 21:02:31
14 O'Brien Boulevard, with your back to the Green 21:02:33
15 Line, looking out cross NorthPoint and across the 21:02:36
16 retail square. So obviously, we aspire to have 21:02:39
17 it be a very active, interesting place. A lot of 21:02:43
18 outdoor eating and the like. 21:02:44
19 This is, if you turned around and looked 21:02:46
20 back at the MBTA station, back toward East 21:02:48
21 Cambridge. Here is again a sense of how we want 21:02:51

1 it to be a very active place with a lot of folks 21:02:54
2 participating in outdoor activities. 21:02:57

3 The other piece that has come up in the 21:02:59
4 community process was the idea of a year-round 21:03:03
5 public market. And we have embraced this as part 21:03:05
6 of the retail square. We frankly think it is a 21:03:07
7 great area. So we really do want to make sure 21:03:10
8 that a year-round public market can work. 21:03:13

9 I think that there is a lot of discussion 21:03:15
10 that still needs to continue with the community 21:03:17
11 about what the year-round public market should 21:03:19
12 look like and what kind of things it serves. I 21:03:22
13 think we have all discussed, for example, the 21:03:27
14 fact that there is a public market that is quite 21:03:28
15 far down the road now in terms of implementation, 21:03:31
16 about three or four stops down on the Green Line, 21:03:34
17 at Haymarket Square. So that public market is on 21:03:36
18 its way. And there is a variety of other retail 21:03:38
19 considerations to think about. 21:03:42

20 One piece of it that we did talk about is 21:03:44
21 the location of the year-round public market. 21:03:46

1 And I think it is not inappropriate for me to 21:03:48
2 sort of say that the community would like, or has 21:03:53
3 considered the idea of the year-round public 21:03:56
4 market to be best located here on this spot. I 21:03:58
5 guess our thought is locating it here gives it a 21:04:01
6 very good chance of success, in the heart of a 21:04:04
7 kind of newer retail square district, and also on 21:04:06
8 the side of the street where the MBTA station is. 21:04:09
9 We would like to continue the discussion, 21:04:12
10 but either of these spots, we are open to, for a 21:04:14
11 year-round public market. We think of that as an 21:04:17
12 important element. 21:04:20
13 We focused a lot -- I know Steve Kaiser 21:04:20
14 is here, and I have spent a lot of time with 21:04:24
15 Steve on this issue. We focused a lot on trying 21:04:26
16 to make sure that this crossing at First Street 21:04:29
17 and Monsignor O'Brien Boulevard is a much better, 21:04:32
18 much stronger pedestrian crossing. Again, we 21:04:36
19 need to make sure that we sort of announce that 21:04:39
20 this is an area for pedestrians, not really for 21:04:41
21 cars. I know there is a lot of cars that come 21:04:43

1 through here, and the cars easily win out, just 21:04:46
2 because they weigh a couple thousand pounds. But 21:04:49
3 in general, we want to make sure that with paving 21:04:51
4 materials, lighting, signage, stoplight timing, 21:04:54
5 all those pieces, that we make this a much better 21:04:59
6 area. 21:05:01

7 We are responsible for building those 21:05:01
8 improvements, by the way, on Monsignor O'Brien; 21:05:03
9 so that is our objective. 21:05:05

10 And as we move through, we want these 21:05:07
11 sidewalks to be quite wide and for the resulting 21:05:12
12 crosswalks to be wide. So we have removed one 21:05:15
13 right-hand turn lane -- I will talk about that in 21:05:18
14 one second -- one preexisting right-hand turn 21:05:19
15 lane here, and narrow this, to make it a much 21:05:22
16 more pedestrian-friendly crossing. 21:05:27

17 We also will focus a lot on this first 21:05:28
18 floor retail here on parcel V, certainly facing 21:05:30
19 Cambridge Street, and trying to make sure that 21:05:34
20 the good, strong retail that is really starting 21:05:36
21 to crop up on Cambridge Street in the last ten 21:05:38

1 years, that that really gets continued down 21:05:41

2 Cambridge Street and into our site. We want to 21:05:43

3 be adding to that, and we want the character of 21:05:46

4 retail to be really local in flavor. We don't 21:05:48

5 need another Cambridge Side Galleria. We need it 21:05:49

6 to be really interesting and local in its flavor. 21:05:52

7 This in the original plan was also meant 21:05:55

8 to be sort of the smaller outdoor park. And 21:05:56

9 Chris in particular, and a variety of other 21:06:00

10 people, pointed out to us that, as a smaller 21:06:03

11 outdoor park, it really would be unused. It 21:06:05

12 would be kind of an orphan. So the community 21:06:06

13 suggested, and we have embraced it, that this 21:06:09

14 should be a great retail spot, an eating spot 21:06:11

15 really, a cafe, kind of one to two stories, 21:06:16

16 small. Interesting design. I would say a lot of 21:06:18

17 glass and something that, again, reinforces the 21:06:22

18 pedestrian character, with outdoor seating areas 21:06:26

19 and really local flavor. So this is your spot 21:06:27

20 where you go get our coffee or your interesting 21:06:30

21 lunch and sit out here, maybe make the walk 21:06:33

1 across to the retail square as well. 21:06:35

2 There are multiple pedestrian crossings 21:06:39
3 that we have also tried to focus on. So it is 21:06:43
4 not just about this First Street crossing. In 21:06:45
5 fact, as we have looked at it, obviously, the 21:06:47
6 bulk of the residential community located here in 21:06:50
7 East Cambridge, if they are arriving at the MBTA 21:06:52
8 station here, behind and underneath parcel Q -- 21:06:55
9 this will be the bus arrival point, by the way, 21:07:00
10 here. Most of the people who live in East 21:07:00
11 Cambridge will probably make this crossing at 21:07:05
12 Water Street, so we want to make sure we focus on 21:07:05
13 this. 21:07:07

14 We think this mid-block crossing is 21:07:07
15 actually quite nice, and we have been working 21:07:09
16 with the Archstone folks, obviously, to make sure 21:07:11
17 that this crossing works well. And I know that 21:07:14
18 they have embraced the idea that walking through 21:07:18
19 here is an important piece as well. 21:07:19

20 You will note obviously that on the side, 21:07:21
21 on the Cambridge Galleria side, this is a nice 21:07:23

1 walk, I think. So making sure that this 21:07:25
2 mid-block crossing works well is a good objective 21:07:27
3 as well. 21:07:30

4 As I said earlier, we moved this 21:07:31
5 right-hand turn lane; so we have gone from, I 21:07:34
6 think, seven lanes to five lines of traffic. 21:07:38

7 DOUGLAS MANZ: Right. The existing is 21:07:38
8 seven lanes today. We have proposed it as six 21:07:38
9 lanes, and now we are down to five lanes. 21:07:43

10 TOM O'BRIEN: With a median strip of 20 21:07:44
11 feet? 21:07:44

12 DOUGLAS MANZ: Correct. There is a 21:07:44
13 median strip that spans about 20 feet. 21:07:52

14 TOM O'BRIEN: So we tried to make this a 21:07:52
15 much more pedestrian friendly area. Again, this 21:07:54
16 was our objective, to put it together and move 21:07:57
17 the design to the next stage. So again, 20 feet, 21:07:58
18 five lanes to cross, and a 20-foot crosswalk. 21:08:03

19 Let's go to next one. 21:08:08

20 So now we tried to create a little bit 21:08:10
21 more of a rendering. This requires, as you guys 21:08:12

1 know, a little bit of imagination. So this is 21:08:17
2 the existing condition, as you know. You step 21:08:19
3 forward one more half block -- and, again, this 21:08:22
4 is the existing condition. And as we start to 21:08:24
5 think it through, this is what it can look like. 21:08:28
6 We are really excited about this. Obviously, we 21:08:30
7 want to make sure that this corner has that cafe, 21:08:32
8 that strong retail component. So this is very 21:08:35
9 pedestrian friendly. 21:08:38

10 And this is obviously not a design that 21:08:39
11 we are proposing; but on the first floor we want 21:08:41
12 to make sure that this is really active and very 21:08:43
13 much filled with interesting retail; and then, of 21:08:47
14 course, that people are engaged to make this walk 21:08:50
15 across the street to the MBTA. 21:08:53

16 We will up-light that. As the previous 21:08:54
17 slide sort of suggested, we will use different 21:08:58
18 paving elements, different lighting, and really 21:08:59
19 try to announce, this as a pedestrian zone. 21:09:02

20 Here is the retail on the other side, so 21:09:05
21 if you maybe walked through this picture 21:09:07

1 underneath the MBTA station into the other side 21:09:09
2 where the retail square is on the other side. 21:09:11

3 Next, I am going to talk a little bit 21:09:13
4 about open space. The original plan required 21:09:18
5 nine acres of open space, the bulk of which was 21:09:23
6 located here in the central park. And what we 21:09:23
7 have suggested is, to really make the plan work 21:09:27
8 at the ground plane, some additional open space 21:09:29
9 is really more warranted. 21:09:33

10 And in particular, what we are trying to 21:09:35
11 do for the back rows of the site, we really want 21:09:37
12 to make sure that those back rows don't feel as 21:09:44
13 crowded as they looked in the original plan. 21:09:44
14 Frankly, there is opportunities, through parks, 21:09:47
15 larger parks in the mid-row, to connect back to 21:09:50
16 the central park, so that it makes for a much 21:09:53
17 better, more interesting sort of first floor 21:09:56
18 experience, ground plan experience, for people. 21:09:58

19 So we propose to add 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, 21:10:01
20 this staircase, so five new parks, which would 21:10:04
21 take the open space from 9 acres to 11 acres; 21:10:08

1 obviously something that some might see as a 21:10:12
2 burden, frankly, but something that we see as a 21:10:15
3 really good objective, and something that makes 21:10:16
4 the whole site work more effectively. 21:10:18

5 So those, together with the retail 21:10:20
6 square, really start to spread the buildings out 21:10:22
7 a little bit. And what they really means is 21:10:25
8 that -- we are going to talk about height in a 21:10:27
9 second -- we are aligning the FAR. We are not 21:10:30
10 asking for any more FAR, but we are aligning the 21:10:33
11 FAR a little bit differently. 21:10:34

12 And the other thing that we have done is, 21:10:36
13 we have tried to take advantage of the park by 21:10:38
14 suggesting that some of the residential 21:10:40
15 buildings, all of which were -- or much of which 21:10:42
16 was concentrated here on the back portion of the 21:10:45
17 site, that these residential buildings we think 21:10:46
18 could work really well, if fronted on the park: 21:10:48
19 Smaller floor plates, slightly taller buildings, 21:10:54
20 but here aligned along the green space in the 21:10:56
21 middle. I think that would really make for a 21:10:59

1 great community.

21:11:00

2 Sustainability, we are just going to
3 spend a moment on this, but this is really what
4 we think will be the hallmark of the site, that
5 the site really cries out for an opportunity to
6 be a green site. We are obviously bringing in a
7 new Green Line; there is Orange Line service.
8 There is plenty of new parks along the Charles
9 River, opportunities for biking, jogging. There
10 is already a shuttle that services the site.

21:11:03

21:11:04

21:11:08

21:11:10

21:11:13

21:11:16

21:11:19

21:11:22

21:11:24

11 And because it is a reconversion of an
12 old rail yard, together with all of the LEED
13 standards that we will bring to the buildings
14 themselves, the whole site cries out as a
15 terrific opportunity to create sustainability as
16 a hallmark, and really a nice chance for us to
17 use that, frankly, as a way to help remember what
18 the site is all about.

21:11:28

21:11:31

21:11:34

21:11:36

21:11:39

21:11:41

21:11:44

21:11:47

19 DOUGLAS MANZ: That photo, just to be
20 clear, that is view from Sierra down onto the
21 existing park, a small portion of the existing

21:11:50

21:11:51

21:11:53

1 park. That is actually the bridge that exists 21:11:56
2 today on the site. 21:11:58

3 TOM O'BRIEN: So again, just to repeat, 21:12:00
4 so here, with our revisions, here is what the 21:12:05
5 plan would start to look like today. And what 21:12:07
6 that takes us to is the second category of our 21:12:10
7 request for zoning changes. 21:12:12

8 The zoning today allows for buildings on 21:12:14
9 the outer edges of the site to be in the piece of 21:12:18
10 150 feet to 220 feet. In order for us make those 21:12:27
11 residential buildings work here in this inner 21:12:28
12 band, we have suggested that that outer band of 21:12:32
13 150 to 220 be expanded to include this inner 21:12:36
14 band, so that the opportunity would be there for 21:12:37
15 buildings to be up to 220 feet; again, at the 21:12:39
16 discretion of the Planning Board. So that is 21:12:43
17 one piece of the height. 21:12:45

18 The second piece of the height is in the 21:12:46
19 NorthPoint district, there are two more buildings 21:12:49
20 that would be allowed, up to -- again, at the 21:12:52
21 planning board's discretion -- up to 220 feet. 21:12:56

1 We are proposing that that number be increased to 21:13:00
2 seven buildings. So we would go from two to 21:13:02
3 seven, again, up to 220. 21:13:04

4 Again, just to underline, we are not for 21:13:07
5 more FAR. We are simply suggesting that seven 21:13:09
6 buildings, rather than two, and only in this band 21:13:13
7 on the far side of the park, that there would be 21:13:16
8 a potential increase of 70 feet, from 150 to 220. 21:13:19
9 They are already allowed to be up to 150. 21:13:23

10 DOUGLAS MANZ: That primarily is being 21:13:26
11 driven by the fact that when we expand the open 21:13:28
12 space from 9 to 11 acres, that two additional 21:13:29
13 acres was originally occupied by buildings. So 21:13:32
14 we are just remasking the FAR into different 21:13:35
15 shapes, in order to create the additional open 21:13:40
16 space. It is kind of a balancing of the, again, 21:13:40
17 the approved FAR on the side. 21:13:42

18 TOM O'BRIEN: And through the magic of 21:13:45
19 technology, we can kind of show how this starts 21:13:46
20 to look. We are going to take this in three 21:13:47
21 sections. This is the first section at the 21:13:49

1 northern end. We will do another section here 21:13:51
2 and here, and you can see it more. 21:13:53

3 So in the original piece, these are the 21:14:04
4 buildings that would build on the original plan. 21:14:05
5 And we are showing with our suggested changes 21:14:07
6 what can happen. 21:14:09

7 So obviously, we think that it produces 21:14:22
8 an interesting plan that looks better, 21:14:23
9 particularly at the ground plane, and really 21:14:24
10 starts to spread the buildings out, to make them 21:14:26
11 interesting and hopefully create a variety of 21:14:29
12 buildings. 21:14:32

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Could you do that again? 21:14:34

14 TOM O'BRIEN: Sure. This takes a lot of 21:14:37
15 memory on the computer for it to work. 21:14:37

16 So we are not asking for any additional 21:15:16
17 height over the original 220, either. So we are 21:15:17
18 just asking for more flexibility, more buildings 21:15:17
19 to be allowed between the 150 and 220. So we are 21:15:17
20 not asking for any change over the existing 21:15:17
21 maximum 220-foot height limit. 21:15:28

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a floor plate 21:15:31
2 limitation on those higher buildings? 21:15:33

3 TOM O'BRIEN: We didn't contemplate it in 21:15:36
4 the zoning. But I think, particularly with 21:15:37
5 regard to the residential buildings, we could 21:15:40
6 discuss that. I think that we would be open to 21:15:42
7 that. 21:15:44

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you for a moment -- 21:15:46
9 a second ago, the slide with the buildings from 21:15:46
10 the original master plan with the letters, can 21:15:53
11 you show which ones? 21:15:55

12 TOM O'BRIEN: Why don't we go to the 21:15:58
13 original one, if we can, and I will show you. I 21:16:03
14 will just try to do it based on memory. So 21:16:15
15 essentially, there is two or three general things 21:16:17
16 that we want to do. The first is much of the 21:16:21
17 residential, as you can see, is concentrated here 21:16:25
18 in the back part of the site. And I think what 21:16:27
19 was contemplated here in the back part of the 21:16:30
20 site was sort of a wall of buildings that would 21:16:31
21 kind of wall off the railroad on the back side. 21:16:33

1 You recall that there is quite a bit of 21:16:37
2 fill that has to come to the site. And so we 21:16:38
3 will actually increase the grade in the back 21:16:41
4 portion of the site by 10 feet. 21:16:44

5 DOUGLAS MANZ: At least 10 feet, in some 21:16:46
6 areas. 21:16:47

7 TOM O'BRIEN: Ten feet in the back 21:16:48
8 portion of the site. 21:16:50

9 So your first sort of at-grade retail 21:16:51
10 piece or entry to the building will be, first of 21:16:54
11 all, 10 feet above where you are today. And that 21:16:55
12 means also, by the way, that the parking above 21:16:57
13 grade in the back portion is actually just 21:16:59
14 slightly below that grade, the first level of 21:17:01
15 parking. 21:17:03

16 But we sort of came away with a couple 21:17:04
17 things. The first is, we think that to have the 21:17:08
18 residential all here might not be the best thing 21:17:11
19 for the residential. We think that the 21:17:14
20 residential could really work well here along the 21:17:16
21 park. And we think that the commercial, the idea 21:17:20

1 of the commercial being here close to the Orange 21:17:23
2 Line, and some portion of commercial being here 21:17:26
3 close to the Green Line, makes sense. We can 21:17:26
4 embrace that as a good idea. 21:17:29

5 But I think moving that residential here 21:17:31
6 means that these blocks can get smaller, a little 21:17:33
7 smaller, so that the street grid plan starts to 21:17:37
8 shift a little bit and become a little bit more 21:17:41
9 workable. 21:17:41

10 And frankly, if we are going to do that, 21:17:44
11 particularly if we are going to put some 21:17:46
12 commercial buildings back here, let's try and 21:17:47
13 make sure that we open up the spaces between 21:17:49
14 these parcels, so that those buildings can take 21:17:51
15 advantage of the central park. So we creating 21:17:55
16 more green space in between these buildings was 21:17:57
17 another important objective. 21:18:01

18 So what we end up with generally is some 21:18:02
19 of this residential moves closer to the park. 21:18:05
20 Some of the commercial, as a result, moves closer 21:18:08
21 to the rail piece, and sort of comes up this 21:18:10

1 stretch towards E and F. And the parking, while 21:18:14
2 above grade here, will be below grade here. The 21:18:19
3 floor plates of these residential buildings would 21:18:20
4 be smaller. The buildings, while taller, would 21:18:23
5 be thinner, and would make for, we think, a 21:18:25
6 better plan as a result of that. And the retail 21:18:28
7 square, we think, could be concentrated here. 21:18:30

8 You will note that in the original plan, 21:18:33
9 that each of the buildings had sort of a retail 21:18:36
10 obligation. We think it is still appropriate. 21:18:38
11 But we think that having a concentration of 21:18:41
12 retail here is really warranted, to make sure 21:18:44
13 that there is sort of town center concept in 21:18:47
14 place. 21:18:50

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you remind us of 21:18:51
16 the color coding? 21:18:53

17 TOM O'BRIEN: Yes. I deal with this all 21:18:55
18 the time, so this is like tattooed to my 21:18:56
19 forehead. 21:18:56

20 The red is commercial. The yellow is 21:19:00
21 residential. The sort of the off-yellow is mixed 21:19:02

1 use, so a mix of some residential and some 21:19:07
2 commercial. 21:19:12

3 HUGH RUSSELL: The other thing that 21:19:17
4 happens here is, if you look at the city lines, 21:19:18
5 is that Somerville gets some commercial 21:19:21
6 development, which I have heard, at least, is 21:19:25
7 something that would very much like to see. 21:19:27

8 TOM O'BRIEN: You have heard correctly. 21:19:30
9 We have met with and spent time with Somerville. 21:19:36
10 And it is clear that one of the objectives of 21:19:40
11 Somerville is -- I mean, I think I can state 21:19:43
12 this. This line here is the border between 21:19:46
13 Cambridge and Somerville. And I think that if 21:19:53
14 you are an elected official in Somerville, then 21:19:57
15 you look at this and you say, "Well, how could 21:19:59
16 Cambridge have zoned or purported to plan my 21:20:02
17 land?" 21:20:06

18 Right? So it is clearly important for us 21:20:06
19 to spend a good amount of time working with the 21:20:10
20 officials in Somerville, which we are doing and 21:20:14
21 have done. 21:20:16

1 We have not yet made a formal proposal in 21:20:16
2 Somerville. We need to sort of, I think, get far 21:20:19
3 enough down the road with this process in 21:20:23
4 Cambridge first. 21:20:24

5 But you are correct, Mr. Chairman, that 21:20:25
6 one of the objectives is whether or not there can 21:20:29
7 be more commercial buildings in Somerville. That 21:20:33
8 is correct. 21:20:37

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: What about Boston? 21:20:37

10 TOM O'BRIEN: Boston is here. It is a 21:20:39
11 cleaner line. It was done -- I won't go through 21:20:41
12 the whole history, but it is a cleaner line. So 21:20:41
13 Charlestown is on this side. So a portion of G 21:20:47
14 is in Boston. 21:20:50

15 You will note that, with maybe only one 21:20:51
16 exception, none of the buildings is cleanly in 21:20:54
17 Cambridge or Somerville or Boston. So we face an 21:20:58
18 interesting task. I mean, I only kiddingly will 21:21:02
19 say we will have a chance to maybe go to 21:21:07
20 Palestine to see if we can figure out whatever 21:21:09
21 problems exist there for thousands of years. 21:21:10

1 But each of these buildings will require 21:21:13
2 a process involving, depending on where you are, 21:21:19
3 two of the communities, or maybe even three of 21:21:22
4 the communities. So we are up for it. We are up 21:21:24
5 for the task. So far, it has gone very well. So 21:21:31
6 far, I think we have tried hard to meet the 21:21:33
7 obligations of each of the different communities. 21:21:37

8 I mean, the thing that has been most 21:21:38
9 helpful for is people have been very clear with 21:21:39
10 us in terms of what the objectives are. So if 21:21:43
11 people are clear in their requests and clear in 21:21:45
12 their objectives, then we can do the best we can 21:21:46
13 to meet those and spend time with folks. 21:21:49

14 DOUGLAS MANZ: Just to be clear, parcel 21:21:53
15 N, which is our first project, an apartment 21:21:53
16 tower, is solely in Cambridge, only governed by 21:21:57
17 Cambridge. Obviously, some other parcels, like I 21:21:59
18 and J and M and N, those, again, are clearly in 21:22:01
19 Cambridge. But I think Somerville may have a 21:22:04
20 single site that is solely in Somerville. 21:22:06

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you show us the 21:22:11

1 seven instead of two? 21:22:13

2 HUGH RUSSELL: J, K, L and M each get a 21:22:20

3 tower that wasn't there before. And there is 21:22:23

4 one, I think, on A. Is that right? 21:22:25

5 TOM O'BRIEN: Yes. I will show you when 21:22:27

6 you get to the plan here. 21:22:29

7 So it is a little complicated. 21:22:32

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you explain the 21:22:36

9 colors on this one? 21:22:37

10 TOM O'BRIEN: We changed the colors. 21:22:40

11 Sorry. 21:22:41

12 The aqua, sort of blue-ish, are 21:22:42

13 commercial buildings. So you will note on the 21:22:47

14 Somerville discussion, we have switched this to a 21:22:47

15 commercial building. The yellow here is still 21:22:51

16 residential. The orange is really retail, almost 21:22:53

17 clearly retail in scope. But of course, retail 21:22:59

18 would be on the first floor of all of these 21:23:02

19 buildings. So there would really be a 21:23:03

20 concentration, together with kiosks, and a big 21:23:06

21 concentration of smaller scale retail on both 21:23:10

1 sides here as well. 21:23:13

2 The red, we have thought of as a 21:23:14

3 potential hotel as well, which might be 21:23:18

4 warranted. So then blue here, is a commercial 21:23:19

5 building. This hotel, obviously we would have a 21:23:24

6 very public first floor, and be really a home 21:23:26

7 base and a central gathering spot for people. 21:23:29

8 What we thought about in terms of the 21:23:31

9 heights is -- so there are two left that can be 21:23:33

10 built. This parcel N, we are proposing to be a 21:23:37

11 220-foot building. We think that height is 21:23:37

12 warranted. I will just point out, the existing 21:23:44

13 Archstone building is approximately 220 feet as 21:23:44

14 well. So parcel N we project would be a 220-foot 21:23:47

15 building. 21:23:47

16 And by the way, in these residential 21:23:54

17 buildings, the way we think these through, just 21:23:55

18 so you will note this, is there would be one or 21:23:57

19 two trays of below- grade parking. So all the 21:24:01

20 parking interior here is below grade. Nothing is 21:24:05

21 above grade. And there would be one or two trays 21:24:06

1 of below-grade parking, but two separate 21:24:09
2 buildings would rise above. So it not be a large 21:24:13
3 block; it would be two small floor plate 21:24:16
4 residential buildings. 21:24:19

5 And of the two, one would be 150, M; and 21:24:20
6 one would be 220. Same concept here. One would 21:24:24
7 be 150, and this would be 220 here. So one, two, 21:24:27
8 three. And then C and D, same; four, five, six. 21:24:32
9 Right, Doug? 21:24:40

10 DOUGLAS MANZ: Yes. The just the end 21:24:40
11 corner of A; not the entire building of A. But 21:24:42
12 the end corner is just caught by the 150-220 21:24:45
13 zone. So that would have an element at the end 21:24:49
14 of it that would be 220. 21:24:50

15 TOM O'BRIEN: Then the other is G. Now G 21:24:53
16 is partially Cambridge and partially Boston. But 21:24:56
17 we think we need to address it in the Cambridge 21:24:58
18 zoning, because it is not wholly in Boston. 21:25:02

19 DOUGLAS MANZ: To have a real estate 21:25:05
20 floor plate for an office building, a portion of 21:25:08
21 that tower will be in Cambridge. Most of it will 21:25:08

1 likely be in Boston, but still it won't fit just 21:25:11
2 in Boston. 21:25:14

3 So the idea is, there is an alternation 21:25:17
4 of height. And we are not suggesting that all of 21:25:19
5 them would be exactly 220. But the idea is that 21:25:22
6 there is some up and down as we go through the 21:25:24
7 sites. We are not looking to have J, K, L, M, 21:25:26
8 and N all at 220. That doesn't make sense, from 21:25:29
9 our perspective. It needs to be varied. 21:25:33

10 TOM O'BRIEN: Yes. You will note that in 21:25:34
11 the zoning, the language already exists, "at the 21:25:36
12 discretion of the planning board," which 21:25:40
13 obviously, we are not going to change that. 21:25:42

14 DOUGLAS MANZ: That is a key thing that 21:25:43
15 Anthony is bringing. G would be the only 21:25:45
16 commercial building to that height. The rest 21:25:48
17 were all residential. And per the zoning, they 21:25:51
18 are only allowed to be residential. 21:25:56

19 TOM O'BRIEN: And of course, the railroad 21:25:56
20 tracks are on this side here. So a large floor 21:25:57
21 plant commercial building, we think, is warranted 21:25:57

1 along this side of the site as well. 21:26:03

2 DOUGLAS MANZ: Commercial buildings 21:26:06

3 aren't as sensitive to the adjacent railroad 21:26:08

4 tracks as well. So that was again the benefit 21:26:11

5 from the site plan, too. 21:26:13

6 TOM O'BRIEN: I think I am nearing the 21:26:15

7 end. So let me just go over a couple things: 21:26:16

8 One, in the original plan, there were a series of 21:26:25

9 community benefits that were asked for. And we 21:26:29

10 will continue, obviously, with all of those. 21:26:30

11 Nine acres of open space, as we talked about, 21:26:32

12 that goes to 11. 21:26:35

13 Approximately 6,500 linear feet of 21:26:37

14 bicycle paths and lanes. The first portion of 21:26:40

15 those have already been built, and another 21:26:43

16 portion will be built as 22 Water Street gets 21:26:43

17 built. The 3,500 linear feet of sewer bypass 21:26:47

18 line, which is a line that would run down Bore 21:26:50

19 Street, to be building. That is a key obligation 21:26:55

20 for us, a key piece of infrastructure to be 21:26:57

21 built. 21:26:59

1 We are responsible for the construction 21:26:59
2 of Monsignor O'Brien Boulevard -- I am no longer 21:27:01
3 going to say "highway." There is already an 21:27:04
4 innovative storm water system that has been 21:27:06
5 created and crosses over into the Lechmere Canal. 21:27:10

6 Each of our residential buildings will 21:27:11
7 comply with inclusionary housing obligations. 21:27:14
8 The first building will have 40 affordable units. 21:27:14
9 Across the entire site, when it is fully built 21:27:19
10 out, there will be over 400 affordable units 21:27:19
11 across the site, which is the equivalent of one 21:27:22
12 quite large project. So we are pleased with 21:27:25
13 that. 21:27:27

14 The entire site will comply with the 21:27:27
15 incentive zoning ordinance at \$4.34 a foot. That 21:27:30
16 is almost \$10 million of public contribution for 21:27:36
17 the build-out to the site. And a road network 21:27:41
18 for 20 city blocks. Obviously, the road and 21:27:43
19 those pieces are not inexpensive to build. 21:27:43

20 In addition, as we pointed out, we are 21:27:47
21 going to begin with a residential project. There 21:27:50

1 was a master plan that does not necessarily 21:27:50
2 dictate that, but beginning with a residential 21:27:59
3 project we think is important. We are including 21:27:59
4 there-bedrooms in that. We want to create this 21:28:01
5 cohesive retail square that is a key public 21:28:01
6 benefit, we think. 21:28:08

7 We think we have improved the MBTA 21:28:09
8 station with the First Street realignment. And I 21:28:10
9 think generally, at the public meetings that we 21:28:12
10 have been a part of so far, people have agreed on 21:28:15
11 that. We will build out those enhanced 21:28:18
12 pedestrian crossings that we have discussed. We 21:28:21
13 did remove the right-hand turn lane, which is a 21:28:23
14 key victory, I think, in that planning process. 21:28:25
15 We will embrace the incorporation of the public 21:28:28
16 market, and make sure that that happens. We have 21:28:30
17 created or proposed to create two additional 21:28:32
18 acres of open space. And really one important 21:28:34
19 piece for this first project is to make that 21:28:37
20 vertical connection between the Gilmore Bridge 21:28:40
21 and the Orange Line. That is a key thing. 21:28:41

1 So I think this is the end. We have 21:28:43
2 decided to leave this up, if people would like to 21:28:51
3 refer to it. But obviously, I am happy to 21:28:53
4 entertain any questions. 21:28:54

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:28:56

6 This is a public hearing. Then I would 21:29:02
7 also like to get a statement from the community 21:29:06
8 development department. 21:29:12

9 ROGER BOOTHE: Roger Boothe, director of 21:29:17
10 design. 21:29:21

11 We saw this project not too long ago at a 21:29:21
12 little bit more of a preliminary state. And I 21:29:26
13 think at that time, I was stating for the 21:29:26
14 department, a lot of enthusiasm about these 21:29:30
15 changes. I think the plan was originally quite a 21:29:33
16 good plan, but it had some flaws. And I really 21:29:37
17 think the movement to have this open space system 21:29:40
18 integrated, expanded, is a very smart thing to 21:29:45
19 do. 21:29:49

20 And it does mean we have more height 21:29:49
21 here. But this is one place where we can really 21:29:51

1 take height. We don't have the kind of issues 21:29:54
2 that often come up where we have got the existing 21:29:57
3 small-scale residential neighbors to worry about. 21:29:58

4 Certainly the string of the retail is, I 21:30:02
5 think, a very strong move. As you recall back 21:30:05
6 when we were looking at the original master plan, 21:30:09
7 we were always worried about that First Street 21:30:12
8 extension and what was going to really make that 21:30:13
9 work. And I think the fact that they have 21:30:15
10 thought about how it integrates with this 21:30:16
11 surrounding uses and re-working the T station is 21:30:21
12 quite major. 21:30:25

13 So I think we are very enthused about the 21:30:26
14 whole approach. 21:30:29

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:30:31

16 PAMELA WINTERS: Can I ask Roger a 21:30:33
17 question? 21:30:34

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Sure. 21:30:34

19 PAMELA WINTERS: Roger, what is your 21:30:35
20 feeling about the increased height of the 21:30:36
21 residential buildings along the park? 21:30:39

1 ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I think again, it is 21:30:42
2 pretty much on the north side of the park, so 21:30:45
3 fortunately, the shadows aren't going to cause 21:30:45
4 much of an issue. 21:30:52

5 PAMELA WINTERS: That is what I was 21:30:52
6 wondering. 21:30:54

7 ROGER BOOTHE: I don't think there will 21:30:54
8 be too much shadow impact at all, really. And 21:30:56
9 they will be more slender buildings than the 21:30:58
10 original commercial buildings. So we have had 21:30:59
11 this discussion before about the importance of 21:31:02
12 slenderness when you get height. And obviously, 21:31:03
13 residential lends itself to that slenderness much 21:31:06
14 more readily than commercial. 21:31:12

15 So even though Somerville, I am sure, is 21:31:12
16 very happy to have the moving around of the uses, 21:31:15
17 I think from our point of view, also I think it 21:31:17
18 is really great to have those people on the park. 21:31:19

19 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you. 21:31:23

20 TOM O'BRIEN: So the sun will come this 21:31:33
21 way. The shadows from these buildings will fall 21:31:35

1 this way across the back portion of the site on 21:31:38
2 the rail tracks. 21:31:40

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you. 21:31:43

4 AHMED NUR: I just wanted to, I guess, 21:31:45
5 give you support on this. First, when it was 21:31:48
6 represented that the residential heights are 21:31:51
7 going to change from 150 to 220, or asking to do 21:31:56
8 that, I was alarmed. But then I realized that if 21:31:57
9 I were a resident in those, I would much rather 21:32:02
10 be higher than the commercial buildings, for one. 21:32:06
11 And also in this area, it was indicated that we 21:32:10
12 can't take some height. And also, it helps to 21:32:13
13 have smaller floor plates. 21:32:16

14 But then I was thinking, well, perhaps we 21:32:19
15 should try to switch it and try to make the 21:32:22
16 commercial lower. But, actually, it sort of 21:32:24
17 shields from the highway. It is like a retaining 21:32:29
18 wall for the noise and everything else. So this 21:32:33
19 actually makes perfect sense to me, and I just 21:32:36
20 wanted to hear your comments on that. 21:32:38

21 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. I absolutely agree 21:32:39

1 that we will still have that sort of important 21:32:41
2 screening function that this whole development 21:32:43
3 really has for the East Cambridge neighborhood, 21:32:45
4 because sound does propagate all the way across 21:32:47
5 the site. 21:32:50

6 Now these buildings, having the first 21:32:51
7 three levels of parking along the railway will be 21:32:54
8 absorbing a lot of that sound and, I think, 21:32:59
9 helping to make this really feel like a part of 21:32:59
10 the city instead of an isolated precinct. 21:33:02

11 AHMED NUR: So they are not losing a view 21:33:05
12 of the highway. 21:33:07

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Should we proceed to the 21:33:13
14 public hearing? 21:33:15

15 In a public hearing, I have a list of 21:33:18
16 four people, but I will ask other people who want 21:33:20
17 to speak. And if you would, when you speak, 21:33:24
18 please come to the microphone, give your name, 21:33:27
19 spell your name so that it may be correctly 21:33:30
20 transcribed, give your address, and limit your 21:33:35
21 remarks to three minutes. 21:33:42

1 So the first name is Yuji Koga. 21:33:43

2 YUJI KOGA: Thank you. Let me spell my 21:33:48

3 name. Yuji, Y-U-J-I. Last name Koga, K-O-G-A. 21:33:52

4 I live at 10 Museum Way, Apartment 1625. 21:33:56

5 I have been a resident of the Regatta 21:34:02

6 Towers, formerly known as the Museum Towers, for 21:34:09

7 over seven years. My family has been in 21:34:09

8 Cambridge for over 40 years. I own one of the 21:34:13

9 150 condos that are over 300 people that will be 21:34:15

10 directly affected by this. There is a 21:34:19

11 neighborhood issue here. There is close to 1,000 21:34:21

12 people that live in my condo development. 21:34:25

13 We will directly be affected by the auto 21:34:28

14 traffic, the increase of auto traffic, noise, 21:34:31

15 human traffic. I will directly be affected by 21:34:34

16 loss of privacy, as I can't play golf, but I can 21:34:37

17 throw a golf ball at building U and building N. I 21:34:42

18 will be affected by a loss of sunlight and 21:34:46

19 overall loss of quality of life. 21:34:48

20 I had hoped -- and we have heard a lot of 21:34:50

21 cooperation from the developers meeting with the 21:34:54

1 East Cambridge Alliance and such. The developers 21:35:00
2 have met for about 15 minutes with our board at 21:35:03
3 our condo, where details were somewhat limited in 21:35:06
4 15 minutes. 21:35:10

5 I would hope that the board here will not 21:35:12
6 give this carte blanche power to the developers, 21:35:15
7 to basically let them do, without or with limited 21:35:19
8 input from the condo owners, the people that are 21:35:22
9 directly affected, the people that actually live 21:35:25
10 on that side of the street. 21:35:27

11 I have yet to be convinced why buildings 21:35:28
12 have to be 220 feet versus the 150 as originally 21:35:32
13 planned. I still do not know how that would 21:35:36
14 affect the already very tight residential parking 21:35:40
15 areas that are there. There is a lot of talk on 21:35:42
16 what is going to happen with First Street, but 21:35:46
17 very little talk about what is going to happen 21:35:48
18 with 10 Museum Way, which is where a lot of the 21:35:49
19 residents at S and T, as well as the Archstone 21:35:51
20 goes through. And if you have noticed, it is a 21:35:57
21 pain to get into O'Brien Highway from our street 21:35:57

1 as they continue on. We are already being 21:36:01
2 affected by the EF building, which is also being 21:36:04
3 developed. It was approved a while ago, and that 21:36:05
4 is going to be developed soon. 21:36:08

5 There is a general sense from the condo 21:36:12
6 owners that there is a loss of power, there is a 21:36:14
7 loss of input. We do not have much of an input 21:36:17
8 in this process. And I implore the Planning 21:36:20
9 Board to take that into consideration, that there 21:36:26
10 is a neighbor issue. There are long-term 21:36:28
11 residents who do live here, including the 21:36:32
12 Archstone residents there. But we are owners; 21:36:35
13 the Archstone people are renters. 21:36:38

14 Thank you. 21:36:40

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:36:41

16 Next person is Stephen Kaiser. 21:36:42

17 STEVE KAISER: Again, my name is Stephen 21:36:48
18 Kaiser. I live at 191 Hamilton street. And I 21:36:59
19 have submitted two written comments, and I hope 21:37:04
20 they stand by themselves. I will not try to 21:37:08
21 summarize them or read to you. 21:37:10

1 I will simply note what a difference 21:37:13
2 five years makes from 2007, where the then 21:37:15
3 developer and the railroad were fighting each 21:37:20
4 other in court with accusations of fraud. And my 21:37:22
5 own neighborhood group, the ACM, was taking them 21:37:25
6 to court and winning a case in the superior 21:37:29
7 judicial court, other tidelands. You look at it 21:37:33
8 today. And they are one happy family, sitting 21:37:38
9 all here behind me, railroad and developer 21:37:40
10 getting along splendidly. The outreach to the 21:37:44
11 neighbors has been generally excellent to East 21:37:47
12 Cambridge, to myself, to Somerville. 21:37:51

13 It is quite an encouraging change, but it 21:37:54
14 doesn't mean all the problems have been solved. 21:37:59
15 As I note in my letter, we still have that 21:38:02
16 10-year old boundary issue, the wiggly line that 21:38:05
17 runs through there, that Cambridge is moved back 21:38:08
18 and forth over the years. It used to be slightly 21:38:10
19 less wiggly. Then they straightened it out, and 21:38:13
20 then they did it more wiggly. And I don't think 21:38:15
21 it has any basis in law. And as I said in my 21:38:17

1 letter, please use the DEP map, and it actually 21:38:21
2 straightens out that wiggly line and makes it 21:38:24
3 much more compatible with the land uses, and it 21:38:27
4 is legal. 21:38:30

5 The other thing that is determined by 21:38:30
6 that line is how much Commonwealth tidelands is 21:38:34
7 in that area. And the Middlesex Superior Court 21:38:38
8 found 13 acres in the Moot versus DEP case. And 21:38:41
9 on one of the slides, even on this one, they show 21:38:48
10 22 Water Street as a separate ownership. This 21:38:52
11 plan does not show those 13 acres of Commonwealth 21:38:55
12 tidelands, which they should. 21:38:59

13 Now the sheet of paper that I just gave 21:39:02
14 you, Mr. Chairman, shows the land ownership as 21:39:04
15 claimed by the railroad. And it doesn't include 21:39:07
16 any claim of acquiring Commonwealth tidelands. 21:39:10

17 So I think the most important thing we 21:39:13
18 can do together here to try to solve the land 21:39:16
19 ownership issue is to request from the 21:39:19
20 railroad -- and Phil Kingman is an excellent 21:39:23
21 gentleman, and I get along with him fine -- but 21:39:28

1 he not be happy with this request if we try and 21:39:28
2 seep a land ownership now from the B&M Railroad 21:39:31
3 to show how much they own in there and how much 21:39:35
4 the Commonwealth owns. 21:39:37

5 Finally, I would like see that you get 21:39:39
6 the plan and the architecture right here. Again, 21:39:41
7 I am worried about having zoning be the cart 21:39:44
8 before the horse. And my real concern here is 21:39:48
9 that for 25 years of planning at NorthPoint, we 21:39:51
10 haven't got the plan right. And I just sat back 21:39:55
11 and thought and mentioned it in one of my 21:39:58
12 letters, what would Jane Jacobs say, if she saw 21:40:00
13 that site, and if she saw that new residential 21:40:00
14 building? I think she would be horrified. 21:40:09

15 She wrote a book called the Death and 21:40:11
16 Life of Great American Cities, in 1961, an 21:40:13
17 extraordinary document. A very odd name for a 21:40:18
18 book, starting "death" and then "life," but I 21:40:19
19 think it was appropriate. So much concern about 21:40:23
20 our cities had been that they were dying and that 21:40:25
21 they were dead and they needed to redevelop and 21:40:27

1 change. 21:40:31

2 And the opposite view of that comes from 21:40:32

3 Mr. La Corbusier, the architect's favorite 21:40:37

4 architect. 21:40:40

5 PAMELA WINTERS: If you could wind up 21:40:40

6 your comments, sir. 21:40:41

7 STEPHEN KAISER: Okay. I will give you 21:40:42

8 the quote, and that will be it. 21:40:43

9 "My scheme for this city is brutal 21:40:44

10 because town existence and life itself are 21:40:48

11 brutal. Life is pitiless. It must defend 21:40:51

12 itself, hemmed in as it is on all sides by death. 21:40:55

13 To overcome death, constant activity is 21:40:59

14 necessary." 21:41:03

15 This is a hero of the architects. And I 21:41:04

16 suspect that those plans here are much more 21:41:08

17 reflective of Mr. La Corbusier than Jane Jacob, 21:41:11

18 and that is the fundamental error that we have 21:41:18

19 made. 21:41:22

20 HUGH RUSSELL: The next speaker is Chris 21:41:40

21 Matthews. 21:41:41

1 CHRIS MATTHEWS: Chris Matthews. 26 21:41:41

2 Sixth Street. 21:41:45

3 It feels a little odd to be here talking 21:41:45

4 about NorthPoint without a suit and tie on. I 21:41:48

5 did spend six years thinking a lot about this 21:41:51

6 project; working on the project in the past 21:41:56

7 years, just thinking about it, not working on it. 21:42:01

8 But I would say that from the 21:42:03

9 neighborhood perspective, from my perspective as 21:42:05

10 the vice president of the East Cambridge planning 21:42:08

11 team, the neighborhood process with the new 21:42:10

12 owners has just been exemplary. They really 21:42:14

13 listened to lot of the concerns that we had when 21:42:19

14 the T were moving ahead with their project in a 21:42:21

15 vacuum without NorthPoint. And I think in the 21:42:24

16 nine points that they went through at the end, 21:42:31

17 that really hit every single one of our major 21:42:35

18 concerns. So is it fantastic. 21:42:38

19 More than that, I would say that to be 21:42:41

20 coming with changes to the master plan that don't 21:42:45

21 ask for extra density is refreshing for East 21:42:48

1 Cambridge. And I would say that the 21:42:55
2 reapportioning of density at the sites makes the 21:42:57
3 plan better. And the new open space and the 21:42:59
4 retail square both make the plan better, too. 21:43:03
5 The idea of having some parking above grade 21:43:08
6 alarmed me, first of all. But I think along the 21:43:12
7 train tracks and along the underside of the 21:43:15
8 Gilmore Bridge, it makes perfect sense. 21:43:18
9 Two things that intrigued me are where 21:43:21
10 West Boulevard goes. I for a long time thought 21:43:26
11 that, in the long term, a connection to 21:43:28
12 Somerville would be great. It would make not the 21:43:34
13 whole of NorthPoint going a cul-de-sac. It would 21:43:35
14 make it a much more integrated part of the two 21:43:39
15 cities. City planning doesn't stop at the wiggly 21:43:40
16 line. 21:43:43
17 And secondly, the twin big pipes that go 21:43:44
18 out to the canal, I believe all we need to do is 21:43:49
19 knock out a few concrete blocks, and the water 21:43:54
20 system would begin to work. The water garden at 21:43:57
21 the moment is jammed up and doesn't work 21:44:00

1 properly. So I would like them to consider that. 21:44:03

2 But everything I have seen and heard over 21:44:07

3 the last year has just been positive, and a model 21:44:10

4 for how things ought to work in this kind of 21:44:16

5 process. 21:44:17

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:44:20

7 The next speaker is Charlie Marquardt. 21:44:21

8 CHARLIE MARQUARDT: Hi. Charlie 21:44:25

9 Marquardt. 10 Rogers Street. That is 21:44:32

10 M-A-R-Q-U-A-R-D-T. 21:44:33

11 I am just going to try to stick to the 21:44:33

12 zoning. Chris has said some really good things 21:44:39

13 about what they have done. They have come back 21:44:40

14 to us numerous times, both during the T proposal 21:44:43

15 and process, as well as discussing the plans with 21:44:44

16 us, which I think has boded well for how we are 21:44:47

17 moving forward. 21:44:51

18 So I am going to touch on two different 21:44:52

19 pieces. One is the request for additional 21:44:53

20 height. And Roger and I had a chance to talk 21:44:55

21 about height during one of the Kendall Square 21:44:57

1 things. And this and Kendall Square might be the 21:44:57
2 two places in the city we can put really tall 21:45:03
3 buildings. 21:45:05

4 Tall actually doesn't bother me. I like 21:45:05
5 tall. And live on the 11th floor. I wouldn't 21:45:08
6 mind living on the 41st floor. 21:45:11

7 And in terms of getting the parks, that 21:45:13
8 is the tradeoff for the parks: Tall, thin 21:45:15
9 buildings, which I think is much nicer than a 21:45:18
10 wall of 150-foot buildings that you can't see 21:45:22
11 through. So 220, 240, that doesn't really bother 21:45:23
12 me. This one is case where Roger and I actually 21:45:28
13 agree on, the height, which I like. 21:45:31

14 The second is with regard to the parking. 21:45:33
15 And putting the parking above grade, it does a 21:45:36
16 couple of things. It makes it more economical to 21:45:40
17 build the building, so you can get started right 21:45:42
18 now. It makes it so that you can actually put 21:45:44
19 something in there that works. I don't want to 21:45:46
20 live underneath the bridge. There is trolls, and 21:45:49
21 those folks can do that. It actually matches 21:45:53

1 what is across the street. If you look at 21:45:53
2 Regatta Riverview, their parking is right up 21:45:53
3 abutting it. It is basically the same approach. 21:46:03
4 I don't think it is really a problem to me. 21:46:03
5 Not increasing the FAR is, I think, in 21:46:06
6 keeping, are trying to encourage different uses 21:46:09
7 of the property. I really would like to see us 21:46:11
8 get this moving forward that so two things: One, 21:46:14
9 I want to see that bridge built, so we have more 21:46:16
10 people going up and down, maybe more people take 21:46:18
11 their feet rather than taking their cars, so we 21:46:22
12 can help with the Regatta and the Museum Way 21:46:24
13 approach. 21:46:28
14 And second, I think for the entire 21:46:29
15 project, that having a number of cranes starting 21:46:32
16 to pop up will be emotionally and psychologically 21:46:36
17 uplifting. We have gone through almost a decade 21:46:40
18 of pretty much nothing that is going on over 21:46:44
19 there, and a lot of distrust and distaste. I 21:46:46
20 think showing some cranes in the air, whether it 21:46:46
21 be the 22 Water Street project or the Erikson II 21:46:46

1 project or N -- I really think we need to start 21:46:57
2 putting some names on them now -- N would be 21:46:59
3 great. So I think moving this forward and 21:47:02
4 getting it done in 2012 rather than 2016 would be 21:47:04
5 awesome. Thank you. 21:47:08

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:47:09

7 Does anyone else wish to speak? 21:47:11

8 CHRIS KANE: Good evening. My name is 21:47:14
9 Chris Kaneb, K-A-N-E-B. 7 Lincoln Lane, and also 21:47:27
10 the Catamount Holdings at 22 Water Street, which 21:47:36
11 we have been in front of the board several times 21:47:36
12 before. 21:47:39

13 Catamount has been working very 21:47:40
14 cooperatively with HYM over the past year on the 21:47:42
15 multi-use path, along with other issues that 21:47:46
16 affect both of our properties. And it has been a 21:47:52
17 very productive relationship. We have also gone 21:47:56
18 over the proposed changes. And I think what has 21:47:59
19 been presented tonight is an improvement to 21:48:03
20 NorthPoint, and we support the changes that have 21:48:06
21 been recommended. 21:48:09

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:48:11

2 AHMED NUR: Who do you represent? 21:48:12

3 CHRIS KANEB: Catamount Holdings, 22 21:48:14

4 Water Street. 21:48:17

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:48:17

6 Does anyone else wish to speak? 21:48:18

7 BARBARA BROUSSARD: Good evening. 21:48:24

8 Barbara Broussard. I will speak as president of 21:48:30

9 the East Cambridge planning team. It is a 21:48:33

10 pleasure to be able to say we have an excellent 21:48:36

11 working relationship with HYM. We don't always 21:48:38

12 have that with every developer. They have really 21:48:42

13 listened to the community. Many of the members 21:48:45

14 who have been members of this organization longer 21:48:48

15 than I have were very pleased to see that 21:48:51

16 something was going on in NorthPoint. And they 21:48:53

17 weren't afraid of the heights. They didn't worry 21:48:57

18 about that. They were glad they there would be a 21:49:00

19 little bit more open space instead of having the 21:49:03

20 large blocks of buildings. And they liked the 21:49:06

21 idea of that possible market, and the parking 21:49:11

1 didn't bother them where it was. And we are 21:49:13
2 working very hard with Museum Towers across the 21:49:17
3 way, under the bridge, to get some of that open 21:49:20
4 land to be used as a public garden. We are 21:49:23
5 working with DCR. So that will be pleasurable 21:49:23
6 for that whole area. 21:49:28

7 And I thank you, and we thoroughly 21:49:29
8 support them. 21:49:31

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:49:39

10 CAROL BELLEW: Carol Bellew, treasurer 21:49:39
11 for the East Cambridge planning team. Carol 21:49:39
12 Bellew, B-E-L-L-E-W. 257 Charles Street. 21:49:51

13 We have to say that HYM has been a real 21:49:51
14 joy to work with, in comparison to others. And 21:49:55
15 we are in total support of what they are doing. 21:49:59
16 And we love to see that NorthPoint is actually 21:50:01
17 moving along now. It has been so many years. So 21:50:04
18 we are all on the same team at this point. 21:50:07

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 21:50:10

20 Done anyone else wish to speak? 21:50:13

21 (Pause.) 21:50:13

1 So that is not part of the zoning? 21:51:48

2 TOM O'BRIEN: That is correct. So to me, 21:51:50
3 there is three broad steps. The first is the 21:51:53
4 zoning process that is under way right now, to 21:51:56
5 effect the envelope and the parking. The second 21:51:57
6 will be a specific design review process that we 21:52:00
7 will be engaged in. And then over time, as we do 21:52:07
8 that, we will also work with you, essentially on 21:52:09
9 the PUD, on those sorts of issues, which I think 21:52:11
10 requires a lot of work with Roger and everybody. 21:52:14
11 There is a lot of taking the base of what was 21:52:17
12 done before and taking that to today. 21:52:19

13 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. If I could just add 21:52:23
14 to that, the zoning does have a 60/40, more or 21:52:26
15 less, split for residential over commercial. And 21:52:30
16 this goes way to back to when we were doing the 21:52:32
17 zoning and traffic limitations were key things 21:52:36
18 that set up those parameters. 21:52:39

19 But the board does have a lot of 21:52:41
20 discretion about where the uses go. The 21:52:44
21 proponent does have to check in with the board 21:52:48

1 whenever they want to make changes. And if you 21:52:50
2 remember, when the previous partnership was 21:52:52
3 having its problems, they had actually come in 21:52:55
4 and had gotten approval for a change in uses on 21:52:57
5 the block. That never got completely 21:53:02
6 memorialized into the special permit. 21:53:06

7 So part of what is going to need to 21:53:09
8 happen, assuming this zoning goes forward, is 21:53:09
9 bringing the permit back up to date, not only in 21:53:12
10 relation to whatever changes happen in zoning, 21:53:18
11 but also just in light of the fact that the T 21:53:20
12 station is quite different from the way it was in 21:53:24
13 the previously-approved plan, and so forth. 21:53:26

14 So we will need to do a lot of work on 21:53:29
15 that, once the zoning gets through, and be back 21:53:31
16 to the board for amendments that basically bring 21:53:34
17 that all up to where it should be. 21:53:39

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you. 21:53:42

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess it kind of 21:53:44
20 relates to your question, which is, what are you 21:53:47
21 asking for? And what do you need to ask for now, 21:53:49

1 versus, particularly, in light of the fact that 21:53:52
2 we seem to be a crunched in terms of timing 21:53:55
3 relative to, at least, summer City Council 21:53:59
4 action. 21:54:01

5 And all of these things, I think, a lot 21:54:02
6 of the directions you are moving in, I am 21:54:06
7 favorable to. I am mindful of the fact that this 21:54:11
8 is another project where we seem to have the 21:54:16
9 least amount of time to think about it than 21:54:18
10 almost everybody else in the process. I love the 21:54:22
11 fact that the neighbors are meeting, and you are 21:54:23
12 meeting with the city and staff, but I get 21:54:25
13 frustrated when it comes to the board, and we 21:54:28
14 don't have time to just think about what we are 21:54:32
15 doing. 21:54:34

16 But in this case, I mean, we just need to 21:54:34
17 separate what are you doing zoning-wise, and how 21:54:38
18 does that affect what you are going to be doing 21:54:41
19 or bringing before us, and what are the things 21:54:44
20 that you will be bringing to us in terms of just 21:54:46
21 review? And then what are the things that you 21:54:49

1 need to have the zoning changed so that you can 21:54:51
2 do this? Because looking at a lot of the broad 21:54:53
3 stuff you are doing there, we seem to have plenty 21:54:56
4 of time to sort some of this out, but I just want 21:54:59
5 to get a strong sense of, as far as the zoning, 21:55:01
6 what is it that you are specifically asking for. 21:55:06

7 HUGH RUSSELL: So let me try answer this, 21:55:09
8 as I understand it, and you can tell me if I am 21:55:11
9 wrong or right. 21:55:13

10 In order to proceed with parcel N, which 21:55:15
11 they want to do immediately, they need to have 21:55:20
12 the parking rules changed. In order to sort of 21:55:22
13 generally proceed with the planning, the height 21:55:26
14 changes come into effect. 21:55:30

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: When you say "planning," 21:55:34
16 what does that mean? 21:55:35

17 HUGH RUSSELL: It means deciding what 21:55:37
18 they are going to do with each particular parcel, 21:55:40
19 and marketing the parcels, moving forward on the 21:55:41
20 blocks. 21:55:45

21 Now that sets the parameters for the 21:55:45

1 planning process, and changes it slightly. And 21:55:50
2 basically, as I see that, it is removing seven 21:55:54
3 stories of building out of some of the spaces 21:56:00
4 that are now shown as green, and in five places 21:56:03
5 we are putting on top of buildings that were 21:56:10
6 already contemplated. It is almost that simple. 21:56:11

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: That is a very simple. 21:56:16

8 But for me, it gives me a very different 21:56:17
9 feeling place, which I think I just need to think 21:56:21
10 about. I mean, in my mind, it is a simplicity 21:56:24
11 that -- it is simple. And I understand what they 21:56:31
12 are trying to do, and I am actually, I think, 21:56:33
13 positive to each one of those. But I am just not 21:56:37
14 quite sure -- it is very different. To me, it 21:56:39
15 has a different feeling between that and the 21:56:43
16 retail space, which obviously has some good 21:56:45
17 points too. It is different. 21:56:48

18 So I just want to separate the planning 21:56:49
19 things that we would do and we would do anyway, 21:56:52
20 as part of this, from just what we are being 21:56:54
21 asked to do this very night. For instance, the 21:56:57

1 parcel N, your first one, which it makes very 21:57:01
2 clear to me that in order to do that parcel, it 21:57:04
3 makes sense, and given the understanding -- I did 21:57:07
4 have a question, which is, I understand the 21:57:09
5 under-bridge piece. But your diagram shows much 21:57:14
6 more than just under-the-bridge piece, so I just 21:57:18
7 wanted to make sure I clearly understood. 21:57:20

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Most of that was already 21:57:23
9 in the zoning. 21:57:25

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, if it is in the 21:57:28
11 zoning, I don't need to deal with it. Sorry. 21:57:30
12 But I am just trying to understand this. That is 21:57:32
13 all. In lot of ways, you gave us a lot. But I 21:57:34
14 am trying to understand. If we didn't have this 21:57:37
15 time pressure or limit or whatever we have -- and 21:57:39
16 I understand the need to be a pressure or limit. 21:57:43
17 It is our choice. But if we didn't have that, I 21:57:47
18 think this would be a lot -- I would go into it a 21:57:48
19 lot more smoothly. 21:57:53

20 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I would say, 21:57:54
21 particularly on the height we are actually going 21:57:56

1 to dig into that on the PUD update. This allows 21:58:00
2 them to bring a PUD plan that is a little 21:58:07
3 different, in terms of the volume on the 21:58:09
4 particular parcels. We are not obligated to 21:58:12
5 approve a PUD plan until we examine it. 21:58:18

6 And on the height, I want to just make 21:58:24
7 one other comment. The transformation diagram, 21:58:27
8 the video, it was strange that we got all done, 21:58:33
9 and it didn't look any more intense. It was a 21:58:40
10 little different, the way things were going. But 21:58:46
11 it wasn't a change in the general quality. 21:58:49

12 And I guess in discussing height and 21:58:53
13 Kendall Square, I have sort of realized that in 21:58:57
14 some sense, what happens up at above 150 feet is 21:59:03
15 sometimes not very important. 150 feet is a lot 21:59:10
16 of height. And so to occasionally go up higher, 21:59:16
17 if it is done in the right places for the right 21:59:20
18 reasons, doesn't have much impact; although it 21:59:23
19 does have impact on the economics, and it does 21:59:26
20 have impact on the marketability. 21:59:29

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think we can disagree 21:59:33

1 on that, but I don't disagree heavily. But I 21:59:34
2 mean, I think that it does matter. With the 21:59:37
3 transition I saw, again, I didn't have a big 21:59:40
4 issue with it. I just want to understand it. I 21:59:43
5 think, for me, I just want to make sure, as a 21:59:45
6 planning board member, I understand what it is I 21:59:47
7 am doing. 21:59:51

8 So just again, getting back, so we are 21:59:51
9 basically saying that in order for them to do 21:59:54
10 their planning and to present -- basically, these 21:59:57
11 are changes which allow a flexibility on how they 22:00:00
12 manipulate the pieces, but we are not approving 22:00:06
13 any specifics about how that piece works. And 22:00:09
14 the big change is going from two to seven 22:00:12
15 buildings where the height can be 220 feet, and 22:00:16
16 this particular parking piece. 22:00:21

17 And just again, for me to better 22:00:25
18 understand it, because, again, this brown area 22:00:28
19 there in Cambridge is pretty; I mean, what is the 22:00:35
20 effect of that change? Obviously, I know you are 22:00:40
21 not going to build under the bridge. But what is 22:00:42

1 the effect in terms of what you can do FAR-wise 22:00:45
2 or what you can do to the height or whatever? 22:00:49

3 TOM O'BRIEN: Above-grade parking on the 22:00:52
4 edges of the site is allowed all the way across. 22:00:54
5 So above-grade parking can be built today, under 22:00:57
6 the zoning, in this reddish brownish area. 22:01:02

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Is it included in the 22:01:05
8 FAR? 22:01:07

9 TOM O'BRIEN: However, in this blue 22:01:08
10 section, it is clearly not included in the FAR. 22:01:10
11 But it is only along the Somerville border that 22:01:14
12 the zoning contemplates that. We are not sure 22:01:17
13 nobody -- I don't think anybody really remembers 22:01:21
14 why it stopped here. But our suggestion is, all 22:01:24
15 of this same planning principles -- the railroad 22:01:26
16 is on the other side, the bridge is a pretty 22:01:28
17 tough area -- all the same planning principles 22:01:31
18 apply. And so our suggestion is that this should 22:01:33
19 really be continued, and that the blue should be 22:01:37
20 the same treatment all the way across. 22:01:41

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for those of us who 22:01:44

1 were here at the time, do we remember? I think 22:01:47
2 one of the reasons why -- and I could be wrong, 22:01:48
3 or help me here. I think one of the reasons was 22:01:51
4 because it was acting as a buffer and up high. 22:01:53
5 We didn't feel we wanted to in any kind of way 22:01:57
6 limit or penalize in the zoning that -- and 22:02:00
7 again, Roger, help me. As it comes around, is 22:02:05
8 that a similar issue? 22:02:08

9 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I think it is. And 22:02:10
10 in fact, you know, it was definitely thought to 22:02:12
11 be a buffer. And we hadn't thought as much 22:02:15
12 about, frankly, the character of the Gilmore 22:02:17
13 Bridge. And I think we have learned a lot. 22:02:21

14 And as one of the speakers said, it does 22:02:22
15 sometimes help to have time sometimes to work 22:02:25
16 these things out and think them through. And so 22:02:26
17 I think what they are doing at the Gilmore Bridge 22:02:29
18 is kind of brilliant, compared to what we had 22:02:32
19 before, and really actually having that serious 22:02:35
20 connection that makes the Orange Line a part of 22:02:39
21 this. We had always talked about it before and, 22:02:41

1 if you remember, we had some scenes -- 22:02:43

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: We did talk about that as 22:02:46

3 a concept. 22:02:47

4 ROGER BOOTHE: We did talk about it. And 22:02:47

5 there were sketches in the original submission 22:02:51

6 that showed short of a little plaza. 22:02:51

7 But it was kind of fuzzy. This has 22:02:53

8 gotten a lot more specific. And I think you 22:02:55

9 can -- here there is a commitment to seeing that 22:02:58

10 Spanish Steps, that they are embracing the idea 22:03:01

11 of retail and livening that, and making that a 22:03:05

12 very important connection. I think that is all 22:03:09

13 pretty great. 22:03:12

14 So I would try to allay your fears, Bill. 22:03:14

15 You are going to have a lot of meetings with 22:03:16

16 these people, trying to work out a lot of these 22:03:18

17 details. What is being asked right now is just 22:03:21

18 allowing these, what I see, as a great series of 22:03:23

19 changes to happen, and they can't happen without 22:03:29

20 these zone changes. Some of them could happen 22:03:32

21 through just coming back to you with changes to 22:03:35

1 the master plan. 22:03:36

2 But I think the fundamentals about 22:03:37

3 shifting the height around are pretty critical. 22:03:39

4 And I wouldn't be supporting it if they weren't 22:03:43

5 doing it with the addition of two acres of open 22:03:45

6 space, and we also getting the slender floor 22:03:49

7 plates near the park. So I think there is going 22:03:53

8 to be a lot of time for you to peruse the 22:03:56

9 details. 22:03:59

10 And just the fact is that several of 22:03:59

11 those buildings are not all in Cambridge. There 22:04:03

12 are going to be other people having input. So 22:04:05

13 whatever they are showing tonight is going to 22:04:08

14 evolve. We still have 20 of the 25 years left, 22:04:10

15 or however many it is. And depending on how 22:04:12

16 rapidly things come into the marketplace, and 22:04:12

17 depending on what the issues are in neighborhood 22:04:12

18 communities, there is going to be a lot of fine 22:04:21

19 tuning and changes around of these things. But I 22:04:23

20 think the critical thing right now is to allow 22:04:25

21 this flexibility, to sort of help breathe new 22:04:29

1 life in the plan, I would say. 22:04:33

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, we are talking 22:04:35

3 about height and allowing it in more places, and 22:04:36

4 we are talking about the parking change. 22:04:39

5 What about the road? 22:04:40

6 HUGH RUSSELL: That would be PUD change. 22:04:46

7 ROGER BOOTHE: Right. 22:04:51

8 HUGH RUSSELL: I think you have to 22:04:52

9 appreciate, even though it is ten o'clock at 22:04:55

10 night, the fact that they have laid it out, put 22:04:58

11 it all in context for us. 22:05:00

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: No. I have no problem 22:05:03

13 there. Again, I just wanted to get it very clear 22:05:04

14 as to what are the things we are being asked to 22:05:06

15 do. That is all. So far, you have answered my 22:05:09

16 question. 22:05:13

17 H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a follow-up 22:05:15

18 question for Roger. 22:05:15

19 I like this. But obviously, changing the 22:05:18

20 parking to allow it -- to be exempt from the FAR 22:05:22

21 requirement must have an impact on the total 22:05:28

1 square footage of what can be built ultimately. 22:05:33

2 And do you know what that is? 22:05:37

3 ROGER BOOTHE: I do not. 22:05:41

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So it really depends on 22:05:45

5 where it is being built. So it is clear you are 22:05:48

6 going to see more stuff above grade. And the 22:05:52

7 amount of stuff is, by the width of the parking 22:05:55

8 van by the length of the site, times two stories. 22:06:03

9 ROGER BOOTHE: But they could have built 22:06:04

10 it above grade. It is a question of whether it 22:06:06

11 counts as floor area. 22:06:08

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 22:06:11

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So we are going to 22:06:12

14 see more bulk on those sites by allowing more 22:06:15

15 bulk to be built. It is not an enormous amount, 22:06:19

16 because it is only part of the site, any one of 22:06:27

17 the sites. So it is like we are allowing an 22:06:31

18 extra lower floor, maybe one and a quarter or 22:06:34

19 maybe one and a half floors. 22:06:39

20 ROGER BOOTHE: Something like that. 22:06:41

21 HUGH RUSSELL: And again, on the Gilmore 22:06:41

1 Bridge, you want them to get up to the bridge 22:06:44
2 level. 22:06:47

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, it is just I am 22:06:50
4 just trying to be -- for every zoning thing we 22:06:52
5 do, we have a comparison of existing and proposed 22:06:56
6 and what the changes are. And we are kind of 22:06:59
7 left on this one to do what you are doing, which 22:07:04
8 is come up with our own mental images of 22:07:06
9 existing, two new buildings, 220; now we want 22:07:09
10 seven. And in my mind, okay, that allows for 22:07:12
11 flexibility. 22:07:17

12 Existing? This parking change, existing 22:07:18
13 bulk or gross square feet that is actually part 22:07:26
14 of their FSA is this. And then I can say like, 22:07:29
15 oh, yes, that is not a small thing. 22:07:32

16 So I guess I just don't want us to 22:07:34
17 feel -- these are relatively simple things. And 22:07:38
18 you are kind of -- this is more our deliberation 22:07:41
19 than yours, at this point because, as I said, I 22:07:46
20 think a lot of the things you are doing, I 22:07:49
21 applaud you on. But I just wanted to make 22:07:51

1 sure -- I just always feel frustrated when I feel 22:07:55
2 like I am -- they can do better just to 22:07:56
3 understand the simple things. 22:08:00

4 And a lot of times on zoning stuff we 22:08:02
5 actually do very consciously say, This is what 22:08:04
6 the relief is, the change they are doing. And 22:08:07
7 this is what that is. And if it is turns out 22:08:10
8 that it isn't big of a deal, that is okay. I 22:08:13
9 just don't want to be in the process where we 22:08:15
10 each all individually are kind of doing guessing 22:08:17
11 games as to what that is, just because of the 22:08:19
12 process we have. And maybe I am, you know, just 22:08:22
13 overreacting to this; but that is it. 22:08:27

14 PAMELA WINTERS: I think it is very 22:08:31
15 specific what they want tonight and what they 22:08:32
16 stated and how Hugh clarified. So I feel 22:08:35
17 comfortable in knowing exactly what you are 22:08:40
18 asking for. 22:08:43

19 HUGH RUSSELL: I have one other comment. 22:08:46
20 My biggest criticism of the original plan 22:08:52
21 was the character of what was then called North 22:08:55

1 Street, and now I can't read the name of it. 22:08:58

2 TOM O'BRIEN: North Street on this side? 22:09:03

3 HUGH RUSSELL: The next street over. 22:09:05

4 TOM O'BRIEN: Dawes Street, D-A-W-E-S. 22:09:07

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Because it was lined with 22:09:10

6 relatively large buildings and very little 22:09:15

7 relief, and that there were two or three places 22:09:19

8 where open space connected in. 22:09:22

9 So this is really, to me, addressing the 22:09:25

10 character of that street in two profound ways. 22:09:29

11 One is to add the open space and enhance the 22:09:33

12 connections. And secondly, to take blocks D, E, 22:09:38

13 and F, or E and F, whichever, and make them into 22:09:46

14 commercial blocks, which makes much more sense to 22:09:50

15 me. E and F. So that. 22:09:51

16 And the street, then, in this diagram 22:09:59

17 widens out at the end, because some of the open 22:10:01

18 space is actually set back for the G building and 22:10:04

19 the F building. So those are, I think, real 22:10:08

20 changes to what -- the project is getting a lot 22:10:13

21 out of that. 22:10:18

1 PAMELA WINTERS: I think Ken Greenberg 22:10:23
2 would approve. 22:10:25

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: I would not care to guess 22:10:26
4 what he would think about that one. 22:10:30

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: He wouldn't have a 22:10:33
6 problem. 22:10:34

7 HUGH RUSSELL: He wouldn't be coming here 22:10:35
8 saying, "Wait a minute. You have ruined it." 22:10:37
9 This is within the framework of planning. And 22:10:40
10 one hopes he would say, "You know, I wish we 22:10:43
11 could have done that, or I could have convinced 22:10:46
12 them do to do that 10 years ago." 22:10:49

13 We don't know what went on 10 or 12 years 22:10:52
14 ago, 10 years ago. Maybe Phil Kingman knows that 22:10:57
15 history, but I am not going to ask him. 22:11:03

16 Other comments today? 22:11:09

17 H. THEODORE COHEN: I was not involved in 22:11:11
18 the earlier process, and I have been standing a 22:11:13
19 lot of time at NorthPoint and then taking people 22:11:18
20 around it. And I think this is really great. 22:11:20
21 Because the big problem when you go there is, you 22:11:25

1 have got this gorgeous park, and then you see the 22:11:30
2 highway and you see the gravel plant. And the 22:11:32
3 idea of residences being butted up against them 22:11:37
4 doesn't seem great to me. The idea of bringing 22:11:41
5 them back towards the park and then allowing them 22:11:43
6 to be taller, which this is certainly an area 22:11:47
7 where we can grow taller, so they will actually 22:11:50
8 be looking out beyond the highway and beyond 22:11:54
9 things, and then putting the commercial, butting 22:11:58
10 it up against the highway, I think is a better 22:12:00
11 use of the whole property. 22:12:04

12 And I think the idea of the smaller floor 22:12:07
13 plates and larger green space will make the whole 22:12:12
14 thing better. I think what we are being asked to 22:12:17
15 do here makes a lot of sense in the terms of 22:12:24
16 allowing them the flexibility and in the terms 22:12:27
17 of -- it just allows it to be flexible and, 22:12:29
18 obviously, have to come back to us or some future 22:12:35
19 Planning Board at some point to get approval for 22:12:39
20 the various buildings. 22:12:43

21 And it seems to me, actually some of us 22:12:45

1 were complaining about the new second building at 22:12:47
2 Archstone, that it wasn't tall enough. So I 22:12:52
3 think the concept of having this variety of 22:12:54
4 heights and variety of taller buildings makes a 22:12:59
5 lot of sense in this area. I have a lot of 22:13:03
6 questions about whether you are ever going to get 22:13:05
7 pedestrians walking across O'Brien Boulevard. 22:13:07
8 But the idea of a market and the idea of a retail 22:13:12
9 space, wherever they may end up -- and it seems 22:13:17
10 to me, yes, you are going to get things 22:13:20
11 potentially successfully on the, I guess, the 22:13:23
12 north side of O'Brien. I don't know if you are 22:13:26
13 going to get that many people shopping across it 22:13:29
14 back and forth, but that is for another day. 22:13:32
15 HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed? 22:13:39
16 AHMED NUR: I will be pretty quick. It 22:13:39
17 is getting late. 22:13:43
18 I wanted to applaud, first, the hard work 22:13:47
19 in getting along with the East Cambridge 22:13:48
20 community. I haven't been here a very long time, 22:13:50
21 but I haven't seem them so happy. This is great. 22:13:56

1 And we would request some more details in 22:13:56
2 the future, I suppose, to the park. I do like 22:14:00
3 the NorthPoint park. We go there for birthdays 22:14:03
4 and other things. With all the residentials 22:14:07
5 coming up, I see that you have a sufficient 22:14:09
6 amount of open space, but I wonder if it would 22:14:11
7 redouble what is there at NorthPoint, in terms of 22:14:15
8 landscape, flowers, and playgrounds and so on and 22:14:19
9 so forth. 22:14:23

10 And then the other question that I had 22:14:25
11 was a little more detailed on the park under the 22:14:27
12 bridge. I wondered what the height is. Are you 22:14:31
13 looking at open space above ground, one-level 22:14:33
14 parking? Or I see something about 25 feet. Is 22:14:38
15 it going to be a ramp going up closer to under 22:14:41
16 the bridge? 22:14:44

17 Those are the only questions. And I am 22:14:46
18 very in support of this. Matter of fact, if I 22:14:49
19 had to make a decision tonight, I am in favor of 22:14:51
20 this. 22:14:55

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think you are being 22:14:57

1 asked to. 22:14:58

2 HUGH RUSSELL: I think the plan on the 22:14:59

3 bridge is, they are not planning to put 22:15:00

4 structures under the bridge. 22:15:03

5 AHMED NUR: To pave it. Yes. 22:15:06

6 TOM O'BRIEN: So this is the first floor. 22:15:08

7 The parking entrance would be here. The bridge 22:15:09

8 is along this edge here. The parking areas would 22:15:10

9 be under the bridge. This is the first floor at 22:15:13

10 grade. The difference between the Gilmore Bridge 22:15:16

11 and grade is about 30 to 40 feet. It is 22:15:23

12 different as the bridge goes along. 22:15:25

13 AHMED NUR: I see. 22:15:28

14 TOM O'BRIEN: So there is room in there 22:15:28

15 to put approximately three stories of above-grade 22:15:30

16 parking, all of which would be wrapped with a 22:15:33

17 first floor of retail, entrances, second and 22:15:35

18 third floor residential units, and capped on top. 22:15:37

19 AHMED NUR: I wasn't even asking you to 22:15:47

20 answer the question now. I was just putting them 22:15:49

21 out there for a comment for the next time around, 22:15:51

1 since we are short on time. Thank you. 22:15:53

2 One other thing for the staff, I would 22:15:53

3 request building U, the representative from 22:15:55

4 building U as an abutter. This is a public 22:15:58

5 hearing, so I would assume that they were 22:16:02

6 notified of the hearing, as well as building T 22:16:05

7 and S. Thank you. 22:16:07

8 STEVEN WINTER: I concur with my 22:16:09

9 colleague. This is a very, very creative, but 22:16:15

10 also very, very thoughtful urban planning. And 22:16:17

11 it is coordinated. It works very, very well. 22:16:20

12 The only comment that I would have for 22:16:22

13 the proponent, that is that you clearly have 22:16:24

14 created public engagement that is successful. I 22:16:28

15 would encourage you to open a dialogue with the 22:16:28

16 folks at Museum Way, just to make sure you 22:16:37

17 understand their priorities. 22:16:37

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Mr. Chair, it is 22:16:41

19 getting later, even for this NorthPoint garden 22:16:42

20 party that everybody seems to be enjoying. 22:16:47

21 Can we move on to a favorable 22:16:51

1 recommendation to the counsel on the zoning 22:16:54
2 change? 22:16:57

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Is that a motion? 22:16:58

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: That is a motion. 22:17:00

5 AHMED NUR: Second that. 22:17:01

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Decision on the motion? 22:17:03

7 Okay. All those in favor? 22:17:07

8 (Show of hands.) 22:17:13

9 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in 22:17:13
10 favor. Thank you very much. 22:17:15

11 (Recess taken at 10:17 p.m.) 22:23:26

12 (Recess ended at 10:23 p.m.) 22:23:33

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Let's proceed on. 22:27:02

14 The board is going to be discussing case 22:27:05
15 Planning Board 26, 125 CambridgePark Drive; 22:27:11
16 Planning Board 47, 150 CambridgePark Drive; 22:27:18
17 Planning Board 270, 125, 150, 180 and 180R 22:27:22
18 CambridgePark Drive, the property located at 125, 22:27:28
19 150, 180 and 180R CambridgePark Drive. 22:27:30

20 And this is a public hearing that we 22:27:33
21 began before. And we are still in the midst of 22:27:41

1 the public hearing. I anticipate tonight there 22:27:45
2 will be perhaps some more testimony from the 22:27:49
3 proponent -- we have received a little bit of 22:27:54
4 additional information -- then asking any 22:27:57
5 questions we want to ask, to make sure we 22:28:01
6 understand what is before us, and then go to a 22:28:04
7 public testimony. Hopefully, that can be 22:28:07
8 concluded rapidly, because I don't think there is 22:28:11
9 any changes. 22:28:14

10 The testimony, we will request people who 22:28:15
11 were testifying to limit their comments to the 22:28:17
12 changes that are being presented tonight, rather 22:28:22
13 than to reopen the entire discussion of the case. 22:28:26
14 And we will discuss it, and try to do so in about 22:28:32
15 seven minutes. 22:28:36

16 RICHARD MCKINNON: Mr. Chairman, just to 22:28:36
17 let you know, we have distributed the written 22:28:36
18 answers that we told you we would, so we will sit 22:28:44
19 down. 22:28:49

20 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Is there something 22:28:55
21 in additional to the document that has "May 8th" 22:28:56

1 on it? 22:28:58

2 DEBBIE HORWITZ: No. That is all. 22:29:00

3 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay. Thank you. 22:29:03

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So therefore, the new 22:29:05

5 information is information that came to us 22:29:08

6 May 8th. So that information basically is that 22:29:12

7 they have met with Pfizer and Becknell, and there 22:29:29

8 is no changes to the plan as a result of those 22:29:38

9 conversations. They have changed the bicycle 22:29:41

10 ratio from one to two; one bicycle for two units 22:29:48

11 to one bicycle for one unit. And they have, I 22:29:53

12 think, clarified what they are doing with regard 22:29:57

13 to part of their project, to help study the 22:30:02

14 connection between the quadrangle and the 22:30:07

15 triangle. They are going to contribute up to 22:30:13

16 \$175,000 to half of the cost that will be a 22:30:18

17 feasibility study for that connection. And they 22:30:23

18 will cooperate with the City to provide a 22:30:25

19 landing. And they have illustrated that 22:30:30

20 cooperation by showing three possible alignments, 22:30:36

21 how it might land at different parts of the 22:30:39

1 overall parcels that are in involved in this. 22:30:44

2 Sometimes some of them come to the housing 22:30:50

3 parcels; some come off the parking lots behind 22:30:54

4 the office parcels. 22:30:57

5 So that is sort of what is new. Basics 22:30:59

6 of the project haven't changed. 22:31:04

7 So are there questions from the board on 22:31:06

8 these new pieces? 22:31:08

9 (No voice heard.) 22:31:11

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Then we would open up the 22:31:12

11 hearing for comment on this changes for the 22:31:14

12 public. 22:31:16

13 Who would like to speak? James had his 22:31:17

14 hand up first. 22:31:22

15 JAMES WILLIAMSON: So my name is James 22:31:23

16 Williamson. I live at 1000 Jackson Place in 22:31:32

17 Cambridge. So I haven't had a chance to read the 22:31:35

18 document that I was just handed. So I will do my 22:31:40

19 best. In just a quick glance at the three 22:31:45

20 options for a bike bridge, I right away like the 22:31:48

21 one that is shortest and straight across. It 22:31:53

1 just seems to be a cleaner solution, and it has 22:31:58
2 the advantage of, if I understand the 150 parcel, 22:32:03
3 that is the parcel that we talking about, it has 22:32:06
4 the advantage of going directly to the 22:32:10
5 residential building as proposed. 22:32:11

6 It is a big building. I was out there 22:32:13
7 the other day. I got stuck on the wrong side of 22:32:16
8 where the basin work is being done, so I walked 22:32:19
9 down the length of CambridgePark Drive mistakenly 22:32:22
10 and did get a look at the area. It is mostly 22:32:25
11 just a giant office park. If it works for people 22:32:28
12 who want to live there, you know, I am fine with 22:32:31
13 that. 22:32:34

14 My concern, just to reiterate very 22:32:35
15 briefly, has to do with transportation issues as 22:32:38
16 they may impact others in the area. And that 22:32:40
17 would be issues having to do with the viability 22:32:44
18 of the Red Line, which is still not working 22:32:48
19 properly after a suspension of weekend service 22:32:50
20 for five months to do repairs. I take the Red 22:32:54
21 Line every day from Alewife for the last five 22:32:58

1 years, and still the trains are moving in and out 22:33:01
2 of Alewife at a very slow pace because of some 22:33:04
3 issues with the tracks there. And I think that 22:33:07
4 it is not up to the developers to address that, 22:33:12
5 but it is up to all of us to think about how that 22:33:15
6 can be addressed in the context of major new 22:33:18
7 impacts. 22:33:22

8 And the other issue is, I am all for 22:33:22
9 people riding bikes, as I said the last time, and 22:33:27
10 I am just going to reiterate briefly. If people 22:33:29
11 are going to be riding bikes, they are going to 22:33:32
12 be riding their bikes down the Minuteman bikeway, 22:33:35
13 presumably, mostly, if they don't take that 22:33:38
14 bridge and go down Concord Ave., which would 22:33:40
15 relieve some of the pressure, and that would be a 22:33:43
16 good thing in that respect. 22:33:45

17 There is a serious problem along that 22:33:47
18 shared pedestrian and bike path from the back of 22:33:50
19 the headhouse to the Red Line heading toward 22:33:55
20 Russell Field, where people on bikes just race 22:33:58
21 along there at very high speeds, completely 22:34:01

1 ignoring signs that have been put up that say 22:34:04
2 "Yield to peds," if anybody even understands what 22:34:06
3 that means. And there is also a flooding issue 22:34:09
4 when there is heavy rain. There is flooding from 22:34:12
5 Gerry's Pit that completely covers that path for 22:34:18
6 both pedestrians and people riding their bikes. 22:34:19
7 Again, this is not something for the 22:34:22
8 people who are building this building or want it 22:34:24
9 approved to have to address. But it is something 22:34:26
10 that I hope we can find a way to factor into how 22:34:29
11 the transportation, including bicycle riding and 22:34:33
12 pedestrian access to the T, can somehow be 22:34:36
13 factored into your plan. 22:34:40
14 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much. 22:34:42
15 And now the sign-up sheet. 22:34:45
16 Are you Ann Thompson? 22:34:47
17 ANN THOMPSON: Yes. 22:34:52
18 HUGH RUSSELL: Great. 22:34:54
19 ANN THOMPSON: I am Ann Thompson. I live 22:34:54
20 at 14 Cottage Ave. in Arlington, Massachusetts. 22:34:57
21 I am going to briefly go over my concerns. One I 22:35:00

1 have mentioned before was the flooding issue, the 22:35:04
2 sewage issue, and the traffic issue. I not going 22:35:09
3 into the traffic -- 22:35:10

4 HUGH RUSSELL: We are asking you to limit 22:35:12
5 your testimony on this three changes that they 22:35:13
6 made to their proposal. Because we -- 22:35:16

7 ANN THOMPSON: But there is one thing. 22:35:18
8 That when the information was sent out last time, 22:35:20
9 the study from BSC on the flooding was not 22:35:24
10 available on the City's web page. You couldn't 22:35:29
11 find it. I found it since then, and found some 22:35:31
12 issues that I think should be -- 22:35:31

13 In addition, I am hoping that the 22:35:36
14 Planning Board here hasn't already make a 22:35:39
15 decision, because I inadvertently received an 22:35:41
16 e-mail from Rich saying that "Mr. R assured all 22:35:44
17 votes are ready to go," on May 15th, which, it 22:35:48
18 means, it seems to me, maybe -- and I have plenty 22:35:52
19 of copies of this, which went around to all the 22:35:55
20 people that have been working on the project on a 22:35:58
21 professional level -- that some kind of a 22:36:01

1 decision has already been made, which is really 22:36:03
2 disappointing, if that is the case. 22:36:06

3 In any case, as far as the flooding issue 22:36:08
4 goes, BSC was involved, with Rich, was involved 22:36:12
5 in the Discovery Park, Faces, and this project. 22:36:16
6 Right? CLOMRs were applied for for Discovery 22:36:20
7 Park and Faces. Those are though FEMA. If 22:36:24
8 anybody needs clarification, I can spell them 22:36:26
9 out. 22:36:29

10 There were new elevation studies done for 22:36:30
11 those two projects, which included cross-sections 22:36:33
12 of elevations at many, many points along Alewife 22:36:37
13 Brook. I live on Alewife Brook. That is 22:36:42
14 obviously certain. None of the new numbers were 22:36:45
15 incorporated into the flooding studies done by 22:36:45
16 BSC. They used what they had originally, rather 22:36:49
17 than incorporating all of this new information 22:36:53
18 that they had gathered a year ago. Now maybe 22:36:55
19 that doesn't matter, but it is something that I 22:36:56
20 think needs to be considered before the rubber 22:36:58
21 stamp is put on this. 22:37:01

1 But when they did the CLOMR study for 22:37:02
2 Faces and Discovery Park, they found that the 22:37:05
3 water table and the floodway, where those 22:37:09
4 projects are, were different than what FEMA had 22:37:10
5 estimated. And those numbers were incorporated 22:37:17
6 into the CLOMR estimate, but they were never 22:37:21
7 again put into what is here. There may not have 22:37:22
8 been an issue, like I said, but I think it is a 22:37:25
9 major concern to people who may be affected, like 22:37:25
10 myself, who lives 25 feet away from Alewife 22:37:28
11 Brook. 22:37:32

12 And also the other issue that we never 22:37:32
13 really got into, which I won't discuss too much, 22:37:34
14 but is the eight-hour sewer storage tank, which I 22:37:37
15 also think is woefully inadequate, especially if 22:37:41
16 we had additional flooding issues near the site. 22:37:43
17 So I guess that is something. 22:37:46

18 And I can hand out more copies of that 22:37:49
19 e-mail that I received, if anybody is interested. 22:37:53

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to 22:38:09
21 speak? 22:38:12

1 STEPHEN KAISER: Mr. Chairman, I think I 22:38:13
2 signed up. 22:38:22

3 HUGH RUSSELL: You are certainly welcome 22:38:23
4 to speak, Mr. Kaiser. 22:38:24

5 STEPHEN KAISER: I just wanted to leave a 22:38:28
6 complete copy of the original 1968 Route 2. I 22:38:32
7 sent you out a copies of your split, so you don't 22:38:36
8 have to cut and paste. It is sort of a nice 22:38:38
9 transportation memory of how wrong our highway 22:38:42
10 planners were 40 years ago, how bad the planning 22:38:46
11 was at Alewife. It is quite a view. 22:38:52

12 I am a little puzzled by the presentation 22:38:54
13 tonight, because I did get the handout, and it 22:38:58
14 discusses parking in there. But I don't recall 22:39:00
15 the last time we had a hearing that there was 22:39:04
16 actually the presentation on the traffic, the 22:39:06
17 traffic impacts. I am sure I was there. I think 22:39:09
18 we ran out of time. So without that 22:39:12
19 presentation, I am a little puzzled on how the 22:39:15
20 board can make kinds of decisions it must on the 22:39:18
21 traffic-related matters. 22:39:22

1 But I will try and do the best I can with 22:39:23
2 the handout, which I just got tonight. I think 22:39:27
3 the biggest problem with the parking, and it 22:39:31
4 relates to a concern that the Planning Board had 22:39:34
5 back in 1985, which was that huge parking lot was 22:39:38
6 intended to be temporary, only during 22:39:43
7 construction. And it remains there. And it is 22:39:45
8 semi-permanent. And I am worried that this 22:39:50
9 zoning will actually lock it in, because it is 22:39:53
10 part of the whole zoning agreement. And this 22:39:57
11 means that we will lose the opportunity to do 22:40:01
12 something to get rid of those huge parking lots 22:40:03
13 and do something better and more compatible with 22:40:06
14 the zoning. 22:40:10

15 So I think it is a shame that our Alewife 22:40:11
16 planning didn't work out better, transportation 22:40:16
17 and everything else. It had a bad start, as you 22:40:19
18 can see from that graphic. And we have never 22:40:21
19 quite gotten the plan to work right. And I know, 22:40:24
20 certain members of the Planning Board, that 22:40:28
21 Alewife is not the ideal planning experience that 22:40:30

1 you hoped it would be. 22:40:34

2 I will say this for the development: It 22:40:36
3 is not exactly traffic-related, but the design is 22:40:40
4 probably better than 90 percent of the other 22:40:45
5 buildings at Alewife. I don't find the 22:40:48
6 La Corbusier objection that I mentioned at the 22:40:53
7 earlier hearing. But I think it is a very 22:40:53
8 sensitive and acceptable design, much better than 22:40:59
9 the surrounding buildings. But it is still 22:41:01
10 poisoned by that parking lot. And for that 22:41:04
11 reason, I have to oppose the zoning because it 22:41:07
12 locks in that parking lot, not because of the 22:41:10
13 actual proposed building. Thank you. 22:41:13

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does anyone 22:41:17
15 else wish to speak? 22:41:20

16 DALE BLANK: Hi. Dale Blank for Pfizer, 22:41:21
17 at 200 CambridgePark Drive. And I just wanted to 22:41:30
18 say I have, in fact, met with the developer on 22:41:30
19 several occasions, as they indicated in the 22:41:36
20 supplement, and the discussions have been good, 22:41:39
21 on the whole. We understand that their attorneys 22:41:42

1 are working on the draft agreement, which we 22:41:44
2 haven't seen yet. The issues for that agreement 22:41:46
3 are the construction innovation efforts and 22:41:50
4 parking agreement. And we are expecting that, if 22:41:55
5 they can work out the pedestrian bridge issues 22:41:58
6 and respond to our questions in a timely manner, 22:42:01
7 that we would be able to put an agreement in 22:42:04
8 place. 22:42:07

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 22:42:08

10 Does anyone else wish to speak? 22:42:23

11 MICHAEL BRANDON: Thank you, Mr. Chair 22:42:24
12 and members of the board. My name is Michael 22:42:24
13 Brandon, B-R-A-N-D-O-N. I live at 27 Seven Pines 22:42:26
14 Avenue. 22:42:32

15 It is 10:45, and I missed the first two 22:42:32
16 hours of your meeting, and I am exhausted, so I 22:42:39
17 imagine you are too. So I don't think I will 22:42:43
18 discuss anything in detail, but would ask that 22:42:48
19 you keep the record open for written comments to 22:42:50
20 come in before you make any kind of a final 22:42:57
21 deliberation on this matter. There are a lot of 22:43:02

1 detailed aspects that I would like to raise. 22:43:06

2 Another thing that has occurred, I think, 22:43:11
3 since your last hearing, was a letter from the 22:43:13
4 transportation department with their comments on 22:43:17
5 the project, that I think I might want to submit 22:43:20
6 detailed comments on that, that haven't been 22:43:24
7 discussed by the board. I think it might be 22:43:28
8 helpful to hear what questions the board may have 22:43:30
9 and what additional information you will be 22:43:34
10 asking. 22:43:36

11 Some topics I will be suggesting to you 22:43:39
12 as possible conditions that you might consider to 22:43:42
13 mitigate what I believe are going to be negative 22:43:46
14 impacts added to the severe problems of traffic 22:43:50
15 and flooding issues, also sewage. In my view, 22:43:57
16 the infrastructure out there, and anybody who is 22:44:03
17 familiar with the area, cannot handle it. The 22:44:06
18 roadways can't. I have concerns that the 22:44:09
19 community benefits that are being offered are not 22:44:16
20 adequate to outweigh the negative influences that 22:44:18
21 will be created, especially when you consider the 22:44:25

1 many areas where waivers or relief is being 22:44:27
2 sought by the board. 22:44:32

3 So I think it would be reasonable for the 22:44:33
4 board to ask for additional things in the nature 22:44:34
5 of scalebacks. There was mention of construction 22:44:39
6 mitigation. Severe problems have been happening 22:44:45
7 at the Faces site, which the same developer has 22:44:49
8 worked on, in terms of pile driving noise. That 22:44:52
9 is going to be a real problem, when this 22:44:57
10 proceeds, for all those offices and the nearby 22:45:01
11 residential building at 30 CambridgePark, when 22:45:06
12 this project proceeds, as I am sure it will. So 22:45:09
13 again, I will be submitting additional written 22:45:17
14 comments. 22:45:22

15 Just one other point that I hope the 22:45:23
16 board will discuss and think about: In the 22:45:25
17 earlier presentations, all this discussion of 22:45:29
18 ground floor retail and creating a neighborhood, 22:45:32
19 if you have ever been out at the far end of 22:45:38
20 CambridgePark Drive at night, I mean, it is 22:45:42
21 desolate. It is almost I feel like I am in a 22:45:45

1 science fiction movie when you go out there, it 22:45:47
2 is just so dead. There is nothing in this 22:45:50
3 project, I think, or this is not enough to 22:45:54
4 animate that. And even in the daytime. 22:45:56

5 What I would suggest is that you strongly 22:45:59
6 press for some sort of a mixed use at the ground 22:46:02
7 floor, a retail use; ideally, a minimart or 22:46:06
8 convenience store to serve those people who, if 22:46:16
9 it is not there, you are now going to have almost 22:46:18
10 1,000 units on that street. Those folks are all 22:46:22
11 going to jump in their single-occupancy vehicles 22:46:25
12 and drive over the bridge to do even small 22:46:29
13 shopping. 22:46:29

14 Mr. McKinnon has even acknowledged that 22:46:34
15 problem. I am at my limit. Sorry to drift into 22:46:36
16 detail. But thank you very much for your 22:46:39
17 consideration. 22:46:41

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. 22:46:43

19 Does anyone else wish to speak? 22:46:44

20 (Pause.) 22:46:48

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I see no one 22:46:49

1 wishing to speak. 22:46:51

2 So we will now go to the board's 22:46:54

3 discussion of this case. This is a discussion 22:46:57

4 among the members of the board that may involve 22:47:02

5 asking questions of proponents to get matters 22:47:06

6 clarified, but we will not be going back to 22:47:13

7 public testimony tonight. 22:47:16

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Tonight? 22:47:27

9 HUGH RUSSELL: What do we want to 22:47:28

10 accomplish tonight, I think is the first question 22:47:30

11 for us. 22:47:32

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: And maybe I can try to 22:47:33

13 answer that, if I may. I think it is unfortunate 22:47:34

14 the way this has shaped up tonight. It is very 22:47:39

15 late. Mr. Kaiser is absolutely correct in the 22:47:43

16 way he characterized our previous analysis of 22:47:50

17 this; it didn't happen. We have never talked 22:47:52

18 about this project in any depth at all. We had a 22:47:55

19 presentation, and then we moved on. I think 22:47:59

20 there were a handful of things thrown out, which 22:48:04

21 you answered, but we never looked at the real 22:48:09

1 questions here. We never talked about the use. 22:48:13

2 This is a change of use from a 22:48:17

3 previously-issued special permit. And I think 22:48:18

4 that is the easiest of the questions. I think 22:48:23

5 everybody is pleased that this is changing from a 22:48:26

6 life sciences building, a large one, to a 22:48:31

7 residential. But I think it is something that we 22:48:35

8 could have at least spent a sentence or two on, 22:48:38

9 and we haven't talked about the use. Not a word 22:48:42

10 has been said about the architecture, that I can 22:48:44

11 remember. We don't even have anything to look at 22:48:47

12 up there; we have these pictures here in front of 22:48:49

13 us from previous presentations, but we have not 22:48:52

14 really gone into it in any depth. And I think it 22:48:54

15 is worth a moment of time. 22:48:59

16 There are some interesting things 22:49:02

17 happening on the architecture. If I am not 22:49:07

18 mistaken, we now have this project, we have 22:49:07

19 Fawcett Street, we have Faces, and, to a certain 22:49:12

20 extent, we have Wheeler Street, all looking very 22:49:14

21 similar, almost as if is by the same hand, 22:49:19

1 although I think in one case it is not. It is 22:49:25
2 worth at least taking a pause to see if this is 22:49:42
3 shaping up the way we would like it to. 22:49:45

4 I am not unhappy with the architecture at 22:49:47
5 all, but I don't feel that any of us really have 22:49:49
6 a good grasp of it. And we do have a number of 22:49:51
7 findings to make. This is one of the more 22:49:56
8 complicated requests that we have had. There is 22:49:58
9 all of Article 19, for one. And I haven't even 22:50:01
10 touched on the parking, which is as complicated 22:50:07
11 as any parking resolution that we have never 22:50:10
12 seen. It has got moving parts. It has got 22:50:14
13 things that need to be explained. You have gone 22:50:19
14 through the explanation a couple of different 22:50:23
15 times, trying it different ways, to see if you 22:50:26
16 could get it across, and I think I understand it. 22:50:28
17 But it is certainly worth spending a moment on. 22:50:31

18 We have traffic, as Mr. Kaiser said, that 22:50:35
19 we haven't talked about in any detail. We 22:50:39
20 haven't had, if I remember right, much of a 22:50:42
21 presentation on that. 22:50:44

1 So I would like to tackle some of that. 22:50:45

2 But I am tired, and I actually don't see -- I 22:50:51

3 hate to have you come back yet one more time. I 22:50:56

4 think you are paying the price for that first 22:50:58

5 aborted hearing, and I think it is catching up 22:51:01

6 with you at the tail end. I hate to have you 22:51:07

7 have such a large team of people here. And I 22:51:12

8 forgot one other issue we haven't even talked 22:51:15

9 about, is the flooding and the water, all of 22:51:20

10 those issues. So I think there is lot of talk 22:51:22

11 about here, and I hate to shortchange it with all 22:51:24

12 the findings that we have to make on such a major 22:51:27

13 project. 22:51:30

14 And I think Mr. Brandon is right on those 22:51:30

15 issues as well. So I am not quite sure what to 22:51:34

16 do here. It is, in fact, too long an agenda. 22:51:37

17 There are a lot of reasons why are we are here at 22:51:43

18 this point. We had not quite enough people here 22:51:46

19 for a quorum last time, and whatever else you 22:51:48

20 might put your finger on. 22:51:52

21 But I guess I ask my colleagues, how do 22:51:53

1 you tackle this? How do we get our arms around 22:51:59
2 this? 22:52:04

3 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I don't disagree 22:52:05
4 that this is a large project, and it is 22:52:10
5 significant, and that the specific relief 22:52:13
6 required is probably a record in terms of the 22:52:18
7 complexities. 22:52:24

8 And that comes out of, in part, what they 22:52:25
9 are doing. They are taking some of those awful 22:52:29
10 parking lots, and they are putting a building, 22:52:32
11 which is probably a reasonable building with a 22:52:37
12 reasonable use, on it. 22:52:42

13 So if you look at the overall deal, it 22:52:43
14 makes a lot of sense. Making sure all the 22:52:47
15 specifics are correct, we have not discussed 22:52:51
16 that. So on one hand, I wish we could just go 22:52:54
17 and say, "Oh, yes, the biggest scale, this is the 22:52:59
18 right deal." But I am again concerned that we 22:53:05
19 don't have the time to do it tonight. 22:53:09

20 Others comment? 22:53:17

21 AHMED NUR: Well, then I suppose I don't 22:53:23

1 really have a lot to add, other than what Tom 22:53:26
2 said, and you, Mr. Chairman. I don't really have 22:53:29
3 a lot of -- I am in favor of this project. I 22:53:34
4 like the architecture and its size and location, 22:53:37
5 especially residential, at that location. 22:53:42

6 However, there are some questions raised. 22:53:44
7 And for those of you who do, perhaps you should 22:53:45
8 put it forward to us. Hopefully you will get it 22:53:49
9 next time. 22:53:53

10 HUGH RUSSELL: I will put before the 22:53:54
11 board an option that we occasionally adopt, which 22:53:58
12 is we request that a decision be prepared, and 22:54:03
13 then we vote on the decision after it is 22:54:07
14 prepared. So we say in general terms what it is 22:54:12
15 we want, and then we ask that the Is be dotted 22:54:18
16 and Ts crossed, after discussing the points of 22:54:22
17 substance. That might be the way to proceed, if 22:54:32
18 we can get can come to an agreement about what we 22:54:37
19 want. 22:54:42

20 Bill, what is your opinion? 22:54:48

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: I definitely agree with 22:54:50

1 Tom. I just agree with everything you just said. 22:54:52
2 So I think really the question is what mechanism 22:54:58
3 we use to get this off the dime. I think having 22:55:01
4 a decision at least drafted, which we can react 22:55:03
5 to, might be something that is a little faster, 22:55:07
6 because we can address the issues as -- because 22:55:10
7 they have to address we are doing. We typically 22:55:14
8 deliberate those things and then understand where 22:55:18
9 we want to go with those. 22:55:21

10 And I agree with Tom that I think there 22:55:23
11 are issues that we just need to talk about, and 22:55:24
12 that is what we are here for. It is just that 22:55:27
13 the timing and circumstances of these just have 22:55:30
14 been not very helpful. And I can tell you that 22:55:33
15 at eleven o'clock, that it is not going to be 22:55:39
16 that meaningful a conversation, for me at least, 22:55:44
17 if we try to do it. 22:55:46

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Can we make a list of the 22:55:50
19 things we want to talk about? Like floodplain; I 22:55:52
20 had have heard response to a report from the 22:55:59
21 traffic and parking departments; I have heard 22:56:04

1 architectural character. 22:56:08

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: And landscape, I think. 22:56:12

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Landscape would be good, 22:56:14

4 too. 22:56:18

5 STEVEN WINTER: Can we catalogue the two 22:56:18

6 concerns from Pfizer also? 22:56:20

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I am not sure it is 22:56:23

8 something we need to deliberate. It is something 22:56:24

9 they have to. 22:56:26

10 STEVEN WINTER: Got it. Okay. 22:56:27

11 HUGH RUSSELL: There have been 22:56:29

12 suggestions, and at this point I don't remember 22:56:31

13 exactly where they have come from; but should the 22:56:33

14 ground floor use of the building on CambridgePark 22:56:38

15 Drive have some convenience store or retail 22:56:43

16 component? That question is raised. And so I 22:56:48

17 would like to put that on the list as something 22:56:56

18 that we should address. I am not advocating it. 22:56:58

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think, relative to 22:57:06

20 that, I think one of the notes I made at the 22:57:08

21 presentation was, there is an attempt on your 22:57:10

1 part to have a more active visual use. And I 22:57:13
2 just had a question mark as to I wanted to just 22:57:17
3 get a little -- I was wondering if that was 22:57:20
4 active enough, the way you show it, and if there 22:57:22
5 is other options or alternatives to give that a 22:57:25
6 little more life. 22:57:30

7 STEVEN WINTER: Isn't it correct that we 22:57:32
8 could ask the proponent to look at the issues, to 22:57:34
9 analyze the issue from a business perspective. 22:57:37
10 But those discussions are driven by demographics 22:57:39
11 and locations and all kinds of things. We are 22:57:45
12 not able to decide those things; but I think we 22:57:48
13 can ask the proponent to look at them with retail 22:57:51
14 professionals. 22:57:55

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. To the extent that I 22:57:56
16 have looked at this particular issue myself, and 22:58:01
17 I think it would be nice to have a retail use 22:58:04
18 there that would serve the residents. But with 22:58:09
19 the residents and the office users and the other 22:58:15
20 residents at the other end, first, it is quite a 22:58:19
21 long stretch. It is 1,500 feet long, 2,000 feet 22:58:23

1 long. CambridgePark Drive goes on forever. And 22:58:29
2 I don't think there is the density there to 22:58:33
3 produce something that is of much use. 22:58:37

4 And then I thought oh, a bridge. A 22:58:43
5 bridge will allow people on the other side to 22:58:46
6 come across. But you start looking at it. So 22:58:48
7 yes, I think you are right. We can ask them to 22:58:55
8 tell us their opinion on the subject, but I don't 22:58:59
9 know if we have to ask them to produce and the 22:59:02
10 answer that I would hope it would. 22:59:08

11 Are there other things that people want 22:59:12
12 to put on the list? Do we want to tackle any of 22:59:14
13 those tonight? 22:59:19

14 H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't think anyone 22:59:24
15 is prepared to tackle any of them tonight. But 22:59:25
16 the best we can do is make a list. And I gather 22:59:29
17 we have a July 10th meeting that was going to be, 22:59:32
18 presumably, for deliberations. 22:59:38

19 HUGH RUSSELL: And Liza is going to tell 22:59:40
20 us her time constraints, I believe. 22:59:42

21 LIZA PADEN: Your time constraints are 22:59:45

1 that the 90 days for filing the decision is the 22:59:47
2 day before your next Planning Board meeting, so 22:59:48
3 it is June 18th. I have talked to Mr. McKinnon 22:59:51
4 ahead of time, and he understands that the board 22:59:57
5 needs to have an extension. I think the detail 22:59:58
6 is to work out how long the extension will be 23:00:02
7 for. 23:00:14

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I think this is 23:00:15
9 going to be a discussion that is going to take 23:00:21
10 quite a while to draft. 23:00:24

11 LIZA PADEN: There is actually three 23:00:28
12 decisions that have to be written. 23:00:29

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So it is a 23:00:31
14 complicated matter, legally, to get through to 23:00:33
15 make this happen. 23:00:37

16 Frankly, I think that would be a start. 23:00:45
17 Because what I think we are discussing are 23:00:52
18 potentially -- there might be some minor 23:01:00
19 conditions or some major conditions that might 23:01:02
20 get attached as a result of our evaluation; but I 23:01:05
21 don't hear people saying this is a bad idea. So 23:01:07

1 maybe some of that will get started. 23:01:14

2 Now to answer your question, that might 23:01:18

3 mean that after we had addressed this, it might 23:01:21

4 still take several weeks to finalize, but it 23:01:25

5 might not take a month. 23:01:27

6 So on our 6-19 meeting, we have something 23:01:29

7 in Trolley Square and the Forest City's proposal 23:01:47

8 to discuss, which we ought to spend a 23:01:52

9 significant piece of time on. Trolley Square is 23:01:54

10 another hour, hour and a half. 23:01:57

11 PAMELA WINTERS: We have the July 10th 23:02:03

12 meeting. We don't have anything on that yet? 23:02:06

13 LIZA PADEN: No. But we knew that we 23:02:09

14 were going to need another meeting. Originally, 23:02:09

15 because of the Wednesday holiday, we were only 23:02:09

16 going to have one July meeting; but we definitely 23:02:15

17 need two July meetings. 23:02:16

18 PAMELA WINTERS: So there is something 23:02:17

19 scheduled for the July 10th? 23:02:20

20 LIZA PADEN: Not yet. But given the way 23:02:22

21 things are going -- 23:02:31

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Are we going to be in the 23:02:33
2 same place, if we put it on the agenda for 23:02:36
3 June 19th? 23:02:40

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think so. 23:02:42

5 LIZA PADEN: The complication is that the 23:02:48
6 June 19th meeting has two public hearings. One 23:02:51
7 is the Trolley Square. And we were going to put 23:02:54
8 on the deliberation for the Mass Ave. overlay 23:02:58
9 district. And the Forest City hearing is still 23:03:02
10 open. 23:03:07

11 Now if you want to put this on, I will 23:03:09
12 put it on and close the agenda. 23:03:11

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I don't think we can. 23:03:14

14 HUGH RUSSELL: So the Council is not 23:03:16
15 going to act on the Forest City matter; right? 23:03:18
16 If they do, it will be the day before. 23:03:22

17 BRIAN MURPHY: If the council were to 23:03:25
18 act, what they would do would be to send it to 23:03:26
19 the second meeting. 23:03:29

20 The only way they could do that would be 23:03:31
21 if next Monday, as part of the committee report, 23:03:33

1 they would advance it to a second meeting and get 23:03:33
2 the -- retain the subject matter in committee. 23:03:36
3 So I would expect that, if they were to do that, 23:03:42
4 then they could vote for ordination of the summer 23:03:45
5 meeting July 30th. Otherwise, the petition would 23:03:48
6 expire. 23:03:50

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So we could put 23:03:51
8 that off to July, it sounds like. 23:03:53

9 BRIAN MURPHY: I think they are sort of 23:04:02
10 teed up in planning. I think Roger and I are 23:04:04
11 meeting with them Thursday. 23:04:07

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Or could we put them third 23:04:10
13 on the agenda. I mean, can we put these guys 23:04:13
14 first, the Trolley Square second, and the Forest 23:04:19
15 City third, and hope we get to it? 23:04:25

16 LIZA PADEN: We can do what the Board of 23:04:34
17 Zoning Appeal does, and that is to put the 23:04:36
18 continued cases on at seven o'clock. And we can 23:04:39
19 do it that way. The Trolley Square has been 23:04:42
20 advertised for 7:20. As long as we don't start 23:04:42
21 earlier than 7:20, we are okay. So if that is 23:04:51

1 what you want to do. And that would be for -- I 23:04:52
2 have already lost track. 23:04:56

3 BRIAN MURPHY: June 19th. 23:04:58

4 LIZA PADEN: 19th. Thank you. 23:05:06

5 But the action has to be that the 23:05:07
6 applicant has to agree to an extension of time, 23:05:09
7 and we have to agree to what that extension is 23:05:11
8 going to be. Because there is not only the 23:05:11
9 discussion on the 19th, but it has to include 23:05:13
10 time for us to write, review, and file a 23:05:16
11 decision. 23:05:22

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I would say 23:05:23
13 July 6th. 23:05:29

14 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: How about the 10th 23:05:33
15 until the next meeting? 23:05:34

16 LIZA PADEN: How about the 11th? 23:05:36

17 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Fine. 23:05:40

18 LIZA PADEN: Okay. Great. 23:05:49

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Now so we have had a 23:05:58
20 request from the petitioner to extend the time to 23:05:59
21 July 11th. 23:06:02

1 On that request, I would need to do a 23:06:04
2 vote to approve that. Everybody say yes, if you 23:06:08
3 are voting to that. 23:06:15
4 (All board in agreement.) 23:06:17
5 RICHARD MCKINNON: We agree to do so. 23:06:21
6 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there anything else we 23:06:21
7 want to say to these people tonight? 23:06:21
8 H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you go through 23:06:25
9 the list again of concerns? 23:06:26
10 HUGH RUSSELL: I will ask either Roger or 23:06:28
11 Liza to do it. 23:06:31
12 ROGER BOOTHE: The list includes a 23:06:33
13 floodplain, traffic and parking issues, 23:06:37
14 architectural character, landscape design, and 23:06:40
15 getting them to explain their thinking about the 23:06:43
16 ground floor, especially regarding retail. 23:06:46
17 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Can we add the 23:06:57
18 sewer issue too, sewer storage? 23:06:59
19 HUGH RUSSELL: The size of the sewage 23:07:02
20 storage tank. Do we have a report from the city 23:07:05
21 engineer on this project? 23:07:08

1 What is the board's pleasure? Do you 23:10:43
2 want to just go home, or do we want to try to do 23:10:45
3 them quickly? 23:10:53
4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do them quickly. 23:10:53
5 HUGH RUSSELL: I think we can definitely 23:10:54
6 do the squeaky one. 23:10:57
7 LIZA PADEN: I can even be quicker. 23:11:07
8 HUGH RUSSELL: Let's do the Squeaker 23:11:11
9 Beaker. Liza, would you explain it to us? 23:11:13
10 LIZA PADEN: Okay. One of the conditions 23:11:15
11 of the Planning Board's special permit for 23:11:20
12 Cambridge Research Park is that any use not 23:11:20
13 listed specifically in the special permit has to 23:11:25
14 come to the Planning Board for a determination 23:11:27
15 that it is an appropriate use. 23:11:29
16 And if you remember in the past, some of 23:11:31
17 these uses have been the bubble tea; there was 23:11:33
18 the burrito one recently; there has been a 23:11:37
19 farmer's market. So there has been a variety of 23:11:40
20 these small, fast-order food retail 23:11:42
21 establishments, which usually are a board of 23:11:46

1 zoning appeals special permit. But since this 23:11:46
2 was a PUD, any use that wasn't listed 23:11:50
3 specifically has to come to the Planning Board. 23:11:53

4 So these gentlemen here are representing 23:11:55
5 the new business, which would be the Squeaky 23:12:01
6 Beaker. And the letter that was submitted was 23:12:04
7 extremely clear on the retail use that it is 23:12:08
8 going to be. 23:12:12

9 For those people who need a little update 23:12:13
10 on the map, this shows only a corner of the 23:12:18
11 building. The entire footprint of the building 23:12:21
12 is here. And he is not -- go ahead. 23:12:24

13 ANTHONY MILLER: This building right 23:12:28
14 here. The storefront will be in this portion of 23:12:30
15 it. So this is part of the Central Square 23:12:34
16 development. 23:12:37

17 STEVEN WINTER: It is a very small space. 23:12:41
18 Yes? 30 feet by 30 feet. 23:12:43

19 ANTHONY MILLER: It is about 1,500 square 23:12:45
20 feet. 23:12:48

21 PAMELA WINTERS: And you will be serving 23:12:48

1 fast food? What are you going to be serving? 23:12:51

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Could you give us your 23:12:51

3 name? 23:12:53

4 ANTHONY MILLER: My name is Anthony 23:12:53

5 Miller. I am a little tall for this microphone. 23:12:58

6 I own the Second Street Cafe, and have for five 23:13:10

7 years, and have been looking to add some more 23:13:13

8 value to the neighborhood. I also live two 23:13:18

9 blocks from the cafe, at Thomas Graves Landing, 23:13:20

10 and I have for 13 years. 23:13:23

11 I have been looking at various spaces for 23:13:25

12 the past three years or so. And this space come 23:13:27

13 up, and I was able to work something with BioMed 23:13:31

14 Realty. And we are not -- we are doing similar 23:13:35

15 to Second Street, but expanded and hopefully 23:13:38

16 doing prepared dinners to go, which is think is 23:13:40

17 really missing from East Cambridge. Sort of a 23:13:43

18 Whole Foods hot bar, but actually letter. 23:13:48

19 So it is quick service, but it is not 23:13:50

20 fast food. We also want to serve Christina's Ice 23:13:56

21 Cream, which I have worked out for them. All my 23:13:59

1 vendors, purveyors are local. I use Mayflower 23:14:02
2 for chicken. My printing is Cambridge 23:14:02
3 Repro-Graphics. It is really, I live here, and 23:14:08
4 it is about more community. And we do a good job 23:14:11
5 at Second Street of people coming in and feeling 23:14:16
6 good about coming in and supporting their local 23:14:17
7 neighborhood. We know their names. And also, it 23:14:21
8 is good to be part of East Cambridge, which is, 23:14:24
9 apart from the mall, there are no chains. 23:14:28

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Why the name, Squeaky 23:14:32
11 Beaker? 23:14:35

12 ANTHONY MILLER: I knew you were going to 23:14:36
13 ask me that. I was thinking about, you know, it 23:14:37
14 is a lab building, and I was thinking about that. 23:14:39
15 And I don't know. It just sort of popped in 23:14:42
16 there. 23:14:45

17 And there is a lot of boutique places 23:14:45
18 that have gone in that area. And that is not 23:14:48
19 really actually what I am doing. And it is sort 23:14:51
20 of more mom and pop, more like your 23:14:53
21 grandmother's, a little silly, frankly, a little 23:14:57

1 friendly. We are not trying to blow you away 23:15:02
2 with the decor particularly. It is more about 23:15:04
3 community. It is just good service and food that 23:15:09
4 makes you feel good when you have eaten it; you 23:15:13
5 don't feel like you want to go to bed. So that 23:15:16
6 is sort of what I believe in. 23:15:19

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Sounds good. 23:15:22

8 HUGH RUSSELL: We all agree that this is 23:15:24
9 appropriate? 23:15:27

10 H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have one 23:15:27
11 question. Is it possible you can expand to 23:15:29
12 six days? 23:15:31

13 ANTHONY MILLER: Yes. 23:15:35

14 H. THEODORE COHEN: Since I will not be 23:15:36
15 part of your community Monday through Friday, my 23:15:40
16 only option would be on a Saturday. And I think 23:15:40
17 it would be great if you could expand to have 23:15:42
18 this ideal situation on the weekend, too. 23:15:47

19 ANTHONY MILLER: Yes, Mr. Cohen, I will 23:15:51
20 sincerely consider that, especially considering 23:15:54
21 that there are concert series right there, and 23:15:55

1 the skating rink. So absolutely. 23:15:59

2 PAMELA WINTERS: Do you have a website? 23:16:01

3 ANTHONY MILLER: I do not. We have not 23:16:03

4 created the website yet. We are having sort 23:16:04

5 of -- I am doing a lot of things by friends of 23:16:07

6 the neighborhood, because I have a lot of friends 23:16:10

7 from Second Street. We are having an iPhone app 23:16:13

8 built for the new place, so people can order and 23:16:15

9 pay from their phones. But I don't have a 23:16:19

10 website yet. I reserved it. I registered the 23:16:20

11 name, but. 23:16:23

12 LIZA PADEN: Can I ask the board if they 23:16:24

13 are interested in specifying that there is no 23:16:28

14 objection to seven days a week? And that way, 23:16:28

15 they wouldn't have to come back in case there was 23:16:31

16 some. 23:16:33

17 HUGH RUSSELL: No objection. 23:16:35

18 ANTHONY MILLER: Uh-oh. 23:16:38

19 LIZA PADEN: You don't have to, but there 23:16:38

20 is no -- it gives you the option. 23:16:40

21 ANTHONY MILLER: Thank you. 23:16:43

1 HUGH RUSSELL: So the form of the motion, 23:16:44
2 Liza, would be? 23:16:46

3 LIZA PADEN: That the board finds that 23:16:47
4 this is an appropriate use in the PUD for special 23:16:49
5 permit 141, and that seven days week would be 23:16:52
6 appropriate. 23:16:57

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Would someone like to move 23:16:58
8 that? 23:17:00

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: So moved. 23:17:00

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: So moved. 23:17:04

11 HUGH RUSSELL: A second from Tom. All 23:17:05
12 those in favor? 23:17:06

13 (Show of hands.) 23:17:08

14 HUGH RUSSELL: So approved. 23:17:10

15 ANTHONY MILLER: Thank you very much. Be 23:17:10
16 sure to come visit. 23:17:16

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So 159 First Street, let 23:17:16
18 me just to bring this up to the board. 23:17:21

19 Basically, this is a project that we 23:17:25
20 reviewed at an earlier stage. It has changed 23:17:30
21 ownership. There are some changes that are not 23:17:36

1 significant in concept to the design. There has 23:17:42
2 been more design work done. There is more design 23:17:46
3 work left to be done. One substantive change is 23:17:50
4 that they have been able to find the space for 23:17:55
5 four more cars in their basement garage. 23:17:58

6 So we could have a long presentation on 23:18:14
7 this, or we could get a confirmation that all of 23:18:18
8 this is true, and make a motion to approve a 23:18:25
9 minor amendment for a parking spaces, and to have 23:18:32
10 them make a motion to approve a design, with the 23:18:38
11 condition that they do continue with their design 23:18:45
12 review with the department and that, if there is 23:18:50
13 anything we notice that we would like them to 23:18:53
14 work on, we could ask that. 23:18:55

15 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, the letter 23:18:59
16 from Paul Ognibene was very clear. It was one of 23:19:01
17 the clearest I have ever read, actually. There 23:19:15
18 are three pieces that they are looking for. And 23:19:17
19 they are willing to not do them, if the board has 23:19:18
20 any concerns about any of them. 23:19:22

21 And from my perspective, the unit 23:19:23

1 distribution made good sense to me. The bicycle 23:19:27
2 parking, which has been looked at and ratified by 23:19:32
3 the Cambridge Bicycle Committee, that all made 23:19:39
4 sense to me. The elevator sizes are where they 23:19:39
5 ought to be. The bicyclists like having the 23:19:42
6 capacity and ability to bring their bikes to 23:19:46
7 their floor. 23:19:47

8 And the only thing that I wasn't real 23:19:50
9 clear about was, I thought that the open space 23:19:56
10 requests were appropriate. But I didn't 23:19:59
11 understand that, "We are first requesting a 23:20:01
12 clarification from the Planning Board," as to 23:20:04
13 whether their intention was to count both the 23:20:05
14 publicly beneficial open space. 23:20:08

15 So from my perspective, I feel that all 23:20:12
16 three of those things are within reason, 23:20:14
17 appropriate, and well stated. 23:20:17

18 However, the only thing that I don't 23:20:20
19 understand is the clarifications that you are 23:20:22
20 requesting. 23:20:27

21 HUGH RUSSELL: You want to speak to that, 23:20:27

1 Mr. Ognibene? 23:20:28

2 PAUL OGNIBENE: Thank you very much. 23:20:29

3 So I knew the open space issue needed a 23:20:31

4 little clarification, so I tried to summarize 23:20:36

5 here in four bullet points. If we can put that 23:20:38

6 chart on the screen, that would be great. 23:20:42

7 So basically, the issue here was that 23:20:45

8 the -- it is a little small. I will just read 23:20:47

9 it. So the approved drawings from the original 23:20:57

10 special permit application indicated that 23:20:59

11 1,509 square feet was determined to be publicly 23:21:05

12 beneficial open space. The 1,509, the area is 23:21:07

13 shown in orange. 23:21:11

14 And 6,355 square feet was considered to 23:21:12

15 be private or usable open space. The 23:21:20

16 nomenclature has changed in the last year, since 23:21:23

17 the original special permit was issued. 23:21:27

18 So together, these spaces met the 23:21:30

19 requirement per zoning section 1355, which states 23:21:35

20 that the open space requirement could be met by 23:21:39

21 any combination of open space types, publicly 23:21:41

1 that the Planning Board consider specifically 23:22:49
2 characterizing the 764 square feet of pedestrian 23:22:53
3 walkway right here -- which has a top to it, so 23:22:58
4 it is an enclosed pedestrian walkway -- and the 23:23:03
5 845 square feet of front yard spaces -- these 23:23:06
6 are, again, consistent with the publicly 23:23:14
7 beneficial space -- we would specifically 23:23:17
8 designate those as publicly beneficial open 23:23:18
9 space, per section 1355. 23:23:21

10 Those were all just technical points, 23:23:23
11 because we felt that the special permit itself 23:23:25
12 needed a little further clarification. But it is 23:23:28
13 all consistent and has been approved. It was 23:23:31
14 just, in our mind, it was just a matter of 23:23:34
15 clarifying the nomenclature, so when we get to 23:23:36
16 the building permit process, there would be no 23:23:37
17 question as to the Planning Board's intent to 23:23:39
18 approve these things as characterized. 23:23:41

19 And lastly, related to open space, we 23:23:43
20 would like to request an additional 1,600 square 23:23:47
21 feet, which would not keep us over the GFA 23:23:50

1 limitation, just simply added as a roof deck to 23:23:54
2 the project. That too would potentially qualify 23:23:59
3 as usable private open space. 23:23:59

4 Hopefully, that clarifies. 23:24:01

5 STEVEN WINTER: I think so. 23:24:04

6 HUGH RUSSELL: I think we can ask that 23:24:07
7 the decision incorporate this. 23:24:14

8 I must say, the idea of an outdoor tunnel 23:24:18
9 being characterized as publicly beneficial open 23:24:24
10 space, it really sticks in my craw. 23:24:29

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: It sticks in mine, too. 23:24:33

12 HUGH RUSSELL: It is not open to the 23:24:36
13 public, and it is going to be nasty. 23:24:39

14 But the addition of the roof deck brings 23:24:41
15 the total up so that it is now above the 7,000, 23:24:44
16 and it seems to me that it then meets the intent 23:24:49
17 of the ordinance. Now maybe you can do better 23:24:53
18 than nasty for that space. 23:24:57

19 JEFF HIRSCH: We sure hope so. 23:25:02

20 HUGH RUSSELL: But I worked for an 23:25:03
21 architect who liked to put those spaces in his 23:25:07

1 projects, and they never were very happy. So it 23:25:10
2 is a real challenge, because it the nature of the 23:25:18
3 space you are creating. 23:25:25

4 PAMELA WINTERS: Do you know if it will 23:25:28
5 be a green roof, by any chance? 23:25:29

6 PAUL OGNIBENE: Do we intend it to be a 23:25:32
7 green roof? 23:25:32

8 JEFF HIRSCH: At this time, it is not 23:25:35
9 anticipated for it to be a green roof. We have 23:25:35
10 been looking at some ways to make it better and 23:25:37
11 to do more with it. But in order to create the 23:25:39
12 roof, we do have to move around mechanicals, and 23:25:44
13 that takes up the rest of the space in order to 23:25:47
14 create space that now becomes a friendly, nice 23:25:49
15 atmosphere for people to hang out. 23:25:55

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: More like a roof deck? 23:25:57

17 PAMELA WINTERS: It will be a roof deck. 23:25:59
18 So maybe a portion of it could be green and? 23:26:00

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Plants or something, 23:26:03
20 containers? 23:26:05

21 JEFF HIRSCH: Yes. 23:26:05

1 parking spaces at the 65 Bent Street location, 23:27:18
2 and four other spaces at a to-be-determined 23:27:22
3 location, let's just say the Galleria Mall. 23:27:25

4 When we were rejiggering the parking lot, 23:27:28
5 and actually making the schematics more working 23:27:31
6 drawings, we found that we could actually create 23:27:36
7 64 real zoning-qualifying parking spaces. Two 23:27:38
8 tandems, and then of course the 25 spaces at 23:27:44
9 65 Bent, and perhaps the other four spaces at 23:27:47
10 leased offsite, would no longer be required. 23:27:50

11 In the process of working through with 23:27:52
12 our special permit partner, Skanska, we had 23:27:57
13 various discussions about a larger parking issue. 23:28:01
14 So we at one point took these spaces which we had 23:28:06
15 found, and just striped them. And we submitted 23:28:11
16 the package. That is the difference between the 23:28:14
17 April 17th purposeful and the May 29th proposal. 23:28:16
18 The April 17th shows the parking; the May 29th 23:28:18
19 just showed stripes, as kind of a deferral to be 23:28:21
20 discussed later. 23:28:26

21 In speaking with the traffic and parking 23:28:27

1 department, and the community development staff, 23:28:31
2 as recently as today, it was clarified that we 23:28:34
3 really needed to make a decision on how we wanted 23:28:37
4 to treat that striped space. So we discussed and 23:28:39
5 concluded that we would like to request the four 23:28:44
6 parking spaces after all. So we are really back 23:28:48
7 to the April 17th proposal; and that is how it 23:28:52
8 stands. 23:28:57

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: I submit that I think 23:28:58
10 what my colleague here has said about the three 23:29:00
11 issues applies to the fourth: It is well 23:29:05
12 explained, and I think it is a minor issue. And 23:29:06
13 I would go along with that, too, in the same 23:29:10
14 spirit as one of my colleagues said here 23:29:13
15 previously. So I would just add that on to the 23:29:16
16 list of things that fit within what you have been 23:29:19
17 asking for. 23:29:22

18 PAUL OGNIBENE: Thank you very much. 23:29:22

19 STEVEN WINTER: I am simply going to say 23:29:23
20 that it seems that brings us to the point where 23:29:29
21 those four points, that we do consider them 23:29:31

1 minor, and that we in concurrence. 23:29:33

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. 23:29:37

3 PAUL OGNIBENE: For whatever it is worth, 23:29:39

4 if I may introduce to the Planning Board, just 23:29:40

5 because they have come a long way, our partner on 23:29:41

6 the project, Joe Coyle from Michaels Development. 23:29:44

7 They are in from Philadelphia. And we of course 23:29:48

8 are very excited to have this kind of national 23:29:50

9 and local presence to execute the project. 23:29:53

10 And we have Dan Garthe in, also from 23:29:56

11 Philadelphia, as our architect. And then our 23:29:58

12 team locally, engineers and planners and things. 23:30:02

13 So I just wanted to introduce you. 23:30:07

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: There is one more 23:30:10

15 issue, Mr. Chair, if I may. You have raised it 23:30:11

16 with me previously, but it occurred to me, too. 23:30:17

17 And maybe the way to do it is to ask Roger. 23:30:18

18 We haven't really focused on the 23:30:21

19 architecture of the building, which is a little 23:30:23

20 bit new to us. I haven't seen it drawn this way 23:30:25

21 before, at least I don't remember it this way. 23:30:28

1 How do we feel about it? Are there any 23:30:32
2 reactions that Roger or you or I have that we 23:30:35
3 might want to comment on that? 23:30:40

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Things that are this big 23:30:43
5 are fine. We need a few more things that are 23:30:47
6 this big. We need more elaboration, more detail. 23:30:49
7 This is a design development drawing, not a final 23:30:53
8 drawing. And it is a little right now -- if it 23:30:59
9 were executed exactly as we see, it would be kind 23:31:06
10 of a plain Jane, not very interesting addition. 23:31:07

11 But with just more attention to how the 23:31:11
12 corners are being made, how the window openings 23:31:17
13 are being made, those kinds of things, it will 23:31:20
14 get a richness that will be fine. 23:31:23

15 There is nothing wrong on the drawings. 23:31:28
16 It just isn't quite at the level of detail that 23:31:32
17 we will want to see finally. And I think they 23:31:34
18 can work Roger on that. It is not an 23:31:36
19 inappropriate building for this location. It has 23:31:43
20 got a variety of materials. It has got scale. 23:31:46
21 It has got base. It has got all the right 23:31:50

1 general ideas; it just needs some final 23:31:54
2 development. 23:31:58

3 I guess the comment -- I hate to bring 23:32:00
4 this up, but I am an architect. I have been 23:32:04
5 required to do units, housing that faces streets. 23:32:09
6 And the architectural access board in the 23:32:15
7 Commonwealth requires those street level accesses 23:32:19
8 to be accessible, even though there is another 23:32:23
9 accessible entrance inside the courtyard. 23:32:29

10 That is a problem for you guys. It has 23:32:34
11 been a problem for me every time I have had to do 23:32:37
12 it. So you have shown little stoops there, which 23:32:40
13 is what we would like to see, but is it not what 23:32:44
14 the access board permits. So I caution you to 23:32:47
15 investigate that further. 23:32:52

16 PAUL OGNIBENE: We will clarify that. 23:32:52

17 HUGH RUSSELL: And should you find that 23:32:54
18 they have changed their mind, I would be the 23:32:57
19 first who would like to know that. 23:33:00

20 We did a building on the street that had 23:33:01
21 a one-and-a-half percent slope. We had to step 23:33:04

1 every apartment on the ground floor 5 inches so 23:33:09
2 we could get from -- it also had to be more than 23:33:13
3 10 feet from the sidewalk. It was possible to 23:33:17
4 do, and we spent a lot of time speaking about 23:33:20
5 what the corridor looked like. It had a two 23:33:23
6 percent slope in it. But I can tell you about 23:33:26
7 that later, if you are forced to do that. You 23:33:29
8 can go down and look at it. 23:33:32

9 So I wish it could look like you have 23:33:33
10 drawn, but you may not be able to do that. 23:33:39

11 PAUL OGNIBENE: That is a shame. 23:33:43

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: I did have one 23:33:47
13 reaction, and there might be nothing that can be 23:33:49
14 done about it. But I do find the entrance to the 23:33:51
15 garage quite cavernous. It is going to be an 23:33:56
16 unpleasant stretch for the sidewalk and the curb 23:34:00
17 cut. And maybe that is the reality of having 23:34:07
18 underground parking, and there is not much you 23:34:10
19 can do about it. The door, when it is closed, 23:34:12
20 maybe is a nicer way to look at it, and you have 23:34:17
21 just been honest enough to show it to us open, 23:34:21

1 have to throw a lot of money at, but a little 23:35:15
2 ingenuity. 23:35:16

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you. 23:35:19

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So I think we have gone 23:35:22
5 through everything. 23:35:25

6 Is there anything anybody else wants to 23:35:25
7 say? 23:35:28

8 PAUL OGNIBENE: Thank you. 23:35:29

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Do we have a motion to 23:35:31
10 grant the necessary amendments -- 23:35:35

11 STEVEN WINTER: Approve his minor 23:35:41
12 amendments. 23:35:44

13 HUGH RUSSELL: -- approve minor 23:35:45
14 amendments, and to approve the design review with 23:35:48
15 the conditions that we have discussed? 23:35:50

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: So moved. 23:35:53

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Second. 23:35:55

18 HUGH RUSSELL: So Tom moved, Bill 23:35:57
19 seconded. 23:35:57

20 All those in favor. 23:35:59

21 (Show of hands.) 23:36:01

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Seven people in favor. 23:36:03

2 Thank you very much. Sorry to keep you 23:36:05

3 waiting for so long. 23:36:07

4 (Whereupon, at 11:36 p.m., the hearing
5 was adjourned.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

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

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Suffolk, ss.

I, Megan M. Castro, a Notary Public in
and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do
hereby certify:

That the hearing that is hereinbefore set
forth is a true record of the testimony given by
all persons involved.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 31st day of July, 2012.

Megan M. Castro
Shorthand Reporter

My Commission expires:

August 23, 2013

23:36:08
23:36:08