

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 19, 2012

7:10 p.m.

in

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

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

Community Development Staff:  
Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for  
Community Development

- Susan Glazer
- Liza Paden
- Roger Boothe
- Stuart Dash
- Jeff Roberts
- Taha Jennings

---

REPORTERS, INC.  
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD  
617. 786. 7783/617. 639. 0396  
www.reportersinc.com

## I N D E X

GENERAL BUSINESSPAGE

1. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases 3
2. Update, Susan Glazer,  
for Community Development 13
3. Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)  
X

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(Continued)

PB#26, 125 CambridgePark Drive Amendment,  
PB#47, 150 CambridgePark Drive Amendment, and  
PB#270 125, 150, 180 and 180R CambridgePark  
Drive 14

Planning Board Petition to amend the Zoning  
Map in the area known as the North Cambridge  
Trolley yard and the area abutting the Linear  
Park, Business A-2 to Residence C-2B 122

(Continued) Forest city Commercial Group  
Petition to amend the Zoning Map by extending  
the Cambridgeport Revitalization Development  
District and the Zoning Ordinance in Article  
15.000, Section 11.200 125

GENERAL BUSINESS

PB# 247, 22 Water Street, extension of  
Special Permit for one year

PB#141, Cambridge Research park, approval of  
spinning classes at the warming shed at the  
skating rink 224

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

(Sitting Members: Hugh Russell, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, Steven Winter.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. The first item on our agenda is a review of the Zoning Board of Appeal cases.

ALEXANDRA OFFIONG: Good evening. My name is Alexander Offiong and I'm here with the 32 Quincy Street BZA request. I think the Planning Board received a package of information. I will be very brief.

We are here for the third time for this project, which is a continuing renovation expansion of the home of the Harvard Art Museums at 32 Quincy Street. We have two minor design changes that require approval from the Board of Zoning Appeal because they affect very, very minorly two of the variances we received. We also have a new signage plan. So very briefly the design

1 changes, one of them actually is a response  
2 to some of the comments we heard from the  
3 Planning Board over here on the Broadway  
4 edge. It's the podium that's on the first  
5 level that is right next to the sidewalk.  
6 And we heard that there was some concerns  
7 about the pedestrian experience. So what we  
8 are proposing is to reduce the length of that  
9 podium edge. This is the design as approved  
10 in 2010. And this is the design that we are  
11 proposing today. So it's reducing the  
12 length. It is animating it with a set of  
13 banners. It's also notching the angle so it  
14 opens up into this area. So we -- and it's  
15 also introducing some wood elements that will  
16 tie it to the wooden addition above.

17 The second design change is on the  
18 other side of the building facing the  
19 Carpenter Center. We have a wing gallery  
20 that's cantilevered out. We are proposing to  
21 remove the structure that's above and below

1 the wing gallery. So right now you could see  
2 this is the wing gallery. There was some  
3 structure here and some structure here. We  
4 are proposing to remove that to -- actually,  
5 I'm over here. There's some structure here  
6 and some structure here that's being removed.  
7 And that's just to simplify the design and to  
8 create a more elegant presentation  
9 particularly as it relates to the Carpenter  
10 Center. So those are the two design changes.

11 The variances that are being sought --  
12 being amended, one is alteration and  
13 expansion of the non-conforming structure and  
14 that is because the building is  
15 non-conforming for parking.

16 The second one relates to the setback  
17 to the Carpenter Center. There's no material  
18 change in that with these changes -- with  
19 these proposals, but it's simply an existing,  
20 non-conforming setback that is being created  
21 because of the additional height.

1           I'll move to the signage plan. So in  
2           -- the Zoning only allows this building to  
3           have two signage -- two traditional signs as  
4           of right because it's in a residential  
5           district. This is a property that faces  
6           three public streets and it has three public  
7           entrances, so that is clearly not going to be  
8           adequate for the functioning of a -- of this  
9           museum facility. So we're proposing 12  
10          traditional signs. And I can go through  
11          that. It's very modest. It's mostly wall  
12          lettering. The eight of the twelve are  
13          lettering on the wall that identify the  
14          museums that are within the building.  
15          They're very modest in scale. And we're also  
16          -- one of the signs is for the loading dock.  
17          One is the carved stone Fogg Museum  
18          identification. One of them's a pylon. It's  
19          all to provide museum information to  
20          facilitate way finding. And it's, it's  
21          really the minimum necessary to allow the

1 building to function effectively. So I think  
2 those are the key requests.

3 (H. Theodore Cohen seated.)

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So I looked very  
5 carefully at the signage and I would agree  
6 with the evaluation that it is a, you know,  
7 very tasteful and modest, and what's being  
8 shown is really what's needed to tell  
9 somebody who is relatively near the building  
10 what's going on. The banners, which are  
11 permitted as a matter of right, are things  
12 which actually catch your attention from  
13 farther away and say this is a museum. So I  
14 think that, you know, it's an excellent job.  
15 And, you know, one of the oddities of the  
16 Cambridge Zoning Ordinance is that the base  
17 zone for Harvard is a Residence C-3 District,  
18 and it's true people in part of the  
19 buildings, but it's just the way it was set  
20 up. And the signage didn't differentiate the  
21 needs of the institution from the needs of a,

1 say -- that at the time it was set up there  
2 were more C-3 districts that had sort of  
3 small apartment buildings in them. And the  
4 rules are sort of set up around a residential  
5 building in a residential district. So  
6 anyway, I think we should send something to  
7 the Zoning Board that says that this is a  
8 reasonable proposal, and the reason it's a  
9 variance is really an artifact of the  
10 Ordinance not reflecting perfectly and  
11 appropriate signage rules for the university  
12 that's in the Residence C-3 District.

13 STEVEN WINTER: I concur.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: And that the  
15 changes are minor and are improvements.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I didn't -- the  
17 two architectural changes are I think  
18 improvements. I'm still thinking they could  
19 go farther along the Broadway frontage, but  
20 I'm not sure that's even part of the  
21 building. It might be pre-standing elements,

1           you know, maybe a stray emery board or  
2           something, that would just change the whole  
3           character of that experience. You know, and  
4           I'm hoping that once the art people get back  
5           into the building, they will recognize that  
6           they can tell more of their story.

7                        So I think we can say for the  
8           architectural changes, they're of no  
9           substance particularly. And if there isn't  
10          anything that's going on there, they're minor  
11          tweaks that are minor improvements, but I  
12          think signage supports.

13                     Pam.

14                     PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, I was just  
15          wondering if the banners are going to reflect  
16          the different shows that are going to be  
17          there or is it just going to be running?

18                     ALEXANDRA OFFIONG: Yes. So the  
19          banners will definitely be changing, and they  
20          will be changing for the exhibitions in the  
21          building.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so we agreed on  
3 that?

4 STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you for  
6 coming.

7 Are there other things you'd like to  
8 draw our attention to?

9 LIZA PADEN: I don't have anything  
10 to draw your attention to, but I'm here to  
11 answer questions if you have any.

12 PAMELA WINTERS: I have one. I'm  
13 just curious about the Moshe Safdie House.  
14 On Waterhouse Street.

15 LIZA PADEN: Waterhouse Street?

16 PAMELA WINTERS: He wants an  
17 elevator in the setback? Was there any --  
18 did you find anything offensive?

19 LIZA PADEN: It's in the side yard  
20 setback. This whole house is non-conforming,  
21 and it's been non conforming since 1941

1           according to the submittal. And so what  
2           they're looking to do with this renovation is  
3           to do some improvements overall. And what  
4           happens is the setback is required to be  
5           20 feet and it will be four feet,  
6           eleven inches. And it's four feet  
7           eleven inches now. So the way it's  
8           arranged -- here's a photograph. Here's the  
9           photographs of the existing.

10                   HUGH RUSSELL: Does this house fall  
11           in Cambridge Common Historic District or  
12           under any Historic Commission?

13                   LIZA PADEN: It's been reviewed at  
14           the Cambridge Historical Commission, and  
15           they've completed their review. They don't  
16           see any further review that they're going to  
17           do.

18                   HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

19                   PAMELA WINTERS: That's what I was  
20           asking.

21                   LIZA PADEN: Okay.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: I know that they see  
2 this as an important structure.

3                   LIZA PADEN: Yes.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: The famous architect  
5 apparently doesn't do buildings that look  
6 like the house he lives in.

7                   PAMELA WINTERS: Nothing like it  
8 actually.

9                   LIZA PADEN: I thought that was  
10 interesting. I like that part.

11                  PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

12                  HUGH RUSSELL: No?

13                  PAMELA WINTERS: You don't like the  
14 building?

15                  STEVEN WINTER: I have no further  
16 questions.

17                  PAMELA WINTERS: Oh.

18                  HUGH RUSSELL: All of these are  
19 pieces that were the abutters and the  
20 immediate people who will come to the Zoning  
21 hearing and they don't seem to have planning

1 -- so I think we're complete with that.

2 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

3 (Ahmed Nur seated.)

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Are you going to give  
5 an update, Susan?

6 SUSAN GLAZER: Yes.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Or should we wait for  
8 Brian?

9 SUSAN GLAZER: There are two  
10 meetings in July. Because of the July 4th  
11 holiday, the first meeting will be July 10th.  
12 And at that time we hope to bring the study  
13 recommendations from the Kendall Square  
14 portion of the Kendall/Central study for the  
15 Board's consideration, and I think that's  
16 conversation that will occur over the summer  
17 and it will not be just one meeting.

18 And the second meeting will be  
19 July 17th. And then in August the dates are  
20 August 7th and 21st.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

1           So, I think we can then go on to the  
2 first item on our public hearing agenda which  
3 is the CambridgePark Drive Housing project.  
4 Parking slab and what I believe brings a  
5 record number of issues before this Board in  
6 a single case in order to accomplish what's  
7 going on.

8           So we've briefly discussed this and  
9 we've heard some public testimony, but the  
10 Board has not really dug into this project  
11 before and so I think we would -- how much of  
12 a presentation do we want?

13           STEVEN WINTER: That's a difficult  
14 question. Enough to satisfy me. I don't  
15 know what to say.

16           HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So I think the  
17 goal would be to remind us rather than to  
18 start from scratch.

19           STEVEN WINTER: Yes, yes.

20           RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes. This --  
21 would you like me to just do a quick sum up

1 as well, Mr. Chairman?

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

3 RICHARD MCKINNON: Okay. Then we  
4 have five questions as you know from last  
5 time.

6 This is a 398-unit -- first of all,  
7 good evening. Happy to be here. My name is  
8 Rich McKinnon.

9 Our project is a 398-unit apartment  
10 complex with same number of housing spaces  
11 and the same number of bicycle storage  
12 spaces. It's built at 160 CambridgePark  
13 Drive nestled in the middle of the office  
14 park right there. It's outlined in yellow.

15 This project had been in front of the  
16 Planning Board back in 2008. At that time it  
17 was approved for two office/lab buildings  
18 with a separate additional parking garage.  
19 So it was going to be a three-structure  
20 building. We have decided because of the  
21 market really, to do this as a residential

1           bui l di ng. We thi nk there' s an awful l ot  
2           that' s ni ce about bei ng here, even though i t  
3           i s an offi ce park. I t' s very close to a l ot  
4           of wonderf ul ami ni ti es, especi al l y outdoor  
5           ami ni ti es that Cambri dge has; bi ke paths,  
6           Fresh Pond Reservati on, Fresh Pond i tsel f,  
7           thi ng s l i ke that. So that' s qui ck l y,  
8           Mr. Chai rman. Okay?

9                           (Bri an Murphy seated.)

10                   BRI AN MURPHY: Thank you.

11                   RI CHARD McKI NNON: And then when we  
12           were here l ast ti me, i t was very l ate i f you  
13           recal l , and we were runni ng up agai nst  
14           el even o' cl ock, and so there were a number of  
15           questi on s that the Board had and that members  
16           of the publ ic had. And what we di d i n the  
17           i nteri m over the l ast two weeks i s we met  
18           wi th your staff and col l ected them i nto a  
19           seri es of fi ve questi on s. And I' m goi ng to  
20           do the fi rst two, then the l ast two -- l ast  
21           three of them have to do wi th archi tecture,

1 so I'm going to let Brian O'Connor from Cube  
2 do those.

3 First question is whether or not there  
4 was adequate review and -- of the floodplain  
5 data and then the size of the sewer tanks.

6 And the second question was whether or  
7 not the traffic had been properly reviewed as  
8 part of the process here.

9 We chose to go in a different order  
10 than we had to do the Conservation  
11 Commission review before we came to the  
12 Planning Board, and so as you know, that's a  
13 thorough review under the Mass. Wetlands  
14 Protection Act. And in fact as a right we  
15 were issued an order of conditions for the  
16 project. So it's been pretty thoroughly  
17 looked at. I've got David Biancavilla here  
18 from BSC and he'd be happy after the  
19 presentation to take questions from the  
20 Board.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. And those

1 of you who are not familiar with the arcane  
2 world of the Conservation Commission, an  
3 order of a conditions is an approval.

4 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: With conditions. I  
6 think there are about 80 conditions of which  
7 about 60 are stock.

8 RICHARD MCKINNON: Yes, that's  
9 right.

10 And then there's the letter from Owen  
11 O'Riordan basically stating that we were  
12 complying with all of the City's requirements  
13 in terms of sewerage. And as you know,  
14 sewerage storage tanks have become a part of  
15 new residential buildings.

16 So that's sort of a direct response to  
17 those two questions that were left behind  
18 from last week.

19 The second question was whether or not  
20 -- and I think it might have come from  
21 someone in the audience, if there had been a

1 review of the traffic analysis. And our  
2 process here in Cambridge is the studies are  
3 done by the proponent and they were reviewed  
4 by the Traffic and Parking. When we were  
5 here the last time, but the time before that,  
6 we still had two issues that were open with  
7 Sue Clippinger, and so you did not have a  
8 letter at that time from the Traffic  
9 Department. As you can see tonight, you do  
10 have a letter. We've been able to settle  
11 those issues after the review was done, and I  
12 think Sue is here if I'm not mistaken.  
13 Probably best if she spoke for herself on her  
14 letter. So that's the first two.

15 The next three all have to do with the  
16 issues around architecture, and so we'll let  
17 Brian come up and answer those last three  
18 questions.

19 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Chairman, and members of the Board. What  
21 I'd like to do is just spend a few minutes

1 walking through each of these last three  
2 questions and hopefully we'll hit on  
3 everything in an adequate manner.

4 The first of the three is discussion  
5 about how the ground floor is activated and  
6 the fronting along CambridgePark Drive is  
7 addressed. And in order to really explore  
8 that, I wanted to just share our initial  
9 design strategy for the plan of the building.  
10 You all remember the building is effectively  
11 two internal courtyards wrapped by a single  
12 building. The building has a large step in  
13 it right here which is framing an urban  
14 plaza. Our primary goal was to try to create  
15 an active face along the entire length of the  
16 building from the side closest to Alewife  
17 Station to the turnaround on the other side  
18 and work hard with what we had to try to get  
19 that happen. So we did break the building in  
20 the middle to try to define blocks, create  
21 smaller, more digestible pieces of frontage.

1 We allowed the building to really frame the  
2 plaza itself. This plaza ends up really  
3 being the centerpiece of the project. It's  
4 an urban plaza that runs from the edge of the  
5 sidewalk to the face of the building and not  
6 only defines and frames the main entry to the  
7 building, but also frames some of the other  
8 key amenities within the building. So  
9 looking at this line, looking at the plaza  
10 and the way we've divided up the blocks, the  
11 next key piece is really thinking about where  
12 the building entries are, where the access  
13 points, and where the amenities are located.

14 So as we flip to this, this is the  
15 ground floor plan. As you can see, this  
16 parking as you're familiar with it, the  
17 ground floor level due to floodplain issues.  
18 So the challenge then became how do we really  
19 create the most active use possible along the  
20 street edge knowing that we didn't want  
21 visibility to parking? And one of the

1 questions that's come up a couple of times,  
2 and I have a response here that I'd like to  
3 hand out to the Board if that's okay. Some  
4 members of our team went out and talked to  
5 retail brokers, and they talked to the  
6 Dartmouth Company in this particular case did  
7 an analysis of this building as a potential  
8 retail location. And I believe this letter  
9 will give you their opinion of the viability  
10 of the site itself as a retail area. And I  
11 think the bottom line is the traffic, the  
12 pedestrian foot traffic counts, and the  
13 location of the site are really too  
14 challenging for this to be a real viable  
15 retail location. So knowing that as a  
16 baseline really drives how the project tries  
17 to activate the street frontage. We did work  
18 hard to try to locate, you know, if we start  
19 on the right-hand edge here, these are  
20 labelled bike storage. And we've talked  
21 about this a few times. We've made some

1 amendments. And the reality is we're trying  
2 to treat these, as you'll see in a moment, to  
3 make them glass, make them transparent, make  
4 them bike repair facilities up at the front  
5 and actually create more of a lounge-like  
6 area up in the front edge of the bike storage  
7 on the left-hand side so that these do become  
8 a place where bicyclists can, you know,  
9 congregate get together before a ride and get  
10 together after a ride and take the use of  
11 these front edges and activate that plaza and  
12 activate that front edge.

13 So there's two primary entrances in  
14 this location and this location to the bike  
15 storage. The leasing and primary entry to  
16 the building occupies this corner, which is  
17 approximately mid-block for the building.  
18 And then as you continue, the idea was to  
19 really take the organic form that we were  
20 trying to create within this courtyard and  
21 let it continue to flow down the face by

1 expanding the sidewalk, pulling in towards  
2 the building, and creating, you know, fairly  
3 well defined residential entries to some  
4 units that we actually have at the ground  
5 floor with direct entry from CambridgePark  
6 Drive. So, you know, we do recognize there  
7 are some challenges here. There's also a  
8 vehicular entry in the central point here,  
9 and then there's access to the site on either  
10 side. But, you know, our goal was to really  
11 create life where we could, create activity  
12 where we could, transparency. Approximately  
13 40 percent of the overall front elevation at  
14 the ground floor on this project is glass or  
15 a glazing of some type that try to really  
16 reinforce that sense of transparency.

17 We're looking here at an enlarged  
18 elevation of that same condition. And, you  
19 know, from an architectural standpoint what  
20 we really tried to do is define the edge and  
21 define the base. And we took masonry and we

1 really brought it down to the ground here.  
2 We changed the texture. We changed the  
3 color. We're trying to create an experience  
4 within this plaza area that reflects  
5 something that's more of a pedestrian scale.  
6 So you can see here these are all the  
7 storefront glazing elements that occur in the  
8 bike storage area. This is the glass and  
9 this curved element that happens down at the  
10 ground floor for the main entry to the  
11 building. And, again, it's really all about  
12 creating these direct entries from the  
13 sidewalk, direct entries from the plaza, and  
14 doing it in numerous different places. We've  
15 also integrated canopies and lighting over  
16 the entries and over the storefront areas  
17 along the plaza and along the sidewalk edge.  
18 And the real focus here is to treat the lower  
19 edge of this building as a strong base that's  
20 detailed and articulated in a way that  
21 responds to the pedestrian rather than just

1 taking the building elements from above and  
2 bringing them down.

3 Here you can see the first floor plan.  
4 And the reason that I'm showing you this is  
5 to highlight again the location of the  
6 clubhouse. The clubhouse is on the first  
7 residential level. And our primary goal was  
8 to make sure to the greatest extent that we  
9 could, that this, you know, plaza area was  
10 activated not only at the ground floor but by  
11 the upper level by an active public space for  
12 the residents that would have light,  
13 activity, and other things happening to again  
14 try to bring the life to the front edge of  
15 the CambridgePark Drive edge of the project.

16 This is a view of the plaza. And you  
17 can see here in a little bit more detail how  
18 some of these elements are working. Primary  
19 bike storage entry is right here. Glass and  
20 glazing along the edge. Projecting canopies,  
21 lighting, and really a hardscaped plaza out

1 here that brings people off of the sidewalk  
2 and allows them to kind of move along the  
3 front edge of the building interacting  
4 directly with these entries and then curving  
5 away from that edge down here where the main  
6 entry of the building is. We'll talk about  
7 landscaping and some of this hardscape in a  
8 minutes. But, you know, I think this is an  
9 image that really captures the spirit of we  
10 were trying to do at the edge of the building  
11 down at the ground.

12 Down here you'll see in a few other  
13 images as we get into the rest of the  
14 presentation there's also a real focus on  
15 treating these pedestrian entries as an  
16 element that really is important to this  
17 street face.

18 The next question was a discussion  
19 about the architecture, how it's appropriate  
20 to the site and how it's different from some  
21 of the other recent buildings in the area.

1 I want to start very quickly by hitting  
2 on the site context piece. You know, the  
3 scale of the immediate environment that --  
4 sorry.

5 STEVEN WINTER: Could you orient us  
6 and just while we're up this high, what's  
7 where and what's what?

8 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Absolutely.

9 This is the project site, right here.  
10 The train station is right down here.  
11 CambridgePark Drive runs along here. 150  
12 CambridgePark Drive, which is our immediate  
13 abutting neighbor, is right next to us.

14 And so we're effectively in an office  
15 park. There's a residential building down at  
16 the end which has a fairly significant scale.  
17 The buildings around us are large.  
18 Recognition of the scale of the buildings is  
19 key to understanding how to approach this  
20 site, and I think is one of the primary  
21 differences between this project and the

1        archi tectural character of thi s project and  
2        some of the other projects. If you thi nk  
3        about Fawcett Street, which i s one of the  
4        projects that we've menti oned, Fawcett Street  
5        i s -- i t's a fronti er project. I t's really a  
6        project where the archi tecture of the  
7        bui lding i s dri vi ng and creati ng the context  
8        of what wi ll devel op around i t i n the future  
9        as devel opment conti nues i n that area. And  
10       so that bui lding has a very di fferent  
11       fundamental approach to i ts own scale.

12                Faces i s one of the other projects we  
13        were tal ki ng about. That project has a very  
14        di fferent context as well. The front edge i s  
15        effecti vely the front door to Route 2. So i t  
16        has a very, you know, hi gh speed at sometimes  
17        of the day traffi c pattern. And then i t's  
18        got a back si de on the reservati on whi ch has  
19        a very di fferent scale and detaili ng level to  
20        i t. So I thi nk j ust understandi ng the  
21        context dri ves the archi tecture.

1           Here as well, the overlay design  
2           guidelines, the fact that we're in a  
3           floodplain, and some of the pedestrian goals  
4           that we believe are important as a project,  
5           also tend to define what that frontage is as  
6           we just discussed a minute ago with the  
7           activation.

8           The key here, because of the context  
9           we're in, is that the building needs to not  
10          only create a residential neighborhood but it  
11          has to stand up to its surroundings. So  
12          putting a building here that doesn't have  
13          larger scale elements that doesn't address  
14          the context would be a problem. Building  
15          design really responds to the goal of  
16          activating the street edge in terms of  
17          setback, height, and proximity. We talked  
18          about that a little bit earlier.

19          Here you can see an elevation. This is  
20          just a piece, this is the main entry to the  
21          building over here. So we're looking at a

1 little more than 50 percent of the building  
2 as it sits up against 150 CambridgePark  
3 Drive. So, again, here you can see the  
4 importance of response to the office park  
5 scale. And what we've really tried to do is  
6 balance this strong horizontal movement that  
7 I was talking about at the pedestrian edge  
8 with taller vertical elements that really  
9 anchor the ends of the building, anchor the  
10 entry and allow the building design to stand  
11 up to some of its context. Varied materials,  
12 articulation, and approach help define this  
13 as a residential building. We don't want a  
14 monolithic treatment to the facade all the  
15 way across.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Could you expand on  
17 what the materials are?

18 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yes, absolutely.  
19 I'm going to walk through the specific  
20 materials in one minute.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Great.

1                   BRIAN O'CONNOR: Again, this is the  
2 overall elevation. I wanted to sort of rekey  
3 in everybody to where we are as we talk about  
4 sort of the goals here. It's to really  
5 create simple clean massing with these  
6 vertical focal points that I talked about,  
7 and key breaks in the plain to ensure that  
8 the places where the building is more  
9 continuous, have a rhythm that comes down to  
10 the street scale. Window scale, building  
11 rhythm, very textured materials also  
12 contribute to the character of this as a  
13 residential building and that pedestrian  
14 experience at the street edge.

15                   We've worked hard in this building,  
16 again, as a counterpoint to some of the other  
17 buildings that we've talked about to create a  
18 strong building base that this thing can sit  
19 on as it addresses the street edge. Fawcett  
20 Street, if you remember, had a large vertical  
21 elements that came all the way down to the

1 ground. And the overarching design builder  
2 was to create almost a series of large  
3 building elements that were very vertical in  
4 nature ending in street stoops to try to  
5 identify that sort of built over time  
6 quality. We're doing something very  
7 different here where. We're trying to deal  
8 with the pedestrian edge as it runs along the  
9 entire frontage of this building in a very  
10 different way. So, again, strong building  
11 base, which we actually stepped here. So you  
12 notice it's two stories here in recognition  
13 of that it's secondary second floor public  
14 element, excuse me, over here. And then the  
15 single story to bring that scale down and  
16 have a more direct response to the  
17 residential entries which you can see here  
18 and here along that section of the building.

19           Again, the goal, clear base, middle,  
20 and top, over and over emphasizing the  
21 importance of pedestrian scale and

1 reinforcing that street frontage.

2 We're gonna zoom in on this area here  
3 to talk about building materials. And as  
4 we're zoomed in, again, you know, I want to  
5 highlight this as sort of a key area of the  
6 building that we focus on. If we start on  
7 the lower right storefront window systems,  
8 fairly large, fairly broad transparent  
9 sections of the building. We really want to  
10 encourage that visibility. Canopies over  
11 those to further define that pedestrian  
12 scale. Masonry base to the building that  
13 goes up two floors, brick, up to the top  
14 floor. And then at the top fiber cement  
15 panel. And then a metal louver sunshade  
16 system at the top to just kind of cap the  
17 building and, again, reinforce that sense of  
18 this thing having a top. The larger elements  
19 at the edge are primarily metal panel.  
20 Again, a material that's a little bit, a  
21 little bit more commercial, again, trying to

1 stand up to the larger buildings next to it.  
2 And it's really a combination of texture and  
3 color here where we have a smooth metal panel  
4 system. All of this is metal trim, smooth  
5 metal in-fill, and then a rib panel to kind  
6 of run down the edge of the building and  
7 really give some texture to that edge.

8 I don't know if you had any other  
9 questions as I'm going through this. I'll  
10 keep going. Feel free to stop me.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: That's exactly what I  
12 was asking.

13 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Great.

14 As we come around the side of the  
15 building, the east elevation facing Cambridge  
16 -- 150 Cambridge Park Drive, again, the pallet  
17 of materials is fairly consistent. We're  
18 not, you know, we're not having major  
19 adjustments to the pallet. The masonry base  
20 here takes on a new element where we're gonna  
21 define a very sort of urban architectural

1 screening system to ensure that places where  
2 we do have garage and we don't have public  
3 use behind them, we're treating them as part  
4 of the building. They have a scale. They  
5 have a rhythm that relates to everything  
6 above. And then metal balconies projecting,  
7 brick cavity walls, fiber cement panel. And,  
8 again, here we're using fiber cement lap  
9 siding instead of the metal panel to draw a  
10 relationship to the texture without  
11 necessarily bringing all the materials around  
12 the corner.

13 This is a view across CambridgePark  
14 Drive looking into this courtyard, and I  
15 think this view does a good job of really  
16 highlighting this element, highlighting this  
17 pedestrian scale. And you can really almost  
18 see the water line here at the two-story and  
19 then dropping down at the one-story space.  
20 Well-defined top. Very clear, well-defined  
21 entry position that does come down to grade.

1           This is a view looking in the other  
2           direction back towards the entry. Again,  
3           here's that central element that defines the  
4           main entry to the building. Here you can  
5           start to see some of the smaller residential  
6           scale entries along the edge of the  
7           CambridgePark Drive where we don't have the  
8           plaza. And then in this shot it's a much  
9           closer view, and you can see the sidewalk.  
10          Along the right-hand side you can see this  
11          curved entry to the plaza. Some of the bike  
12          storage entries right here and, you know, it  
13          gets obscured with the landscaping but this,  
14          we really want to create a very rich  
15          environment for the pedestrian; shade trees,  
16          seating, benches, and a transparent building  
17          edge down at the ground floor.

18                 Third question was the discussion of  
19                 landscaping and how it's appropriate for this  
20                 site. And what I'll do is I've -- this is  
21                 just broken down to an east and a west side

1 so you can see it. We've spent a little bit  
2 of time talking about the plaza. I think the  
3 key point here is that the plaza itself was  
4 designed in conjunction with the building.  
5 And the idea is to really reinforce the idea  
6 of bringing people to the edge of the  
7 building, creating good, strong, clear access  
8 points into the building, and allowing it to  
9 really also not interrupt the sidewalk but  
10 serve as a very strong plaza. That area  
11 itself is a blend of hard and landscape  
12 surfaces with planting beds here. We're  
13 going to reestablish the street trees that  
14 are missing along that edge and really look  
15 at this edge as a, you know, an opportunity  
16 to recreate what was there and what should be  
17 there to define that edge as a real city  
18 edge. Again, a hard scape focal point right  
19 here, seating areas, gathering spaces, and  
20 really the start on the next slide you can  
21 see here of creating these buffer zones with

1           Landscaping and with planting that start to  
2           build more separation between that public  
3           space and what is really more private space  
4           at the individualized entries to the  
5           residential units that happen along  
6           CambridgePark Drive. So buffer zone, layered  
7           planting beds. We have a flush sidewalk  
8           condition over here at the entry drive. So  
9           that whole pedestrian experience just flows  
10          smoothly across. And then, you know, there's  
11          an opportunity out here along the street edge  
12          near these residential entries to locate  
13          bicycle racks out on the edge.

14                   Here's another view from a little  
15          higher up. Again, I think we've looked at  
16          this one earlier, but it does, again,  
17          reinforce the richness that we're trying to  
18          build into this plaza. I mean, you know,  
19          creation of as many different areas as  
20          possible while at the same time having a  
21          single, unifying theme I think is something

1 that really -- we've worked hard to achieve.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: Excuse me, on  
3 that picture where is the entry to the  
4 parking?

5 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Entry to the  
6 parking, right here. You can see the curb  
7 cut right in that location. So it's right  
8 beyond the tower.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: And the main entry  
10 to the building?

11 BRIAN O'CONNOR: The main entry to  
12 the building is right at the middle of this  
13 curved section right here.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: And the entry to the  
15 bike storage area?

16 BRIAN O'CONNOR: There's a bike  
17 storage entry right here, and then there's  
18 another one right there. Right in that  
19 location. And then this sort of curved glass  
20 element here, that meets up to and defines  
21 the main entry to the building at the

1 pedestrian level also is that zone where  
2 we're really looking at more lounge seating  
3 and trying to draw a connection between the  
4 main entry lobby and the bike storage and  
5 repair area so they don't feel like two  
6 different things. They really become this  
7 glass connected sort of experience to really,  
8 you know, try to bring things together.

9 I think that's it. That's kind of a  
10 quick summary. We tried to hit on hopefully  
11 the things that you were interested in  
12 hearing about and address the questions as  
13 directly as we could and we hope that -- we  
14 hope that we've done that.

15 AHMED NUR: Thank you.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

17 So do we want to start discussing this  
18 or do we want to ask for any comments that  
19 people have had to this presentation?

20 STEVEN WINTER: I'd like to hear  
21 comments.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we've heard  
2                   comments once before and I think what we're  
3                   interested in hearing is not the same  
4                   comments repeated, but reaction to what  
5                   you've just seen in the new material and any  
6                   second thoughts that you may have had after  
7                   much reflection.

8                   So the first and only name on the list  
9                   is Anne-Marie Lambert. Sorry.

10                  Do you wish to speak?

11                  ANNE-MARIE LAMBERT: I would, yes.

12                  HUGH RUSSELL: Please come forward  
13                  and use the microphone. Please give your  
14                  name and spell your name for the recorder.

15                  ANNE-MARIE LAMBERT: My name is  
16                  Anne-Marie Lambert. A-n-n-e - M-a-r-i-e  
17                  Lambert from Belmont, Massachusetts,  
18                  next-door. And do you need anything else  
19                  about me?

20                  THOMAS ANNINGER: That's it.

21                  ANNE-MARIE LAMBERT: I have a no

1           doubt that these gentlemen are aware that  
2           there's a residential building in Belmont  
3           nearby that is permitted for 298 units on  
4           Acorn Park Drive, and so my question is  
5           whether or not that was taken into  
6           consideration with the traffic study. And  
7           with the storm water management response,  
8           there was a question on each of those. And  
9           since Acorn Park Drive at rush hour is  
10          currently backing up three-quarters of the  
11          way back on Acorn Park Drive from current  
12          traffic, I'm concerned that the cumulative  
13          effect of our two towns, the town city  
14          developments are taken into account when  
15          permitting this project.

16                    HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I'll ask Sue  
17                    Clippinger to address that when she speaks to  
18                    us.

19                    Does anyone else wish to speak?

20                    Yes, James.

21                    JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. My

1 name is James Williamson. I live at 1000  
2 Jackson Place out along Rindge Ave. I have  
3 some comments before. The comment that I  
4 think is in addition to what's already been  
5 said and what I've already said, I think I  
6 had pretty good instincts about the  
7 transportation issues, especially with the  
8 Red Line. Some of you may know but or maybe  
9 you don't all know that since then there has  
10 been a study that was funded by the Urban  
11 Land Institute coordinated by Stephanie  
12 Pollack who is a transportation person at  
13 Northeastern University and it's a 28-page  
14 study, easy to look through. And the gist of  
15 it is the Red Line is already at or over  
16 capacity depending if you focus on certain  
17 stations, but the key sort of understanding,  
18 I think, for understanding what's happening  
19 at Alewife, is that as a hub and spoke  
20 system, people boarding at Alewife, you know,  
21 may be able to board, but then they get the

1       Davi s and more peopl e board and then they get  
2       to Porter and more peopl e board and then they  
3       get to Cambridge -- to Harvard and then  
4       there' s little room left. And by the time it  
5       gets into Boston, forget it. So, the Urban  
6       Land Insti tute study is avai lable at thei r  
7       websi te, and I thi nk you' re gonna hear more  
8       about it at one of the later heari ngs  
9       tonight. And I hope you' ll pay attenti on to  
10      the real ly important transportati on capaci ty  
11      i ssues.

12                Thank you.

13                HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

14                Does anyone el se wi sh to speak? Okay,  
15      sure, Mi chael .

16                MI CHAEL BRANDON: Thank you,  
17      Mr. Chai r. Thank you members of the Board  
18      for al lowi ng me to address you. I' m a li ttle  
19      di sturbed that there' s a 25-page new  
20      submi ssi on that i s dated yesterday. I fi rst  
21      was abl e to get a copy of it today at 4: 30.

1 I obviously haven't had a chance to really  
2 read it through carefully let alone digest  
3 what --

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: Are you talking  
5 about this?

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, that's the same  
7 thing.

8 MICHAEL BRANDON: Goulston and  
9 Storrs is the cover letter. It addresses  
10 some of the issues that were just -- we were  
11 just briefed on, but the devil is really in  
12 the details, and I can't really address  
13 those. Another thing that has just been made  
14 available this evening is a tentative draft  
15 decision which, again, I mean, it looks like  
16 it's kind of boilerplate for what's usually  
17 issued. But this as was discussed last time,  
18 was a much more complex application and seeks  
19 nine or ten different special permits,  
20 including amending previous permits. So,  
21 yeah, I'm a little frustrated that, you know,

1 I obviously can't address those. But I'll  
2 just comment on some things. Well, another  
3 aspect is as the letter says, it doesn't  
4 include details about landscaping plans that  
5 indicated Mr. Anninger last time. That was  
6 an area that you wanted to discuss. Now,  
7 there was something shown here, I'm not sure  
8 if those drawings are any different from  
9 what's in the application packet. Perhaps  
10 the architect could explain how it is  
11 different if that's the case. My knee-jerk  
12 reaction is that there is not enough  
13 permeable green space. And I think previous  
14 speakers have raised that issue with you.  
15 Given that this is a floodplain, the emphasis  
16 on hardscaped areas I think is too much. I'd  
17 much rather see some lawn areas even if the  
18 building had to be reconfigured or perhaps in  
19 the rear. And on the landscape issue another  
20 concern I have, because there was nothing new  
21 added, I went looking through the application

1 packet, and I couldn't find it in there. I  
2 may have missed it because it's voluminous.  
3 A certification from the city's arborist  
4 indicating that the city's tree protection  
5 ordinance has been complied with. And I  
6 believe some mature trees, in addition to the  
7 street trees that were mentioned, are being  
8 removed, but there's really no way to judge  
9 what's happening there and what this Board  
10 might want to ask be done on those adjacent  
11 large mammoth parking lots in terms of  
12 possibly adding landscaping island in  
13 conjunction with this permit given that  
14 you're being asked to amend those permits.  
15 But without that information, it's not there.  
16 And I believe the Ordinance actually requires  
17 the submission of that certified study from  
18 the arborist, you know, certainly before you  
19 issue a permit.

20 I don't want to repeat what I said last  
21 time but I don't think this project

1           constitutes smart growth. Perhaps I would  
2           argue to the contrary. It's kind of dumb  
3           growth. As I said last time, I think it's  
4           never smart to develop in a floodplain,  
5           especially develop substantially as is being  
6           done here. And I understand there are  
7           engineering solutions that you're being told  
8           will address the problem. I hope that's  
9           correct. Because I have no doubt, like I  
10          said, that ultimately something significant  
11          will be built on this lot with this Board's  
12          permission.

13                   HUGH RUSSELL: If you could begin  
14                   wrapping up?

15                   MICHAEL BRANDON: Yes, I will  
16                   definitely begin.

17                   Well, not smart, the infrastructure is  
18                   maxed out. The roadways, the sewer system,  
19                   which is spilling junk in the Alewife Brook  
20                   and into basements in the area. The flood  
21                   storage capacity, a point I wanted to make

1 was that what people were saying to you last  
2 time, and what I think isn't addressed, is  
3 the responses have been that well, the  
4 departments have approved the parking issue.  
5 Those are minimum requirements. There's  
6 nothing -- this Board is empowered to ask for  
7 more and I would argue that you really  
8 should. So more flood storage, more of this  
9 sewerage storage. So it's held on-site after  
10 a significant storm which we will see more  
11 and more of. The pedestrian bridge, I  
12 believe, although the contribution for a  
13 study for it, I think it's far late to  
14 continue to, in my view, to overdevelop the  
15 quadrangle and the triangle until the  
16 infrastructure is there. You know, I don't  
17 know how these people are gonna be served.  
18 On the issue of the retail, again, a letter  
19 was plopped down, you folks didn't even get  
20 it in advance. I don't know what it says.  
21 My suggestion last time that prompted the

1 Board's inquiry I think was that there be  
2 some sort of a convenience store. It's not  
3 geared, you know, to walk-in traffic. There  
4 are other possibilities. A bike repair shop  
5 might work. The active uses are visual.  
6 They're not -- I was talking about, I mean  
7 active uses, especially something at night  
8 when it's a no-man's land out there. The  
9 conditions in the draft are inadequate. I  
10 would hope that you will add others after  
11 your thorough discussion of this. One  
12 suggestion I would make that the CDD recently  
13 -- or redesigned its website, and some of the  
14 material that was added included a TPDM -- I  
15 think that's the right acronym -- plan, for  
16 the commercial project that was previously  
17 permitted. I would suggest that you get a  
18 copy of that plan and ask that it be modified  
19 and impose it as a condition on this. Given  
20 you're talking 400 units, you know, at least  
21 a thousand more people.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Let's move on.

2 MICHAEL BRANDON: Thank you,  
3 Mr. Chair, I'm going to wrap up. Well, I  
4 have more. I hope after your discussion,  
5 you're maybe going to ask for more  
6 information and we'll leave at least the  
7 written record open for further comments,  
8 comments on all this material that just came  
9 in tonight. Thank you very much for  
10 indulging me.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. There's a  
12 man back there in a red shirt.

13 PAUL STONE: Paul Stone, 219 Harvard  
14 Street. I come at this fairly fresh. I'm an  
15 infant basically. I'm just totally unaware  
16 of this. But I am aware that it just took me  
17 a half hour to get off the Mass. Pike ramp to  
18 get into Cambridge. And so the question I  
19 would have is if there hasn't been a study  
20 done on the real impacts of the 400 units  
21 which probably be what, six or seven-hundred

1 cars, I know they only have 400 spots, but  
2 someplace the cars are going to be placed.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: There has been a  
4 study.

5 PAUL STONE: Sorry?

6 HUGH RUSSELL: There has been a  
7 study.

8 PAUL STONE: There has been a study?

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

10 PAUL STONE: Okay. And does that  
11 track how much traffic goes across Cambridge?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: No.

13 PAUL STONE: So what does it track  
14 if I might ask?

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, we're going to  
16 have a discussion of it for the person who is  
17 responsible for overseeing it in a minute so  
18 I can't answer your question.

19 PAUL STONE: Okay.

20 My overall concern is that there's a  
21 lot that's on the table that I'm aware of in

1 the city and I think you have to take this,  
2 this is a thing that's just going to choke  
3 the life blood out of the city. People  
4 aren't going to be able to get from one side  
5 to the other. I tried to go passed the  
6 Alewife, and if it's close to rush hour,  
7 those, you know, the cars are trying to sneak  
8 out fast and make right turns before the rest  
9 of the traffic goes through. It's very  
10 chaotic. So, thank you.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does  
12 anyone else wish to speak?

13 (No Response.)

14 HUGH RUSSELL: All right, then we'll  
15 move on to discussion by the Board.

16 STEVEN WINTER: May I ask for some  
17 comments from Roger Boothe on the  
18 three points, the three architectural points  
19 that were just discussed to get his  
20 perspective on that?

21 HUGH RUSSELL: I would like to kick

1           it off with Sue since we mentioned her before  
2           and then Roger can collect his thoughts while  
3           Sue is speaking.

4                       SUSAN CLIPPINGER:    So, you have a  
5           letter from us from May 15th.    So the traffic  
6           study was done on the project.    We have  
7           looked at and talked about mitigation  
8           associated with the project.    People are  
9           probably aware this is an unusual area in  
10          terms of vehicle traffic because of the fact  
11          that CambridgePark Drive is a dead end  
12          street.    You're right at the end of Route 2  
13          and Route 16, and you've got the Alewife  
14          Station there.    One of the advantages of the  
15          change of use that this project represents  
16          from an R&D building to a residential  
17          building is the predominant moves for the  
18          traffic in this area is in the exact opposite  
19          direction of what was previously being  
20          contemplated and is actually in the direction  
21          that has a little bit more capacity to it.

1 So that's advantageous. And we've talked  
2 about these issues before. There is a  
3 relatively small Mass. Highway project for  
4 Route 2 and 16 which is focussed mostly on  
5 trying to get the queues not to back up into  
6 the other moves which will make some small  
7 improvements, but it's not actually going to  
8 solve congestion problems. There are --  
9 there is congestion on Acorn Park Drive that  
10 is occurring now when people choose that  
11 option in lieu of Route 2, and that adds its  
12 own complications for people who are destined  
13 to that location that we're working with  
14 tenants there.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Am I correct that the  
16 Belmont project was not figured into this to  
17 the CambridgePark Drive project because it's  
18 simply not close enough to have impact; is  
19 that correct?

20 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Correct. And --  
21 partially correct. And we always have less

1 information about what other cities and towns  
2 are doing then what's happening in our own  
3 city and town. But when we do these we do  
4 these studies when we're looking at future  
5 growth, we do a percentage growth over  
6 existing traffic to look at what a generic  
7 growth pattern would look like for this area.  
8 So that kind of analysis would include the  
9 kind of increases that the Cambridge project  
10 would bring to this area -- the Belmont  
11 project would bring to this area. So it's  
12 not totally ignored. So that's sort of the,  
13 you know, what everybody always knows about  
14 the area today. I think the Planning Board  
15 criteria that are triggered for vehicles are  
16 Rindge and Alewife and Alewife and the access  
17 road at the T station. But the issues that  
18 we've focussed on in terms of looking at the  
19 traffic study, thinking about this site and  
20 in preparing the letter for you in terms of  
21 recommendations, were really around those

1 things that might be done but would help to  
2 mitigate some of these impacts. And one of  
3 the big ones obviously is parking. And this  
4 is a little unusual because the project is  
5 being sited on a current surface parking lot  
6 which is serving commercial buildings and  
7 they are doing shared parking for some of  
8 those commercial buildings. With the  
9 residential building they're building,  
10 they're eliminating some of the parking  
11 totally for the commercial buildings. And  
12 that area has traditionally had a very, very  
13 high parking supply for the square footage of  
14 development out there which was a concern of  
15 the Board's and 20 years ago. So we've  
16 worked really closely with the developer to  
17 look at given today's environment what kinds  
18 of supply makes sense. And there's a very  
19 complicated set of pieces of information in  
20 the letter for you, but basically because the  
21 project sits on top of these other permitted

1 projects and sort of touches on everything,  
2 what we did was try to make sure that the  
3 parking that remains both for the new  
4 building and for the existing buildings that  
5 are there all made sense in terms of trying  
6 to look at reductions and total supply while  
7 still supporting the buildings that are there  
8 and the needs of the developer. So I think  
9 the bottom line proposal makes sense. If you  
10 want more information on this, I'd be happy  
11 to try to go through, you know, in more  
12 detail.

13 The other significant project that --  
14 the piece of the project that we had been  
15 looking at is two pieces related to the  
16 pedestrian bike bridge that we really want to  
17 try to have created between the triangle and  
18 the quadrangle which once again is focussed  
19 on trying to bring both the wonderful outdoor  
20 resources as well as the shopping  
21 opportunities down along the parkway as well

1 as the T access right at Al ewi fe to both  
2 quadrangl e and tri angl e. And so there' s  
3 money whi ch i s matched wi th, money that we  
4 recei ved from Fawcett Street that allows the  
5 feasi bi li ty study to go ahead. And we al so  
6 worked very hard on trying to have space  
7 avai labl e on thi s speci fi c project so that as  
8 the feasi bi li ty study goes forward, we try to  
9 fi gure out, okay, where' s thi s bri dge gonna  
10 l and and how wi ll i t conti nue to work? And  
11 those opportuni ti es aren' t precl uded. So  
12agai n, I thi nk i f you want more i nformati on,  
13 I' m happy to talk further. But we feel l i ke  
14 thi s i s a -- the proposed l anguage here  
15 supports that future and allows that  
16 opportuni ty not to precl ude i t.

17 And then just i n terms of --

18 HUGH RUSSELL: I f I coul d i nterrupt  
19 you for a second.

20 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: We don' t actual l y

1 have a hard copy of your May 20th report. It  
2 was included in the transmission of the big  
3 package that came from Brown Rudnick. We  
4 didn't actually get a hard copy.

5 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: This you have not  
6 seen?

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I read the  
8 submission.

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Well, I can run  
10 through the rest of it and run across the  
11 street and make copies for you and bring them  
12 back. I mean, across the hall if that makes  
13 sense. Or do you want me to stop and Roger  
14 go ahead and I'll make copies and go ahead.

15 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Sue, I  
16 have extra copies.

17 PAMELA WINTERS: It's hidden in the  
18 other pack.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: It's important for us  
20 to know that there are recommendations of  
21 considerable length and address

1           transportati on demand management measures  
2           whi ch one of the speakers asked that we  
3           address. And thi s actual ly has been thought  
4           out and worked out by Sue and the proponent.  
5           So I don' t --

6                       SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So questi ons?

7                       HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, questi ons.

8           Ordi nari ly we adopt your recommendati ons so I  
9           don' t thi nk we' re aski ng you to defend them.

10                      H. THEODORE COHEN: I j ust had a  
11           qui ck -- i f you had your druthers, where  
12           woul d thi s pedestri an bri dge l and?

13                      SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Wel l , the fi rst  
14           druthers i s where you coul d have l and on both  
15           si des and where you can afford to bui l d i t.  
16           But I thi nk the other part -- answer to the  
17           questi on i s further to the east so that the  
18           l andi ng i s ei ther, you know, reasonabl e  
19           rel ati onshi p to the street that runs between  
20           thi s devel opment and 150 and i s al so i n the  
21           di recti on of bei ng cl oser to Al ewi fe Stati on.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: So would it  
2 continue off of Fawcett Street across the  
3 tracks?

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Well, one of the  
5 difficulties is we don't have a for sure  
6 landing site on either side, and so that's  
7 part of trying to create the flexibility.  
8 And then there is a building on the railroad  
9 track right of way that it's possible we  
10 shouldn't be on top -- we shouldn't be going  
11 over. But there's a lot of, obviously  
12 details, and the railroad right of way is of  
13 varying widths along the way. There's a lot  
14 of issues here.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Complicated,  
16 difficult. You could take \$350,000 to sort  
17 it out.

18 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's the point.

19 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

20 PAMELA WINTERS: Sue, I noticed that  
21 you are also going to be monitoring, that was

1 the last item, monitoring the shared parking  
2 program?

3 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. On the --

4 PAMELA WINTERS: For at least  
5 five years?

6 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. And, you  
7 know, we've been really amazed at how much  
8 we've been able to learn from the monitoring  
9 that's associated with the PTDM plans, and  
10 it's really invaluable as we, you know, work  
11 with you and with developers on, you know,  
12 going forward.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: All right. I mean,  
14 we -- there's a lot of complications because  
15 we're building on a parking lot, but it's --  
16 you absolutely is the right thing to do to  
17 get rid of unneeded parking and to make a  
18 street face a building instead of a parking  
19 lot. So I mean, it just is complicated to  
20 accomplish that and work with all the people  
21 who have rights.

1 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair.

2 I just wanted to comment, Sue, I wanted  
3 to thank you for helping us as we look at 20,  
4 40, 60-year strategic plans and timelines to  
5 understand that as we, as we create more  
6 density in this urban environment, that a  
7 reduction in parking spaces, while it sounds  
8 really counterintuitive and it's not popular  
9 almost anywhere, that really is the way that  
10 we have to go. And I really, I want to say  
11 that I certainly on the Planning Board really  
12 appreciate your helping us to keep our eyes  
13 on that.

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Any other  
15 questions?

16 AHMED NUR: I do. I'm sorry,  
17 according to the Dartmouth Company Real  
18 Estate, this letter that was just given to us  
19 here, indicates that they looked into the  
20 traffic counts and that although there's a  
21 good residential destiny at Alwife District,

1 that this particular site would not meet the  
2 retail criteria for success. Would you agree  
3 with that comment?

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I don't know  
5 anything about how to create good retail.

6 AHMED NUR: From a traffic aspect  
7 for example.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: But the only traffic  
9 on CambridgePark Drive beyond the site is  
10 leading to the Pfizer building at the end.  
11 So that's the -- those are the total people  
12 in cars that will pass the site who will  
13 perhaps go into the retail store. And  
14 whereas on a city street, you know, there's a  
15 single street has 20,000 cars a day going  
16 passed or something like that. So it's just  
17 an order of magnitude difference. But I  
18 think that's --

19 AHMED NUR: You're off the hook I  
20 guess.

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: I have one last

1           questi on.   Is parki ng now al lowed on  
2           Cambri dgePark Dri ve?

3                   SUSAN CLI PPI NGER:   No.

4                   H. THEODORE COHEN:   And is it  
5           envi si oned that it woul d be al lowed at some  
6           ti me?

7                   SUSAN CLI PPI NGER:   I thi nk so.   It's  
8           actual ly bui lt as a -- it's bui lt as a  
9           four-lane road, ri ght?

10                  RI CHARD McKI NNON:   Yes.

11                  SUSAN CLI PPI NGER:   And we real ly  
12           want to have bike lanes that one lane less,  
13           so then we have an extra lane.   And, you  
14           know, I thi nk we're goi ng to have both thi s  
15           bui lding and the bui lding across the street  
16           whi ch wi ll be comi ng to you at some ti me i n  
17           late summer/fal l, both wi shi ng the parki ng's  
18           on thei r si de.   So we' ll have that i ssue to  
19           deal wi th.

20                  HUGH RUSSELL:   It's goi ng to be a  
21           chal lenge to control that parki ng so that

1           i t' s used for the purposes that you like to  
2           see. Can you -- i t' s not in a residential  
3           di strict, right? So you --

4                   SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

5                   HUGH RUSSELL: And you might want it  
6           to be used for vi si tors I woul d thi nk woul d  
7           be the pri mary use?

8                   SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

9                   HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe that' s years, I  
10          don' t know.

11                  SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, and maybe  
12          gi ven the l oca ti on, maybe not. I mean I  
13          thi nk i t' s --

14                  HUGH RUSSELL: You hate to see  
15          peopl e comi ng in and parki ng on Cambri dgePark  
16          Dri ve and taki ng the T.

17                  SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So, you know,  
18          i t' s an i ssue that we' ll face I thi nk, you  
19          know, goi ng forward in terms of, you know,  
20          what are the needs and what can we do and  
21          what makes sense and how is it consistent

1 with the decisions that you all make about  
2 the various buildings that do get built  
3 there, the goals.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

5 Roger, would you like to give us your  
6 comments about the architecture? And I'll  
7 add sort of further charge which is how far  
8 is this along the development process and  
9 what conditions should we be establishing for  
10 further review as the design develops?  
11 Should we grant a permit for this?

12 ROGER BOOTHE: All right, I'll try  
13 to do that. The questions had to do first  
14 with the activation of the ground floor, and  
15 I'll say, we met with this team quite  
16 sometime ago now and went through a lot of  
17 discussion about how to address the street  
18 here knowing full well that it's a difficult  
19 problem. And certainly we asked the question  
20 right off the bat, could we have ground for  
21 retail here? As you say, it's a really -- a

1 dead end. So it's really hard to do retail  
2 on a dead end. It's very hard to do  
3 one-sided retail as well. If you recall the  
4 40 CambridgePark Drive project, right across  
5 from the T station, tried to do retail and  
6 it's been basically a failure. So I think  
7 that the team took the right approach in  
8 saying how can we make this the richest sort  
9 of environment given that we don't have  
10 ground floor retail? And I think very  
11 intelligently it focussed on the bicycle.  
12 And it sort of meshes nicely with the fact  
13 that we're now requiring lots more bicycle  
14 parking, because we're seeing that throughout  
15 the city, that the bicycling is really quite  
16 successful even in the denser, more urban  
17 parts of the city. And certainly out here  
18 it's a great thing to have that as an  
19 alternate way to get around. And people are  
20 out there on their bikes pretty intensely,  
21 and this is very close to the Minuteman and

1 so I think that's been as well exploited as  
2 one can do here in my opinion. I think  
3 they've done a very good job in trying to  
4 make that something that's attractive, and  
5 having the idea of the lounge and, you know,  
6 you do see groups of bicyclists coming home  
7 and wanting to just sit and have a, you know,  
8 something to -- a bite to eat or something to  
9 drink while talking about their bike ride. I  
10 think it does provide some sort of forum for  
11 the users out here.

12 And if you look at this image, which  
13 we've been looking at for a while now, it has  
14 a bit of richness. This, the danger with any  
15 sort of site like this, is you get a  
16 monolithic kind of structure. And this  
17 relates to the other question about is this a  
18 different scheme for this site? And I think  
19 the architect did a good job of explaining  
20 how they were addressing the site  
21 constraints. It is true, however, that we

1 are seeing a certain sameness in these very  
2 big, old sites that used to be large  
3 industrial buildings. Now we're glad to be  
4 having residential out here because it's  
5 better for traffic to have residential use as  
6 opposed to all offices that was envisioned  
7 many years ago. So you wind up with these  
8 very large sites and how do you humanize a  
9 site like that? We have the horrible example  
10 of the sixties of Rindge Towers where you  
11 plump down big towers and you've got ground  
12 floor parking and nothing worked. And with  
13 the effort with severity of these projects  
14 that we've been looking at is to try to make  
15 some sort of a courtyard. And of course the  
16 Faces site had a courtyard that they didn't  
17 finish off on the other side. But they're  
18 all a little bit different, again, responding  
19 to the context. And I think in this case,  
20 you know, a great deal of effort has been put  
21 into trying to have their common room near

1 the entryway and trying to have a difference  
2 in this part of the project with the  
3 two-story space as compared to what you see  
4 off on the right there that's a different  
5 piece of it as you dove further down the way.  
6 So I feel very comfortable that they've done  
7 a lot to make this work on many levels. And  
8 as for the landscaping, again, that's  
9 something that we've been looking at from the  
10 very start. You can see that there's a  
11 significant row of street trees. There are  
12 other ornamental planted trees up along the  
13 building. Different pieces of the site with  
14 perennials and all sorts of flowers and so  
15 forth. So I think the intent is clearly  
16 there. So your question is where do we go  
17 with the review, and we need to look more  
18 specifically at how those plantings are laid  
19 out and make sure that they're properly  
20 irrigated and maintainable and so forth.

21 And in terms of the materials pallet, I

1 think they've given a very good sense of  
2 trying to have a hierarchy of how, I think  
3 it's very successful, of having this tower  
4 next to the office tower be more office like,  
5 but still trending towards the residential,  
6 and, of course, with the pattern of the  
7 windows and so forth. But we'll do more  
8 looking at the exact materials and make sure  
9 we looked at materials on-site and so forth.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Bill.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think in that  
12 light, I think I agree in principle with what  
13 you just said. I guess the thing that still  
14 gets me is if you look at the facade, I look  
15 at it as almost like a stealth facade that  
16 implies activity, but there's not too much  
17 activity there. But I would add to say what  
18 you just said to say, I think the design of  
19 that lounge in the back area is critically  
20 important in order to have a feel that you're  
21 just not looking into this dead bike area or

1 those sorts of things. I think the idea of a  
2 bike repair shop seems very reasonable. You  
3 have a large bike population right here. The  
4 bike path is there. That's something that I  
5 think the developer could probably help to  
6 support as opposed to just saying let's look  
7 forward to the bike, it sits on its own --  
8 based on your typical retail movement, but I  
9 think the design of that is critically  
10 important and I would like to say that I  
11 think it's -- I think they did a good job on  
12 the exterior and materials and the glass and  
13 the glazing to do that, but I'm just so  
14 concerned of it just being a big  
15 disappointment of seeing all that stuff and  
16 looking in and not seeing activity. And I  
17 think they're striving to show activity. So  
18 anything like that that can encourage that  
19 activity and any that could give dynamics to  
20 the design, even if it's murals on the wall  
21 or something that gives it a sense of

1 something is happening there I think would be  
2 helpful. I kind of think of the Koch  
3 Building at MIT. Now that's on a major  
4 street which has plenty of retail, but there  
5 they said also they were trying to give us  
6 activity and they gave us a design in the  
7 front, but when you walk by there, there's  
8 just not much is happening there. So I want  
9 to make sure that we can do whatever we can  
10 as you're doing your design review to do what  
11 we can. And the thing something around the  
12 bike is something that's serving the  
13 immediate community as opposed to trying to  
14 draw people in for retail, you're looking for  
15 those kinds of opportunities that would be  
16 helpful.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: I'm wondering that  
18 one thing that might make sense for us to put  
19 a condition in the decision that would say  
20 if, for example, you want to have a bicycle  
21 repair person come and offer those services,

1           that's included in the permit. You know, if  
2           you have a place where people are seen  
3           getting coffee, it's okay to sell a cup of  
4           coffee to somebody because they live there.  
5           So that it --

6                         WILLIAM TIBBS: They come back.

7                         HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So that they  
8           have the flexibility to tryout ways of  
9           additional animation that might, you know,  
10          pull in people. I mean, like let's say  
11          they've got fabulous bike thing, there's a  
12          building built across the street, well, maybe  
13          it makes sense to have the, you know, have  
14          some kind of a sheered thing where these guys  
15          have the bikes, and across the street they've  
16          got the cafe. But I think it's right now  
17          everybody is saying we're going to see how to  
18          make it work. And I don't want our  
19          regulation and our decision to keep people  
20          from trying to make things richer, more  
21          active, because I don't think there's a

1 danger of things becoming more -- too active.  
2 You know, I'm not saying that we write in the  
3 decision something that allows them that has  
4 a branch of Faces here.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm very happy  
6 that we asked the architect to give us a  
7 perspective on the building because I  
8 understand it much better now than I did the  
9 first time. The aspect of the presentation  
10 that I would like to build on is to do what  
11 we do often with buildings, is to see if we  
12 could ask you to give us a walk around the  
13 building. So far what we've seen is just the  
14 front. And I think the sides, and in  
15 particular the rear where I'd like to have a  
16 good grasp of what the parking's going to  
17 look like. I've heard it described, part of  
18 it is covered, part of it is still that open  
19 lot. Can you help us visualize what that is.

20 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Absolutely. We  
21 have the last presentation still in here.

1           Let me start by just kind of walking  
2           you through. Chris is going to try to grab  
3           some of the images that we're looking for.  
4           I'm going to step back to the site plan for a  
5           minute, the building plan.

6           So one of the things that we were  
7           trying to do -- we'll walk through the  
8           elevations in a second -- is we tried to make  
9           sure that the activity level along this front  
10          edge was as high as possible level. So by  
11          really front loading all of the public  
12          amenities here, the parking which is at grade  
13          and in effect needs to be at grade to the  
14          greatest extent possible. So one of the  
15          things that we tried to do with the parking  
16          was ensure that from any viewpoint you would  
17          really have in either direction from  
18          Cambri dgePark Drive, there was adequate  
19          screening to come down and really ensure that  
20          you would never have a direct view of the  
21          cars.

1           So let's walk around the building.  
2           Let's go back to the front for a second. All  
3           right, so we've talked about the front. And  
4           one of the things that we tried to do is to  
5           ensure that we had a continuous sort base,  
6           middle, top. The level of scrutiny at the  
7           ground floor is actually the highest at  
8           CambridgePark Drive. From the other side  
9           it's almost impossible to see this building  
10          from any location, never mind the ground  
11          floor so we were far less concerned about it,  
12          but we did really focus on the sides of the  
13          building, on the east and the west side as  
14          they relate to CambridgePark Drive. So I'm  
15          just going to flip forward here and see if we  
16          can get to some of these images.

17                 So this is the side elevation if you --  
18                 if you're standing on the other side of 150  
19                 CambridgePark Drive, this is the east  
20                 elevation, what effectively runs through the  
21                 dividing road along this building and the

1 commercial office building that you saw a few  
2 minutes ago. So this tower that you see here  
3 which is the main entry tower, and it's  
4 almost 200 feet back away from you. So just  
5 elevations are just sometimes a little  
6 challenging. This is that corner tower  
7 element that we talked about really creating  
8 that bookend to front against that commercial  
9 building. And what we did is there's some  
10 glass and glazing, and it wraps this corner.  
11 And then that transitions -- these are two  
12 garage entry points here that are tucked in  
13 this location right here as far back away  
14 from the street as we could. And then,  
15 again, the idea was to screen the garage for  
16 this entire length through a combination of  
17 solid materials and architectural screening  
18 that really feel like they have a rhythm and  
19 a scale to them so that, you know, they're  
20 not windows, they're not glass for sure, and  
21 we're not trying to pretend that they are,

1 but I think the relationship between these  
2 openings and how they're articulated and what  
3 they're made out of needs to have a  
4 relationship to the building above. So this  
5 pedestrian scale base, that really is just  
6 about keeping the scale low, continues around  
7 the building, down the side, but it's  
8 in-filled with screening and more solidity as  
9 it goes back towards the rear of the  
10 property.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: So during the day if  
12 you were walking down that, to say to the  
13 ridge, the future pedestrian bridge, you  
14 wouldn't see cars through the screens so  
15 they'd be pretty indistinct.

16 BRIAN O'CONNOR: That's correct. I  
17 think we have some work to do, and we want to  
18 work with Roger and everybody else on  
19 defining on what exactly that screening  
20 material is and what the level of opacity is  
21 and how solid it is, but we do want to ensure

1           that that pedestrian experience along the  
2           edge of the building never feels like you're  
3           up against a lot. So that's an important  
4           element. And for us it had a lot to do with  
5           in-filling the pieces and then really making  
6           sure that the scale and the character of  
7           those openings, you know, we definitely don't  
8           want to just fill them with fence. They need  
9           to be something that relates to the building.

10                   And as you get towards the back of the  
11           building, the back of the building is  
12           really -- I want to go back to the plan here  
13           for a second if I can. I'm sorry for jumping  
14           around. But, you know, one of the important  
15           things that we really considered in the  
16           building is on the rear there are, you have  
17           the tracks down along this side. And your  
18           visibility of this building, we didn't want  
19           to just kick the building at an angle and  
20           present a completely flat facade that would  
21           run parallel to the tracks, primarily because

1 it actually would create a larger building  
2 mass that you may be able to see from Fawcett  
3 or some of the locations on the other side.  
4 The reality is we did shoot some views. It's  
5 almost impossible to see anything but really  
6 the top of this building. However, you know,  
7 we feel like creating a focus on these tower  
8 elements on the back side is equally  
9 important, because from long distances away  
10 you will see them. They will have some sense  
11 of identity. And while we didn't treat the  
12 rear of the entire building with the same  
13 level of intensity that we did in the front,  
14 we tried to respond to the scale and the  
15 level of scale that you would actually  
16 perceive from the distances that we thought  
17 you would see. So here you see the rear  
18 elevation and you see these sort of three  
19 tower elements on the west side, in the  
20 center, and then on the east side over here.  
21 And, again, the palate of materials is the

1 brick. And the single-story hardy board  
2 fiber cement panel that's brought around,  
3 these materials, we wanted to change the  
4 color, we wanted to change the texture, and  
5 in these locations we're talking about, you  
6 know, fiber cement panel down low. We're  
7 actually proposing in the darker areas to do  
8 lap siding so that they would have some  
9 textural effect. And then on the upper  
10 levels these would be more of a smooth  
11 material where you would have, you know,  
12 boards with integrated reveal. So we wanted  
13 to make sure there was a rhythm of balconies  
14 that showed through. We wanted to take  
15 pieces that felt like they had a digestible  
16 relationship to the front and really focus on  
17 these tower elements. As you continue  
18 walking around the building, this is the  
19 other elevation as it faces 200 CambridgePark  
20 Drive. And you can see these are the three  
21 tower elements, again. And what's

1 interesting is the building here steps back.  
2 So here you're about, you know, 188 feet  
3 back. And here you're about 191 feet back.  
4 So it's not a huge step there, but it is a  
5 step that would create shadow and it will  
6 create definition. So these tower elements  
7 that define the back also define this edge as  
8 they step off into the distance. And, again,  
9 the treatment here on the CambridgePark Drive  
10 side as it goes back along that edge facing  
11 200 is consistent with the treatment against  
12 150 CambridgePark Drive. We really want to  
13 ensure that, you know, pedestrian access  
14 along the edges of this building, as people  
15 may go back there to get to the garage or  
16 walk along the sides, are fairly strong.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Now, if I  
18 understand it right, not all the cars fit  
19 underneath the building?

20 BRIAN O'CONNOR: That is correct.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: So where are they?

1 BRIAN O'CONNOR: They are -- if you  
2 like here, you can actually see what's  
3 happening. There's a little light. Let me  
4 see if I can actually find a better image for  
5 you. So here, this is the ground floor that  
6 we looked at a moment ago here. And the edge  
7 of this building is this red line right here  
8 that I'm tracing with the cursor. So all of  
9 the parking spaces in this area are  
10 completely under the building. You can  
11 actually see it a slightly darker grey shade.  
12 I don't know if it's too subtle or it's  
13 perceivable, but there is parking in this  
14 area along the back edge and limited parking  
15 in this area that does in effect bleed out  
16 along the edge of the building. We thought a  
17 lot about how to treat that. And in the rear  
18 elevation we really focussed on these tower  
19 elements that are here, here, and here,  
20 working hard to bring the building down to  
21 the ground in those areas. So while there

1 are drive aisles down here that penetrate the  
2 building and make it a little bit more open,  
3 we wanted the building to ground itself where  
4 we felt like we could even though the reality  
5 is that it's really almost impossible to see  
6 that edge. We don't know what's gonna happen  
7 with landscaping off our property. We don't  
8 know what else is going to be built. You  
9 know, we think it's important to make the  
10 connection where we can. So there are a  
11 series of openings on the back edge down at  
12 the ground floor level, but we've also worked  
13 hard to try to make sure that the building  
14 lands solidly sound on the ground at those  
15 tower locations.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are these parking  
17 lots -- spaces going to be assigned?

18 BRIAN O'CONNOR: I don't believe  
19 they are, no.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: And the question, if  
21 you're parking in there --

1 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yeah.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- the reason why I  
3 ask because it's just that whole sense of  
4 when you're in this big, huge parking lot,  
5 how do you get, one, in the building? And it  
6 looks like you have some stairs over on the  
7 perimeter --

8 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yeah.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- and I assume  
10 those will just have some kind of limited  
11 access way that only people who are  
12 authorized --

13 BRIAN O'CONNOR: That's correct.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: But if they're not  
15 assigned, will there be a lot of people  
16 roaming around trying to find a parking lot  
17 and is there enough circulation down there  
18 for that to happen?

19 BRIAN O'CONNOR: There is. We spent  
20 a lot of time thinking about the visitor  
21 experience and making sure that there are

1 designated visitor spots right at that main  
2 entry right at CambridgePark Drive so they're  
3 clearly accessible.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: I was more concerned  
5 about the residents.

6 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Absolutely. And as  
7 you come through, what we've tried to do is  
8 create a parking flow that feels like a  
9 normal parking lot. We didn't try to jam  
10 every space and catty-corner in strange  
11 locations. So as you come in here, you can  
12 flow smoothly through. You can flow smoothly  
13 through and right back out. And this, what I  
14 think actually helps, strangely enough, is  
15 this circulation path that runs along the  
16 property line at the back edge is not under  
17 the building. And most of these circulation  
18 paths, if not all, tend to die into that in a  
19 continuous way so you constantly at least  
20 have a sense of orientation as to where you  
21 are. And I think with all the circulation

1 running vertically here and tying into that  
2 consistent edge, we think it should help.  
3 And I also think as residents live here, once  
4 they go through the garage the first time  
5 they'll sort of have a sense of how to flow.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Right --

7 HUGH RUSSELL: And a lot of the  
8 decisions you make and decisions about where  
9 you paint, if you decide you need some more  
10 crossovers, you can change the painting.

11 RICHARD MCKINNON: That's right.  
12 Hanover Company is going to own the building.  
13 And they've been around for 30 years. Equity  
14 is the owner of the office properties.  
15 They're the biggest company in the country.  
16 They're both very good at running parking for  
17 this project. So the mechanics of it appear  
18 worked out now.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Let me keep going  
20 if we can, we're almost walked around it.  
21 Now we're coming to the west side if I'm not

1 mi staken.

2 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yes. Over on this  
3 edge?

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: One of the great  
5 benefits of this building is that you are  
6 replacing that dreadful, enormous surface  
7 parking with a building.

8 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yes.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: On the west side  
10 between you and Pfizer are there any remnants  
11 of that parking lot left or is it all gone?

12 BRIAN O'CONNOR: The edge of the  
13 building itself is right here. This vertical  
14 line.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

16 BRIAN O'CONNOR: So there are about,  
17 I want to say about 20 spaces along the edge  
18 of the access drive that we wanted to  
19 maintain outside of the perimeter of the  
20 building; fire department, emergency vehicle  
21 access. So there's kind of a clean path that

1 runs down around and completely outside the  
2 footprint of the building. And as we laid  
3 that out, you know, we did balance kind of  
4 the impacts over here and the impacts over  
5 here and tried to figure out where the  
6 building wants to sit. And we did end up  
7 with about 20 head-in spaces over here on the  
8 drive. I don't know if that answers your  
9 question.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, it does in  
11 part but to the west of that little strip of  
12 landscaping. What happens between you and  
13 Pfizer?

14 BRIAN O'CONNOR: There's more  
15 landscaping there right now off the edge of  
16 the property.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: That is not a  
18 parking lot?

19 RICHARD MCKINNON: Oh, no. You're  
20 talking about the --

21 BRIAN O'CONNOR: I didn't

1 understand. Sorry. The edge of the existing  
2 parking lot is somewhere within this zone, so  
3 there is no parking beyond.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see.

5 RICHARD MCKINNON: We're losing  
6 almost the entire lot. You're correct, Tom.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

10 AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, I guess  
11 with the positive input from the city  
12 architect and the staff for the traffic, I am  
13 favor of this project, however, I do have a  
14 couple of questions as of to -- I'm not to  
15 question, but if you could show me the east  
16 and west elevation again or one of them, the  
17 colors of the finishes on those facades seem  
18 to be inconsistent somehow. Okay, yes, so  
19 for example, you've got this on the columns  
20 on the right side --

21 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Right here?

1 AHMED NUR: No, to the right. White  
2 on the vertical columns. So you have these  
3 going up and the -- I'm not sure what the  
4 idea behind that whole thing is in terms of  
5 consistency I guess or the lack of.

6 BRIAN O'CONNOR: So let me try to  
7 address it, and if I don't just let stop me  
8 anywhere along the way.

9 AHMED NUR: Sure.

10 BRIAN O'CONNOR: This is one of the  
11 three focal towers that happen along  
12 CambridgePark Drive. And all three of the  
13 towers are primarily metal panel. And the  
14 metal panel, there's a range of color and it  
15 has a range of texture. And what we were  
16 really trying to do here is ensure that that  
17 front tower on CambridgePark Drive wraps  
18 around the corner so that as you approach the  
19 building down CambridgePark Drive, your focus  
20 will be here and you'll see the white inset  
21 into the grey metal panel here. We don't

1 want to replicate what's going on from tower  
2 to tower, we want to sort of break them down  
3 a little bit so that they feel different, but  
4 of the same family. And so the idea was to  
5 bring some of that white, smooth metal panel  
6 from the primary tower over to the corner so  
7 it had a relationship to the other tower  
8 without actually creating an inset white  
9 piece.

10 And then down here, the masonry base as  
11 it wraps around the corner, it actually drops  
12 back down to a single level on the other side  
13 of that tower, primarily because we don't  
14 have any active public uses down there and  
15 we're trying to keep the language of base  
16 height to have a relationship to where we're  
17 proposing at the public use. So that the  
18 base drops down, the masonry base is  
19 consistent all the way across. The brick  
20 elements are the same. And then one of the  
21 differences here is that the brick does step

1 down and we end up with two stories of the  
2 fiber cement panel up here versus one. And,  
3 again, this is really just an attempt to  
4 allow the building to have presence at  
5 CambridgePark Drive that wraps around and  
6 isn't completely consistent all the way  
7 around the building. We didn't really want  
8 to create a monolith, so we wanted the  
9 materials to kind of play as they move to the  
10 less visible areas.

11 AHMED NUR: Okay. Thanks for  
12 explaining that.

13 On the front of the building, the front  
14 entrance, where is that glass lobby area that  
15 we were looking at? The picture that you  
16 left there for a long time at one point.

17 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yeah. You can see  
18 it right here. So it runs from about this  
19 location right here and all the way over to  
20 here. And the doors are sort of centrally  
21 located within that.

1 AHMED NUR: But there was a view  
2 showing the roof of that triangular from the  
3 top.

4 BRIAN O'CONNOR: It might be later.

5 AHMED NUR: It's the one that you  
6 left up. That's fine. I was just wondering  
7 what you doing on that with the rooftop  
8 because that's visible from all the floors.

9 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yeah. It's a good  
10 question. I think one of the things that we  
11 need to work through a little bit is really  
12 defining that. We have -- we have to make  
13 sure that the waterproofing works. We can  
14 deal with snow loads. You know, we've had  
15 really good success with using membrane, if  
16 it's done well up there. No equipment, no  
17 mechanical, nothing like that. So it ends up  
18 being fairly clean. And I think our biggest  
19 concern with this roof is probably less the  
20 visibility of the roof from the units. I  
21 think you're going to see that probably more

1 from 150 Cambridge Park Drive than you would  
2 from 160. Because it is fairly shallow and  
3 the foreshortened view that you get out the  
4 sills from of your window, I think you'd have  
5 to work pretty hard from almost any of the  
6 units to see it, but it is a big concern.  
7 We're gonna look at it. We think a membrane  
8 and being very careful with the detailing and  
9 not putting any equipment on there, you know,  
10 will really disappear.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Putting some green  
12 elements on that might be nice.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can we see one  
14 more time the whole front of the building so  
15 that we can take a look at that middle tower  
16 one more time?

17 BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yes. Is that  
18 enough?

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, I guess  
20 that's pretty good. I guess the comment I  
21 was making, and I'm not even sure I'm

1 convinced of what I'm saying here, but I like  
2 very much the proportion of hardscape that  
3 you've used. So I'm disagreeing with one of  
4 the comments that was made that he wished  
5 there were more lawn. I feel just the  
6 opposite. I think the only way to animate  
7 this is with hardscape. So I agree fully  
8 with how you've come out on it.

9 On that middle tower I'm a little bit  
10 unconvinced that you've quite got it right  
11 there. I'd like to look at it some more from  
12 different angles, but I think possibly  
13 there's a -- there's some further work to be  
14 done on getting the balance of that middle  
15 tower right.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: So are you thinking  
17 it's not bold enough or too bold?

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't want it to  
19 be pulled back from being less bold. I think  
20 there has to be a clear message that this is  
21 where you come in. And I think you're --

1 that is playing a role in that. On the other  
2 hand, I don't want to use any pejorative word  
3 because it taints it, but there's something a  
4 little ungainly about it the way I see it  
5 right now. I think it could use some further  
6 refinement. It's the only thing I see in the  
7 whole building that caught my eye.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, you know, I had  
9 the same reaction to it, and I'm now looking  
10 at it again and again and I'm realizing that  
11 part of the problem is that this is a very  
12 large drawing in a small scale. And so what  
13 you don't see is the materiality of it. What  
14 you see is, you know, something projecting on  
15 a screen by a lousy projector. And the --  
16 I'm familiar with Cube 3's work, and they do  
17 really care about materiality and how things  
18 go together, so it's going to look a lot  
19 better than that drawing because that's, you  
20 know, that's kind of a given for me. I know  
21 that's what they're going to try to do. I

1 know that's what Roger is going to do for the  
2 city. And in that process it may change  
3 somewhat, and I think we may be feel more  
4 comfortable as we see it and we get close to  
5 it, we see the detail. Not everybody who  
6 appears before us am I quite so willing to  
7 say well, this is a fairly preliminary  
8 drawing and it's got a lot of thought in it,  
9 but it's only -- it's gone to a certain  
10 point. And then I can feel real confident  
11 that it's going to carry forward and keep  
12 getting better and better.

13 RICHARD MCKINNON: Roger and I just  
14 said a word -- we would be absolutely happy  
15 to keep an eye on the lobby tower as part of  
16 the administrative design. We also keep  
17 walking around the building, Tom.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm going to put a  
19 couple of my things that I want you to keep  
20 looking at. I'm not totally -- I'm not happy  
21 with the two-story high top materials on the

1 east and west elevations. I want you to look  
2 at that some more. And I don't know whether  
3 it's the material or whether it's the lack of  
4 articulation on the top floor.

5 I think it's important to make those  
6 kinds of changes. So if you and Roger will  
7 -- when you look at those elevations, which  
8 again are not primary elevations. They're  
9 seen at a very acute angle by the people who  
10 go passed the CambridgePark Drive or seen  
11 from a long distance from Fawcett Street. So  
12 that's one piece.

13 My -- the landscaping is really not  
14 developed beyond a conceptual level. We know  
15 where you're thinking of and what the general  
16 intent is. I'm hoping that as you develop  
17 the front courtyard everything that's paved  
18 shrinks a couple of feet and that the green  
19 grows a little bit out. I think some of  
20 those paved areas are, you know, they're  
21 bigger than this room. And on a small

1 drawing they look in scale. But in as you  
2 really think about them, you have your  
3 cut-through paths, I know those might be  
4 six feet wide, maybe they should be four feet  
5 wide. So I think that, again, that's part of  
6 what I'm asking the architect to bring to  
7 this, is taking that concept and making it  
8 richer and getting the best thing. I don't  
9 have any problem with the concept. It's  
10 really just how does it really feel when it  
11 gets built full scale?

12 And I mean this is a, it's quite a  
13 challenge to build this building here because  
14 on the one hand it's too small compared to,  
15 you know, 150 which is an enormous building  
16 for Cambridge. And on the other hand it's  
17 very large. And the strategy of, you know,  
18 identifying corners, doing something special  
19 at the corners that is in some ways talking  
20 to the commercial people around you in the  
21 materials although, you're going to be far

1 nicer than the materials at 150, for example,  
2 is a sad period of architectural design and,  
3 you know, brick is a Cambridge material. You  
4 know, a billion bricks were manufactured  
5 within a half a mile of here.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: That's right.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I think roughly as a  
8 calculate it out. So it's nice bringing the  
9 brick back. If you made it all brick, it  
10 would be --

11 PAMELA WINTERS: Boring.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: -- boring.

13 RICHARD MCKINNON: Heavy.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: So, you know, you  
15 could have taken the approach -- I've seen  
16 some projects in Washington, DC that covered  
17 an entire block. And when you get all done,  
18 it looks like there are 12 buildings on the  
19 block. Just 12 different architectures built  
20 really closely. Hey, the windows are all  
21 pretty much the same pattern because it's

1           actually a big residential building. I mean,  
2           so it's not -- it's trying to be itself and  
3           not trying to be -- not confusing. This is  
4           one composition, but it's got a lot of  
5           richness to it. So I'm -- I mean, I'm very  
6           happy that this project has come to us  
7           because I think it's the right thing to do  
8           here. It would be interesting, what's  
9           CambridgePark Drive going to be like when a  
10          thousand people are living on it? You know,  
11          that's -- how many people live in Cambridge  
12          Highlands? 126 houses? So it's, you know --  
13          what will happen? What opportunities will  
14          present itself?

15                 That's really all I want to say. I do  
16          favor this project. I think it's coming  
17          along very well, and it made a lot of very,  
18          very good decisions. I think I understand  
19          the floodplain issues. There's a thin skin  
20          of water over the parking lots and the flood  
21          events and that water will still be properly

1 -- the flood storage capacity at each level  
2 will be the same or slightly better. It's  
3 going to perform in the 25-year storm the  
4 same way it now performs in a two-year storm,  
5 so things will be somewhat better. The  
6 sewerage generated by the building will be  
7 captured during those storm events so that it  
8 doesn't go into combining sewers while we  
9 still have combined sewers which we will  
10 probably have for a while. We're working on  
11 it. And the traffic, you know, it's going to  
12 be a little challenging for the people who  
13 live there, and it will be challenging for  
14 people who are renting the apartments. You  
15 know, I make it a policy of not travelling  
16 through Alewife in rush hour. It is actually  
17 possible to do it, it's just takes longer  
18 than I would like to spend. It doesn't, you  
19 know, if you drive to the western part of the  
20 state at rush hour, it takes you -- Alewife  
21 is the chug point but it's not the only chug

1 point. There are several chug points in  
2 Concord, and the whole system is kind of  
3 running -- there are places where you run  
4 free and you say oh, wow, right? You're  
5 getting to Alewife is, you know, as someone  
6 pointed out, isn't the easiest thing at rush  
7 hour either. So I think the big problem  
8 would be addressing I think the Red Line  
9 capacity and we have to start taking our  
10 streets back and more people ride bicycles in  
11 more parts. But I think this is the right  
12 thing to do on this piece of land if it's  
13 done properly.

14 Other comments?

15 MICHAEL BRANDON: Mr. Chair?

16 HUGH RUSSELL: This is a discussion  
17 portion the of the meeting, Michael.

18 MICHAEL BRANDON: Can I ask for a  
19 clarification?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: No, you can't.

21 MICHAEL BRANDON: Okay.

1                   THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we're  
2 ready.

3                   HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so we have a  
4 draft decision. I believe that we have a  
5 checklist that has all the decisions and all  
6 the findings, and I think the decision is  
7 parallel with that checklist. And so first  
8 we would say that we are inclined to vote  
9 these permits. Is that correct?

10                  STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

11                  HUGH RUSSELL: And in terms of  
12 conditions, there have been several design  
13 review conditions. I mean, there's a general  
14 condition that there be design review and  
15 there are some particular things that we want  
16 to be looked at.

17                  There are a number of conditions that  
18 were worked out with the Traffic, Parking,  
19 and Transportation Department. And we would  
20 want to adopt those conditions into the  
21 decision relating to the pedestrian bridge

1 and the mitigation and several points.

2 So have people had a chance to review  
3 the draft?

4 LIZA PADEN: Excuse me, Hugh.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

6 LIZA PADEN: Is the public hearing  
7 closed or are you going to close it?

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, we're a little  
9 unclear about that. I think we are --

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we can  
11 close it.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: We can close it now  
13 because we've got all the information. It's  
14 not totally clear that we actually have to  
15 close the public hearing.

16 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Let's close it.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: But we're going to do  
19 it. And how are those revised law rules and  
20 minutes coming along?

21 LIZA PADEN: Waiting to put it back

1 on the agenda.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Because that

3 in part is --

4 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: -- will help us a

6 little more about procedure.

7 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: So let's just

9 close the hearing and declare it so.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So all those

11 in favor of closing the hearing.

12 (Show of hands.

13 All Board Members voting in favor.)

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I have a

15 question about this draft. Has this been

16 reviewed with the proponent?

17 LIZA PADEN: It was forwarded to the

18 proponents but about the time it was

19 forwarded to you.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: So I think we do not

21 want to adopt this as a final decision

1 exactly as it's written because that process  
2 of review with Council is important so that  
3 sometimes there's a word or a phrase that a  
4 banker or an equity partner will be looking  
5 for or, you know, and so that that's  
6 something we do in every decision. Decisions  
7 are always reviewed. So I don't think we  
8 want to vote this decision as it stands. We  
9 want to, however, probably review the  
10 findings, say the findings are proper  
11 findings in substance and then vote to grant  
12 the permits that are enumerated in the  
13 decision.

14 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: It's all pretty --  
16 it's basically pretty factual stuff. There's  
17 a lot of questions and there's a lot of  
18 answers. And we can say what's there. And  
19 the questions are in the Ordinance in the  
20 form of criteria. And the answers are the  
21 descriptions of the building.

1 I'm looking to my legal subcommittee  
2 here for a little advice as to how we proceed  
3 on this.

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I had not  
5 seen the draft opinion until now and I know  
6 the staff put together a great listing of  
7 criteria that I think the project all  
8 complies with, but we haven't really had an  
9 opportunity to review it. I think perhaps  
10 maybe if staff could flush it out what they  
11 drafted initially and to have a more detail  
12 proposed opinion that could be sent to us and  
13 we could review it and perhaps vote it at our  
14 next meeting. I don't think we're prepared  
15 to go through it criterion by criterion right  
16 now.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Maybe there's a  
18 different approach, a little simpler. Our  
19 standard approach is not to adopt opinions  
20 after they get presented to us in final form.  
21 I mean, typically we do something else, and I

1 think we can use the draft opinion as an  
2 outline of all the findings that we need to  
3 have rather than to go through them in a  
4 tedious fashion. I think we can just move to  
5 adopt the draft as presented in the form that it's  
6 been presented to us with such changes as are  
7 appropriate by Council and the development  
8 department and so on, and that we -- I think  
9 we can assume that they have covered all of  
10 the criteria that are necessary and we don't  
11 need to go through it anymore. I think we're  
12 just ready to vote on a motion to go forward.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: And we do have that  
14 criteria list, too, that we were given which  
15 is very helpful.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Frankly I'm not  
18 sure we need to see the opinion again.  
19 That's something that you do, Hugh.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, that's true. I  
21 do read them all, every single word and

1 occasionally ask for words to be added or  
2 subtracted so that the sense of what we're  
3 doing is clear.

4 So I'm hearing two different things  
5 from my two lawyers. Ted, do you see this as  
6 a way to proceed tonight or no?

7 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I have no  
8 problem with voting to approve the project  
9 and, you know, our practice is indeed for  
10 staff to prepare the opinion subsequently and  
11 the Chair to review it and sign off on it.  
12 My only concern is generally before we've  
13 done that we have gone through all of the  
14 points of the Special Permit we need to  
15 review and all the various criteria and we  
16 discuss them or at least mention them. I  
17 know staff has drafted something. As I say,  
18 I haven't had an opportunity to review it.  
19 If others have and feel comfortable enough  
20 with it, then, yes, I'm intent on going  
21 forward with that. I'm a little

1           uncomfortable not listing all the criteria  
2           which we could do right now if we wanted to,  
3           take another 15 or 20 minutes, but I'm aware  
4           we've got a lot of people it sounds like  
5           outside for another hearing. But I don't  
6           have strong feelings about it. If everybody  
7           else is comfortable, then I will proceed to  
8           that point of view.

9                        HUGH RUSSELL: I think probably what  
10           we should do is take ten minutes and read the  
11           draft and then we'll be able to say that it  
12           does reflect what we've said and move  
13           forward. We have this discussion in the  
14           record already. It would be unfortunate  
15           should the permit be challenged if we had not  
16           gone through that stage.

17                        So for you it's a ten-minute break.  
18           For us it's a reading break. Does everybody  
19           have a copy of the draft?

20                        (All Board Members: Yes).

21                        RICHARD MCKINNON: Thank you

1 Mr. Chairman, we'll be back.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

3 (A short recess was taken.)

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so we're going  
5 to start up again. We've had a chance to  
6 review the findings applying to case No. 270,  
7 and I just want to remind the Board that we  
8 issued two other Special Permits for the  
9 existing buildings in the CambridgePark Drive  
10 on case Planning Board Case No. 26, for 125  
11 CambridgePark Drive and Planning Board case  
12 No. 47 for 150 CambridgePark Drive. And  
13 amendments are needed for both of these  
14 decisions that -- to basically the use of the  
15 land that this project is being on and is  
16 formally used for parking for the projects,  
17 the quantity of the parking that is being  
18 provided. So all of the --

19 LIZA PADEN: And a shared driveway.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: And a shared  
21 driveway.

1           So, so we've seen it, like, the shared  
2           driveaway findings from the point view of  
3           Planning Board case 270, but that would be a  
4           reciprocal shared driveaway for Planning Board  
5           case 47.

6           So I'm informed that all the findings  
7           are all the same. And we have this wonderful  
8           chart that Taha prepared which shows a list  
9           of all the various legal steps, permits that  
10          need to be taken, findings that need to be  
11          taken, and how they relate to the various  
12          criteria of the project. That we see there  
13          are multiple checks in each line and column,  
14          and so it's not a wonderful prose to use  
15          because it's maybe like a Gertrude Stein,  
16          same thing comes back again and again and  
17          again.

18                    RICHARD MCKINNON: It does.

19                    HUGH RUSSELL: But it's more clear  
20                    than Gertrude Stein.

21                    So I think I would be looking for a

1 motion to grant the Special Permits that have  
2 been cited for case No. 270 and the necessary  
3 amendments to case 26 and 47 to be  
4 consistent. We reviewed the findings and I  
5 guess we should take a moment to say are  
6 there any amendments to the findings? I  
7 found one thing that I believe there are now  
8 one bicycle parking space per use.

9 ATTORNEY DEBORAH HORWITZ: Correct.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: And finding to the  
11 previous number.

12 RICHARD MCKINNON: 204.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So that has  
14 to be corrected. So there could be there are  
15 other minor factual things that may need to  
16 be corrected. I think the -- we understand  
17 the project. We understand the impacts. We  
18 understand how the impacts are being handled,  
19 and we've had a chance to review those. Is  
20 there anything else of what we've read that  
21 we want to comment on?

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: I agree with all  
2 of that. I just want to make certain that  
3 all of the conditions that the Traffic and  
4 Parking Department in their report are  
5 incorporated into the decision.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And the design  
7 review conditions.

8 AHMED NUR: Do we need to say  
9 anything about the criteria of the  
10 modification of the rear property line and  
11 fire access? No?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: It's in there.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: It's referred to.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: It's referred to  
15 there. Maybe page 18 or so.

16 AHMED NUR: Yes.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Would someone like to  
18 make a motion to that effect?

19 STEVEN WINTER: So moved.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second?

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Ted got there first.

2 Is there a discussion on this motion?

3 All those in favor of the motion.

4 (Show of hands.)

5 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in  
6 favor. The permits are granted.

7 And so what we've done is basically  
8 voted to allow this project to proceed.

9 Thank you all for your patience.

10 RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you. Thank  
11 you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: I've said many times  
13 great power of the Planning Board is to allow  
14 good things to happen.

15 RICHARD McKINNON: Appreciate that.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: We'll take -- we need  
17 to take a break now?

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: No.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next item  
20 on our agenda is consideration of the  
21 Planning Board Petition to amend the North

1 Cambridge Zoning. So we'll start that in a  
2 few minutes once people had a chance to clear  
3 the room.

4 (Slight pause).

5 (Sitting Members: Hugh Russell, Thomas  
6 Anninger, William Tibbs, Pamela Winters,  
7 Steven Winter, H. Theodore Cohen.)

8 HUGH RUSSELL: We're going to get  
9 started again. And the next item on our  
10 agenda is a public hearing and a  
11 consideration of the North Cambridge Trolley  
12 Yard abutting the Linear Park currently zoned  
13 Business A-2 to Residence C-2B District.

14 LIZA PADEN: The Trolley Square  
15 Zoning Petition was scheduled for Planning  
16 Board public hearing and it's had a City  
17 Council public hearing, but unfortunately due  
18 to the timing and the summer schedule of the  
19 City Council, it has not been passed to a  
20 second reading. The 90 days for final action  
21 will expire before the City Council can take

1           their final action. And the reason for this  
2           is that there has to be a publication of the  
3           proposed Ordinance for 14 days before the  
4           vote. The vote would have to happen at the  
5           July 30th meeting, and so passing it to a  
6           second reading would have had to have  
7           happened last night.

8                         So the upshot of this is this go-around  
9           of Trolley Square cannot go forward. Given  
10          the hour this evening, I would suggest that  
11          the Board can open the hearing, take no  
12          presentation, no testimony, and it will just  
13          be placed on file and we will continue to  
14          work on it and the other ideas associated  
15          with it. And we would move on to the Forest  
16          City public hearing continuance. And  
17          depending on stamina would then deal with the  
18          North Mass. Ave.

19                        HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I think in  
20          fairness to those who might be tempted to  
21          stick around for the next hour and a half

1 while we talk about Forest City, I think we  
2 should make a decision that we're not going  
3 to act on it.

4 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Is everybody  
7 agreeable to that?

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

9 LIZA PADEN: So you're clearly not  
10 going to act on Trolley Square?

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

12 LIZA PADEN: And the North Mass.  
13 Ave. discussion, should we continue it to a  
14 date certain? Either July 10th or July 17th.  
15 The 10th we're trying to hold for Kendall  
16 Square discussion, but it's up to you.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: I think we should  
18 continue it to a date certain, the 17th.

19 LIZA PADEN: Okay. July 17th then.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Everybody  
21 agreed upon that?

1 (All Members in Agreement.)

2 LIZA PADEN: Everybody who is here  
3 for the Trolley Square and the North Mass.  
4 Ave. understand that? We'll see you on  
5 July 17th.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: We should  
7 apologize, too.

8 LIZA PADEN: Yes, we're sorry that  
9 we're taking so long with this.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Next item on our  
11 agenda is the Forest City Petition to amend  
12 the Zoning Map. And I think I'd like to  
13 start with asking the staff to tell us where  
14 this sits in the City Council, when they  
15 expect to act, and what the effect of the  
16 amendments that they may have made in the  
17 Ordinance Committee.

18 BRIAN MURPHY: Sure, I'd be happy to  
19 set that up, Mr. Chair.

20 This Petition was a re-file -- was  
21 first submitted in February of 2011. That

1 was withdrawn.

2 It was resubmitted in March of 2012.  
3 It had a Planning Board hearing on May 11th,  
4 and an Ordinance Committee hearing on  
5 May 15th in its original form as it was  
6 filed.

7 At the June 11th City Council meeting  
8 there was a motion made to amend the petition  
9 and send the amended version on to a second  
10 reading. And that was passed and went  
11 forward.

12 There's another Ordinance Committee  
13 hearing June 27th at four p.m., and this --  
14 because it has gone to a second reading,  
15 unlike the Trolley Square case, this would be  
16 eligible to be voted on by the City Council  
17 at the July 30th meeting because it will have  
18 met the requirements that it be -- that it be  
19 posted for the two weeks.

20 The Petition does expire August 13th,  
21 so given at least as of now there's no City

1 Council meeting scheduled after July 30th.  
2 It will either be voted on at the 30th or it  
3 will expire.

4 The amendment that was done was one  
5 that essentially took out the housing  
6 provision. I think there's a memo that was  
7 sent to the Board that basically said that  
8 the amendments were intended to allow all of  
9 the possibility of developing the proposed  
10 commercial building at the corner of Mass.  
11 Ave. and Blanche Street, but not to allow the  
12 development of a new residential building at  
13 the corner of Sidney and Green. So that  
14 essentially what the amendment does is to  
15 take out the provision that would have  
16 increased the available amount of GFA for  
17 residential and took that off the table and  
18 maintained the same amount of non-residential  
19 use for GFA.

20 So essentially what is going to be  
21 before the Council for the July 30th is only

1 the -- it does not include a residential  
2 component. It only includes the office and  
3 life sciences proposal for the building on  
4 Mass. Ave. and Blanche Street. So that's the  
5 position which comes before you tonight.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: So there's no way  
7 that the residential could be reinstated  
8 without re-filing the Petition at this point;  
9 is that right?

10 BRIAN MURPHY: I don't believe so.  
11 And the Council said that their intention was  
12 not to do this at this time.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So we don't  
14 have to listen to the 50 people who wrote to  
15 us and said they thought that was a bad idea  
16 because the Council's already listened to  
17 them and acted. And so -- and that's -- I  
18 just want to be clear what -- I don't want to  
19 go over ground that's already been resolved.

20 So you guys have a computer. You have  
21 a model. You look like you want to say

1 something and I would encourage you to.

2 PETER CALKINS: Three minutes.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, yes. To say  
4 what you have to say but try to be brief  
5 about it because it appears that the only  
6 revision has been this residential, taking  
7 out the residential opportunity.

8 Please come forward. We're always  
9 happy to see you.

10 ROGER BOOTHE: I don't really want  
11 to say anything at this point. I think you  
12 should make your presentation and we'll hear  
13 from the public.

14 PETER CALKINS: Thank you. My name  
15 is Peter Calkins with Forest City. And as  
16 Brandon has mentioned, this amendment has  
17 been amended to delete the residential. What  
18 you have in front of you is a package that is  
19 quite similar to the last package that we've  
20 had. It's similar to the last one we gave to  
21 you. It's almost identical to the one we

1 gave to the Ordinance Committee when the  
2 Ordinance Committee last met, except that we  
3 have removed all of the residential  
4 components from the graphics and the  
5 analysis. So it now represents just the 300  
6 Mass. Ave. piece. And I appreciate your  
7 desire to keep this brief and I will do so.  
8 And it's not my intention to go through the  
9 entire presentation. It's on the screen  
10 mostly for reference, although I'm not going  
11 to use it much.

12 I would like to say that --

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Just a second. I  
14 feel very clear that I'm understand this.  
15 I'm not sure that the rest of the Board is  
16 maybe up to -- how much do you want to hear?

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'd like to hear  
18 it.

19 H. THEODORE COHEN: I'd like to hear  
20 it.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so hit the

1 important, significant points you're asking.

2 PETER CALKINS: Yep, we'll keep it  
3 tight.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

5 PETER CALKINS: The proposal we now  
6 have before you was a response to requests  
7 that were made by the City when we last  
8 presented a version of this to you a year  
9 ago. And at the time it was suggested that  
10 the building was a little bulky and that it  
11 might be nice if we looked at ways that we  
12 could in a companion form put some  
13 residential, you know, use some residential  
14 in a companion way. And so we spent  
15 sometime -- we withdrew that Petition, spent  
16 sometime working with the Planning Board --  
17 or with the planning staff. And, in fact  
18 with Goody Clancy to evaluate some good  
19 ideas. And the proposal that we first  
20 submitted was a response to that process. We  
21 certainly understand that the residential

1 proposal and the -- its affect on the green  
2 space took some people by surprise, and for  
3 that reason we supported the suggesti on that  
4 we ought to wi thdraw that from the di scussi on  
5 for the moment. And we can revi si t that once  
6 the C2 process has run i ts course and, you  
7 know, the people have had a chance to sort of  
8 digest the idea and we'll look at that and  
9 look at other kinds of thi ngs.

10 We woul d ask that you consider a  
11 proposal for 300 Mass. Ave. sort of i n the  
12 context of the Uni versi ty Park as a whol e.  
13 And I have touched on thi s before, but i t's  
14 i mportant so I woul d like to just bri efly  
15 touch on that agai n.

16 You know, the agreements that were put  
17 i n pl ace back i n 1988 wi th the Ci ty and the  
18 nei ghborhood and Forest Ci ty and MIT call ed  
19 for a project that was 1.9 mi lli on square  
20 feet of commerci al and 400 of resi denti al .  
21 And we, i n fact, went well beyond that

1 residential line, building an extra 274  
2 residential units and decreasing our  
3 commercial in a commensurate way so that we  
4 built 325,000 less than what was originally  
5 called for. This proposal still leaves us  
6 80,000 feet below that original 1.9 million  
7 square feet of non-residential space that was  
8 in our original plan for University Park, and  
9 it does that obviously within an expansion of  
10 land area. You know, we have been -- we've  
11 been very pleased with residential buildings  
12 that we built instead of that commercial.  
13 Those two buildings were effectively 23  
14 Sidney and 100 Lansdowne which we both think  
15 were very successful additions to the  
16 Cambridge landscape and to the Cambridge  
17 residential stock. At the same time the loss  
18 of that commercial space, you know, has had  
19 an effect. We've lost companies that we  
20 haven't been able to provide space to who  
21 have expanded. We've been having a number of

1           conversations with various companies who have  
2           been pressing us for ways to expand. And, in  
3           fact, we are quite close to an agreement  
4           with, you know, a Cambridge company who will  
5           take all of the space other than the retail  
6           space on the first floor in 300 Mass. Ave. as  
7           proposed. So that's a company that's been  
8           here for a while. It's looking to expand in  
9           the city. Would like very much to expand in  
10          this location, and, you know, they're ready  
11          to go.

12                 So, you know, with that as background,  
13          I just thought I might briefly touch on the  
14          sort of the design perspective on the massing  
15          and the thinking that we've put into the  
16          current version of 300 Mass. Ave. We have  
17          been working closely with Scott Simpson and  
18          his team at (inaudible) on that and also with  
19          the city planning staff. And we've tried to  
20          respond to a couple of different factors.

21                 One is the sort of variegated character

1 of Mass. Ave. which does have a -- you know,  
2 the last building we presented a year ago had  
3 essentially one height and one long mass.  
4 And the comments we got from you and from  
5 planning staff were that it felt a little  
6 bulky and that we should look at how do we  
7 get a more variegated character in the  
8 architecture even if that meant looking at a  
9 little more height. So we took that and went  
10 to work with that. We also -- and the model  
11 is helpful to see this. Mass Ave. does have  
12 something of a different character in this  
13 direction from Lafayette Square than it does  
14 in that direction. And so, you know, this is  
15 a building that clearly wouldn't be right in  
16 this location. We think it actually can be  
17 right and can be a significant addition to  
18 the landscape in this location as Mass. Ave.  
19 begins to move down towards the new Novartis  
20 buildings and then beyond Necco and what's  
21 MIT.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: Can you point out the  
2                   Novartis buildings on the model?

3                   PETER CALKIN: Sure. So the  
4                   Novartis -- these are the -- these are the  
5                   buildings that are now under construction for  
6                   Novartis. This is a seven-story building.  
7                   It's actually about 110 -- 108 to 110 feet  
8                   tall.

9                   This is an eight-story building, which  
10                  is about 15 feet taller. It's about 125.

11                  This is a seven-story building at 110,  
12                  so about the same height is what this would  
13                  be.

14                  And then you have the Necco building  
15                  here.

16                  HUGH RUSSELL: Which is about  
17                  five stories.

18                  PETER CALKINS: The Necco building  
19                  is what you see at this line is about 100  
20                  feet. The rooftop is actually about 96 or  
21                  97. But the cornice that you see on the

1 street line is 100.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

3 PETER CALKINS: We did -- you know,  
4 we've had a lot of discussion about shadows.  
5 And I will -- so we have put in your packages  
6 shadow studies for each month of the year  
7 beginning in January and running through the  
8 end of the year and for each hour between  
9 eleven a.m. and four p.m. We obviously, you  
10 know, could go to the extremes. The two  
11 different studies, the one on the top, the  
12 orange building, is essentially the building  
13 that one could build under the constraints of  
14 the current zoning. And the one on the  
15 bottom is the building that is modeled on the  
16 model here that you see here in front of you.  
17 And, you know, there are some differences.  
18 There are certainly some points in time when  
19 the building that we're proposing cast a  
20 shadow that is incrementally longer. But at  
21 the end of the day the differences are not

1           substantial in terms of what could be built  
2           under current zoning and what's being  
3           proposed. So I don't know that I, you know,  
4           need to go. Obviously as you get into the  
5           summer, this is March and April, the shadows  
6           get much less. You can see that at no point  
7           in time that this building --

8                         WILLIAM TIBBS: Stu, can you put the  
9           lights back on? I can't see my papers.  
10          Thank you.

11                        HUGH RUSSELL: Put them all on.  
12          Thank you.

13                        PETER CALKINS: At no point in time  
14          does this building ever cast a shadow on Jill  
15          Brown-Rhone Park which is one of the concerns  
16          that was expressed when we had the  
17          residential building in the package because  
18          that building did. This building, the sun  
19          never gets around that far. And in fact, 350  
20          Mass. Ave. is a lot closer. And whatever  
21          shadows might get cast early in the morning

1 will come from that existing structure. So  
2 the shadows really move, you know, across the  
3 street.

4 This is May and June. You know, the  
5 shadows are obviously fairly minimal. They  
6 get a little longer, you know, at four  
7 o'clock in the afternoon.

8 July and August. You can go through  
9 them.

10 So the point of this analysis is really  
11 to demonstrate that there are no shadows on  
12 the park which was a concern of a lot of  
13 people from this building, and that the  
14 shadows from what we're proposing, because of  
15 the setbacks and things, are not hugely  
16 different from what an as of, you know, the  
17 current zoning building could be.

18 I will point out, you know, in addition  
19 to the life science component -- I'll go back  
20 to the plan and leave it there. We continue  
21 to be very committed to retail along Mass.

1 Ave. where, you know, we've always felt that  
2 our retail impact was minimized by the fact  
3 that we had very little retail frontage along  
4 Mass. Ave., and this is -- the building is  
5 about 270 feet in total length, and with the  
6 exception of a lobby, which is fairly small  
7 at the street wall. The entire Mass. Ave.  
8 frontage is devoted to retail. We're looking  
9 forward to focusing on local smaller scale  
10 retailers. We're working with Jesse Bercon  
11 (phonetic) who is a broker who's had a lot of  
12 success in the area with that kind of  
13 retailer. So we're pretty excited about what  
14 we think the retail can do to this block of  
15 Mass. Ave. which is currently a pretty  
16 unhappy block to walk along. And I would  
17 point out that, you know, the retail at a  
18 rent that is much less than could be charged  
19 upstairs and tenant improvement allowances  
20 that are quite -- usually quite high in order  
21 to support that kind of a smaller local

1 retailer. That retail does need to be  
2 supported by the research and office space  
3 upstairs from a financial perspective.

4 We've also, you know, worked hard in  
5 terms of -- and, we're not, you know, we're  
6 not at the point of talking about  
7 architecture. We'll be back to you in the  
8 fall to have though conversations, but  
9 certainly looking at how we try and modulate  
10 the building along Blanche Street so that you  
11 get some sort of opening up on both the Mass.  
12 Ave. side and also back here where we have a,  
13 you know, a pocket park that really benefits  
14 the Star Market entrance, the hotel entrance,  
15 and the Green Street entrance to 300 Mass.  
16 Ave., but really trying to enhance the  
17 pedestrian access back through Blanche Street  
18 to get back to the Star Market and the hotel,  
19 this does -- the street will have a service  
20 function it current is where the loading  
21 docks where 350 Mass. Ave. are. And it will

1 also be the docks for 300. But we think that  
2 we've demonstrated farther down on University  
3 Park how we can effectively combine service  
4 zones and pedestrian zones pretty effectively  
5 and we look to do the same kind of things  
6 here.

7 And finally, and we mentioned this  
8 before, but no new parking need be built with  
9 this project. We have sufficient capacity in  
10 this garage right here which is where these  
11 people would be parking. We'll move some  
12 people who are currently in this garage  
13 around to other garages in University Park.  
14 We have the ability to balance that parking.  
15 So no new parking. We haven't done a  
16 detailed traffic study with this. That would  
17 be part of the Article 19 proposal. But we  
18 do have analysis from the annual counts that  
19 we do every year as part of our traffic and  
20 mitigation agreements, and we're currently  
21 well below the 17:00 p.m. peak hour current

1 cap that was based a long time.

2 So that's really what we have to  
3 present. I'd be happy to answer any  
4 questions that you might have in the course  
5 of your discussion. What we're hoping is  
6 that you can make a recommendation to the  
7 City Council that the massing of this  
8 building appropriately responds to some of  
9 the concerns that were expressed, and it is  
10 appropriate for this piece of the city and  
11 that you would support a project of this  
12 nature.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

14 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I have a  
15 question for this gentleman if I could.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: And your question is?

17 PETER CALKINS: Yes.

18 STEVEN WINTER: My question is is  
19 the proposed retail that fronts Mass. Avenue  
20 now separated into distinct store units? And  
21 if so, what are the sizes of those units?

1                   PETER CALKINS: It can be -- it's  
2 flexible. It can be broken down any way that  
3 makes sense. It's about 14,600 feet, I  
4 think, in total with about 3800 square feet  
5 over here or something like that, 4,000 feet,  
6 and about ten over here. We would  
7 anticipate, you know, probably some sort of a  
8 larger element here. Perhaps a series of  
9 smaller ones along here. This could be  
10 smaller elements. You know, what you see  
11 modeled in this rectangle is a roughly 1200  
12 to 1500 square foot retail, but we have  
13 flexibility to do whatever made sense as we  
14 work with Jesse to get the right mix.

15                   HUGH RUSSELL: And that doesn't  
16 actually -- isn't part of the Zoning? It's  
17 more part of the design review of the  
18 building.

19                   STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

20                   HUGH RUSSELL: And so what we're  
21 actually talking about with the Zoning is

1 sort of enabling this by first extending the  
2 boundary of the district and then adjusting  
3 the numbers of the amount permitted area  
4 which actually reduces the amount of  
5 previously approved commercial floor area,  
6 increases the amount of housing area to equal  
7 what you've already built.

8 PETER CALKINS: What we have built.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: And you can then,  
10 you'll be using the full -- essentially the  
11 full committed complement with this building;  
12 is that correct?

13 PETER CALKINS: Yes. We'd be -- it  
14 might fall several thousand feet short, and  
15 we actually have about 3,000 feet of  
16 residential left.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

18 PETER CALKINS: There's no way to  
19 build that.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So there's no  
21 opportunity to build any place else until

1           there' s further consi derati on of any other  
2           si te that -- I mean, there' s one si te that  
3           sure to be in the master plan and that has  
4           green on i t. And once thi s passes, you can' t  
5           bui ld on that si te.

6                         PETER CALKINS: That' s correct.  
7           Thi s bui lding woul d essenti al l y bui ld out the  
8           revi sed enti tlements for CRDD and there  
9           woul dn' t be any other addi ti onal capaci ty.

10                        HUGH RUSSELL: And so I' m just  
11           leafi ng through the Ordi nance markup change.  
12           There' s some paragraphs that are taken out  
13           that are hi stori cal . There are a few  
14           paragraphs about how much housi ng has to be  
15           bui lt at what times, so that' s been sort of  
16           removed.

17                        PETER CALKINS: Ri ght.

18                        HUGH RUSSELL: Clea n i t up because  
19           the word was actual l y.

20                        PETER CALKINS: Effecti vel y what we  
21           took out was the l anguage that talked about

1 -- converting commercial square feet to  
2 residential square feet.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

4 PETER CALKINS: And we just  
5 simplified it and said okay, you can have X  
6 amount of residential which was effectively  
7 what we've already built, and Y amount of  
8 commercial which exceeds what currently  
9 exists by about 240,000 square feet and  
10 that's what would enable us to build the  
11 building here.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: And it's -- it  
13 precedes the current permitted density by 80  
14 to 100,000 square feet; is that right?  
15 Within that range.

16 PETER CALKINS: Of this site?

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

18 PETER CALKINS: Yes, this site  
19 currently permitted density is about 138,000  
20 feet. We've asked for 243 or something like  
21 that.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: That's about 100,000.

2 PETER CALKINS: So it's about 100,  
3 105,000 square feet, something like that, on  
4 this particular block.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: And so -- and the  
6 question always comes up when you increase  
7 permitted density, what's the public benefit?  
8 And this is an unusual case where the public  
9 benefit's already been provided. The  
10 addition of the 260 additional housing units  
11 and the additional open space have already  
12 been accomplished in the plan, and the  
13 traffic impact through good PTDM outlasts and  
14 permitted. So it already delivered the  
15 public benefits, and so I think that's an  
16 unusual case where when earlier you were  
17 asked to do something in the future, they've  
18 already done it. And we're just recognizing  
19 while, if we choose to recommend this, that  
20 it is sensible to include this piece into the  
21 project and the density that is being

1 proposed is the density because the overall  
2 commercial density was based on analysis of  
3 the -- basically on the traffic hearing  
4 capacity. You know, streets were built,  
5 intersections, there was a lot of work that's  
6 happened and it's functioning so you know  
7 what's going on.

8 The height limit on the site is  
9 established at 115 feet. It's conceivable we  
10 might recommend to the Council an amendment  
11 to that, that might more clearly deal with  
12 some of the setbacks that are being proposed  
13 on the Plexiglass model. Because I think  
14 it's your intention to do it, and I think  
15 that's part of what makes the 115 feet work,  
16 is that it's on Mass. Avenue. It's not 100  
17 straight line. It's a tower at 115. It's  
18 some setback, and some other things. So  
19 Roger, I believe, could draft a paragraph  
20 that would describe a little more clearly  
21 what's going on in the model if we want.

1 They say they want to do this, we have a  
2 chance to approve it. And when the relief  
3 comes before us to approve the building, and  
4 then we have within our discretion to do that  
5 anyway. It doesn't need to be done? I don't  
6 know, but you would have no objection.

7 PETER CALKINS: We wouldn't have no  
8 objection if you chose to do that.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: And obviously you've  
10 chosen to work together to make sure the  
11 language is the proper description.

12 PETER CALKINS: Yes.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: I'd be inclined to do  
14 it or suggest to the Council that we do that  
15 just to clarify the intent. Sometimes  
16 unexpected things happen. (Inaudible), you  
17 know, we know of a large biotech company that  
18 had a huge manufacturing problem, that threw  
19 all of their plans in disarray and ultimately  
20 ended up them being acquired by a new  
21 company. And unpredictable, unfortunate

1           particularl y for the peopl e who need the  
2           product of the plant, but life is  
3           unpredi ctabl e. So I woul d do that.

4                     And then there' s a littl e anticipati on  
5           of the new bi cycl e regulati ons, so that the  
6           Zoni ng, the new bi cycl e regulati ons -- agai n,  
7           probabl y don' t have to writ e that in but --

8                     PETER CALKINS: And that' s actual l y  
9           al ready writt en in in effect that it' s in the  
10          l anguage that' s been propos ed.

11                    HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

12                    PETER CALKINS: Part of the iss ue is  
13          that si nce we' re not bui ldi ng any parki ng  
14          spaces, the regulati ons that tie bi cycl e  
15          spaces to automobi l e spaces, somebody coul d  
16          say that those -- there' s a gap. So we sai d  
17          that' s not the intent. We' re going to  
18          provi de the bike spaces and so we want ed to  
19          make sure that was understood.

20                    HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Shoul d we go  
21          to publ ic testi mony?

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Is there a  
3 sign-up sheet?

4 I mentioned earlier there was 40 pages  
5 of written testimony, most of it relating to  
6 the residential building and it was clearly  
7 very effective because the Council heard it  
8 and acted. And is there a sign-up sheet?

9 We prefer that people not celebrate  
10 that victory at this time of night.

11 Okay. There are 15 people who want to  
12 speak. First one is Karen Galespie.

13 Pam's now got her timer and would you  
14 give your name and address?

15 KAREN GALESPIE: Karen Galespie, 157  
16 Harvard Street. Thank you, Chairman Russell,  
17 for the opportunity to speak to up zoning  
18 issue on this petition as it relates to this  
19 building on Mass. Ave. A standing alone and  
20 also in conjunction with all the other  
21 massive developments being planned within the

1 confi nes of Cambri dge at the present time,  
2 approvi ng up zoni ng for Forest Ci ty at the  
3 All Asia Locati on woul d negati vel y affect the  
4 resi dents i n Area 4 and beyond. In  
5 parti cul ar, more traffi c congesti on  
6 throug hout all of Cambri dge, unheal thy ai r  
7 pol luti on, envi ronmental dangers, ongoi ng  
8 damage to homeowners' properti es, (i naudi bl e)  
9 change to Cambri dge' s demographi cs, and for  
10 everyone, i ncl udi ng renters, al ready payi ng  
11 maxi mi zed rents, hi gher housi ng costs. I  
12 cannot i n the few mi nutes al lotted to me  
13 emphasi ze all these i ssues, but I et me take  
14 quotes from the Cambri dge Ci ty' s Growth  
15 Pol i cy Documents whi ch was devel oped over a  
16 matter of months; 1992, 1993, and documented  
17 Februa ry 23rd. It was by the then seated  
18 Cambri dge Pl anni ng Board i n coordi nati on wi th  
19 the Cambri dge Communi ty Devel opment  
20 Department, as wel l as members of the  
21 di fferent Cambri dge nei ghborhood

1        associations. For the sake of time I want to  
2        keep my emphasis to relevant paragraphs and  
3        the introduction to the policy and in the  
4        section under heading: Transportation. I  
5        quote: Cambridge is a dynamic multifaceted  
6        community that benefits greatly from the  
7        diversity of its citizenry and our interest  
8        in preserving an enhancement to this unique  
9        quality of life. That diversity produces a  
10       wide range of opinions about what is  
11       important to the quality of life, and as many  
12       -- raised many questions about the future  
13       growth and development of the city.

14                As for the section referring to the  
15       transportation issues as it relates to the  
16       Cambridge's future development, although the  
17       draft of your sustainable growth policy does  
18       indicate that availability of transit  
19       services should not mandate the maximum  
20       development density that can be allowed, it  
21       also alludes to the destructive forces that

1 increased traffic and air pollution can cause  
2 in low-lying residential areas. Central  
3 Square, of course, being one of the lowest  
4 lying residential areas in Cambridge. From  
5 page 69 under Transportation, this is a  
6 quote: Despite the relatively large size,  
7 Alwiffe area alone is more than 300 acres.  
8 The opportunities for future redevelopment in  
9 this area is continually diminished as new  
10 development patterns are set as in the case  
11 of Kendall Square and East Cambridge. And  
12 while some of these areas are relatively  
13 remote from established neighborhoods,  
14 external impacts like increased traffic  
15 affect even the most distant neighborhoods or  
16 physical development prestige.

17 So I ask you how, therefore, can the  
18 impact not be extremely harmful to the  
19 immediate areas, as the residents of Kendall  
20 Square and Area 4 in general.

21 The last paragraph, and one that I feel

1 is very relevant, are the evolution of the  
2 City's industrial area should be encouraged  
3 under the guidance of specific urban design  
4 plans and through other public policies and  
5 regulations such that, No. 1, those areas can  
6 adapt to new commercial and industrial  
7 patterns of development. Something that is  
8 not gonna happen --

9 PAMELA WINTERS: You need to wrap  
10 up. Your three minutes are up.

11 KAREN GALESPIE: Can I finish the  
12 last little bit?

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

14 KAREN GALESPIE: And No. 2, the  
15 residential neighborhood edges abutting such  
16 areas are strengthened through selective  
17 residential reuse within the development  
18 areas or thorough, careful transition and  
19 density scale and lot development. Please  
20 tell us how is this happening with this  
21 development if it is recommended and goes

1 through?

2 In conclusion, please keep this policy  
3 in mind when considering any approval of  
4 Forest City's up zoning petition, but rather  
5 -- rather than thinking of only the monetary  
6 gains that a management needs for a city,  
7 please think of the people and the residents  
8 of Cambridge from a human point of view.  
9 Just say no or at least put a hold on moving  
10 forward with Forest City's petition until  
11 Forest City takes the time to work in tandem  
12 with members of the different Area 4  
13 neighborhood associations --

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Excuse me. Your  
15 time's up.

16 KAREN GALESPIE: Thank you.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Next speaker Nadeem  
18 Mazen.

19 NADEEM MAZEN: Yes.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Could you spell your  
21 name, please.

1                   NADEEM MAZEN: Yes. Nadeem,  
2                   N-a-d-e-e-m like in Mary. Mazen, M-a-z-e-n.  
3                   I live at 102 Prospect. I also do business  
4                   with a laser cutting shop in Central Square,  
5                   the design firm of -- near Tavern in the  
6                   Square. I actually studied bioscience at MIT  
7                   prior to doing creative work. And I'm  
8                   curious about the bioscience use in this  
9                   space. I have to look at its prior use, the  
10                  space was used for entertainment, culture,  
11                  arts, and to some extent community service.  
12                  It doesn't make sense, I think, to construe a  
13                  new use that doesn't fundamentally add to the  
14                  character of Central Square in this way.  
15                  Bioscience as a whole is a great market move  
16                  and possibly good for the tax base, but as a  
17                  humanitarian or cultural mission, it's a shot  
18                  in the dark as every new drug and new company  
19                  must be. But other efforts like Cambridge  
20                  Innovation Center and others that take  
21                  smaller community-based initiatives and seek

1 to incubate them and aggregate have much more  
2 communi ty impact and also much more in  
3 keepi ng wi th the spi ri t of Central Square. I  
4 thi nk i t i s probabl y fallaci ous to assume  
5 that the retail space here -- I'm not sure  
6 what the triple nets will be with the high  
7 tax rate on this land, that the retail space  
8 woul d go to a quote, unquote, smaller local  
9 retail er. The types of things you see in  
10 thi s retail space tend to be ten-year leases  
11 whi ch are untenabl e for a newer or small  
12 busi ness. You' ll see extremel y high rents.  
13 You' ll see extremel y high triple nets. What  
14 you' ll see in these spaces I dare say will be  
15 vacanci es for a long time to come or some  
16 other use that has not been clearl y lai d out  
17 by the archi tects.

18 Movin g parki ng and the handy way i t was  
19 done, will not be such an easy thi ng nor will  
20 I assume that the parki ng there will be  
21 suffi ci ent. I don' t thi nk the case was made

1           there quite well at all. Traffic, again, a  
2           hand wavy issue. You'll have quite an  
3           increase in traffic which won't be  
4           ameliorated by any of the prior work done by  
5           the firm, nor is it fair to say that -- I  
6           respect and value the opinion of the Chair,  
7           nor is it fair to say that the prior housing  
8           that's been committed in prior development is  
9           enough to defray the community obligations,  
10          the housing obligations that are to be  
11          fulfilled for a space like this. It's a more  
12          matter of opinion and it's not clear to the  
13          community that the residential obligation  
14          would be tied retroactively to something like  
15          this. Nor would it be fair to the community  
16          to do so. The public benefit is not in this  
17          case clear.

18                   The last thing is just about the  
19                   decorum and the means of running a meeting  
20                   like this while trying to entice public civic  
21                   engagement. This is my first meeting like

1 this, and I appreciate that I'm allowed to  
2 speak, but I think it is strange that the  
3 panel of the Council or the Committee would  
4 presume to limit my time after being  
5 800 percent over a 20-minute part one. And  
6 after taking a 25-minute reading break for  
7 what was proposed as a 10-minute reading  
8 break. It is not necessarily fair to us to  
9 feel marginalized in this way nor is it  
10 necessarily fair to us who have kids, have  
11 obligations -- I'm now missing a business  
12 meeting at this very time because we're so  
13 far over. And it is not necessarily fair to  
14 us to schedule in such a hodge-podge way and  
15 to have people here at 10:10 in the evening  
16 when they were meant to speak at  
17 eight o'clock and meant more importantly to  
18 listen. I will now have to go and not  
19 benefit from listening to my -- to your  
20 constituents and my colleagues. Nor will I  
21 have the benefit of listening to the

1 architect and others who may have valid and  
2 important points to make about their  
3 development.

4 So in general, this to me, seems both  
5 like an unclear premise but also like a  
6 rather unstructured deliberation and I'm not  
7 in general for it.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Well, sir, I was  
9 going to say your time is up but also you can  
10 read the transcript online.

11 NADEEM MAZEN: Participatory  
12 Democracy is very different from reading  
13 online.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

15 The next speaker is Paul Stone.

16 PAUL STONE: Hello again. Paul  
17 Stone, 219 Harvard Street. I have two major  
18 problems with this proposal.

19 One is that I don't honestly see the  
20 give back that would warrant our extending  
21 that zone to include 300 Mass. Ave. and in

1 allowing them to build up a larger building  
2 and pick up more land space that would be  
3 appropriate.

4 And secondly, I think the -- right now  
5 there are studies going on that relate to  
6 development use for Central and for Kendall  
7 Squares, and it strikes me that this thing is  
8 being rushed through with the idea of getting  
9 it through before anybody has a chance to  
10 logically think about a much larger construct  
11 about the impacts that will take place with  
12 this and other developments at the same time.  
13 And I would like to see this thing bounce  
14 back for whatever reason because it's just,  
15 it's just not appropriate to not see this in  
16 context of the larger wave of development  
17 that's coming in.

18 Thank you.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

20 The next speaker is Nancy Seymour  
21 perhaps 170 Harvard Street.

1                   NANCY SEYMOUR: Do I have to say my  
2 name and dress again?

3                   HUGH RUSSELL: You do.

4                   NANCY SEYMOUR: Nancy Seymour, 170  
5 Harvard Street. Nancy Seymour, 170 Harvard  
6 Street.

7                   Before you consider any audience for up  
8 zoning, please step back and think about the  
9 precedence you're setting. Multiple new  
10 development projects are bearing down on  
11 Central Square with no overall plan to  
12 sustain what's makes Central Square  
13 wonderful, welcoming, and distinctive in my  
14 mind boggles. I've lived at Harvard and  
15 Windsor Street for 30 years, after nine in  
16 the Central Square side of mid-Cambridge, and  
17 I say grant no permits and start no  
18 construction until planning for Central  
19 Square the C2 part of K2C2 is complete. K2  
20 seems like a done deal. What I experienced  
21 there will make no sense in Central Square.

1 It will undermine the communities now living,  
2 shopping, eating, dancing, making and  
3 listening to music, rehearsing and seeing  
4 plays, making videos in community TV  
5 encountering their friends and neighbors in  
6 some many ways enlivening the square. Unlike  
7 Kendall, which was urban renewed into a  
8 wasteland after the space center up and went  
9 to Texas, Central is a model urban magnet.  
10 Let's build on its strength, its histories,  
11 its diversities. Let's value its scale, its  
12 open spaces, its like and settings for  
13 conversation. Let's make it an even better  
14 place for its people and sustain all of its  
15 neighborhoods, Area 4 from Portland and Main  
16 and Hampshire to Prospect and Mass. Ave.,  
17 Cambridgeport, Riverside, and mid-Cambridge.  
18 Central Square's human yet urban scale is as  
19 unique as what's been labelled as, quote,  
20 white hot most innovative square mile in the  
21 world, unquote, on the other end of Main

1 Street. Please don't let that white heat,  
2 the white heat of that square mile scorch all  
3 of us in its path. Some say property values  
4 will go up. So will rent and taxes. How  
5 does that benefit our communities? How many  
6 of us will have to leave this time?

7 Please do not move forward with no  
8 direction known into a complete unknown. You  
9 hold our lives in your hands.

10 Thank you.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next  
12 speaker is Richard perhaps Goldberg.

13 RICHARD GOLDBERG: That's correct.  
14 Richard Goldberg, 170 Harvard Street. I am  
15 speaking as an individual. I'm also speaking  
16 as an officer of the Area 4 Neighborhood  
17 Coalition. We've met several weeks with  
18 large numbers of people, many of whom were  
19 here tonight but had to go home so I do ask  
20 that the oral testimony portion of this  
21 proceeding be kept open so that those people

1 who had to leave could speak at a future  
2 time.

3 I'm going to shorten my comments  
4 because of the hour. Any up zoning in the  
5 Central Square area really ought to be  
6 rejected until the Goody Clancy committees  
7 under the city auspices finish their work.  
8 Those committees were designed to make a  
9 comprehensive plan. It seems to me that  
10 Forest City is trying to get an up zoning in  
11 under the wire, grant an up zoning to Forest  
12 City, and I don't see the logic of denying  
13 anybody else a chance to up zone in Central  
14 Square rendering the whole process of  
15 studying this process for over a year are  
16 relatively moot. Let's consider the All Asia  
17 site, a super tall building, monotonous  
18 edifice would probably be very much like the  
19 one that was planned for the park site near  
20 the fire station. That of course had all of  
21 the residential units that Forest City has

1 planned. So they take that away and now  
2 they're left with asking for an up zoning for  
3 lab and office space. What makes Central  
4 Square unique to me is its eclectic nature,  
5 it's very human scale, the many low buildings  
6 that give the feeling of let's say Greenwich  
7 Village. Here is a place of human scale  
8 where one can still see the sky but know  
9 you're in a city. Will the site that will be  
10 developed have any of these qualities? I  
11 think not. To look at what will probably go  
12 on this site you need only look at what  
13 Forest City has already built, the  
14 architectural monotony of Sidney and  
15 Landsdowne Street, a canyon of big box  
16 buildings. Don't we want an exciting urban  
17 promenade on Mass. Ave. and not an extension  
18 of what they've already built?

19 Here's what I'd like to see: I'd like  
20 to see low buildings on the site. Four of  
21 maybe five stories. I'd like to see a

1            building set back from the street as far as  
2            possible leaving room for trees and a wide  
3            sidewalk. And I'd like to see those  
4            buildings have mixed use, but no office  
5            space. I'd like to see small stores of a  
6            size that are disappearing from Central  
7            Square. And above those stores I'd like to  
8            see affordable apartments on the upper  
9            stories. Forest City has promised to build  
10           some housing that the families of Area 4  
11           might actually be able to afford. Let's see  
12           if their word is any good.

13                            Thank you.

14                            HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

15                            Lee Farris.

16                            Could you spell your last name?

17                            LEE FARRIS: Sure. My name is Lee,  
18            L-e-e Farris, F-a-r-r-i-s. I live at 269  
19            Norfolk Street. I've lived in Cambridgeport  
20            since 1979 until I moved to Area 4 in 1993.  
21            I'm a member of Area 4 Coalition. And as

1 Richard just said, the Area 4 Coalition  
2 continues to oppose the Forest City petition.  
3 We're wondering why would the City of  
4 Cambridge and the Planning Board want to give  
5 additional height and an additional 245,000  
6 square feet to Forest City? Of course I'm  
7 glad the presentation showed that there will  
8 be retail and that the height of the front of  
9 the building will vary so that it looks  
10 better in Central Square, but that's just  
11 good common sense and good design. I would  
12 -- I don't think there needs to be a reward  
13 for that. It shouldn't need an additional  
14 35 feet of height to do the right thing.  
15 Forest City leased its property from MIT with  
16 a zoning of 80 feet. I have yet to hear of  
17 any community benefit prospectively offered  
18 for Forest City being able to have more  
19 square feet which basically enables them to  
20 make more money. I think if they did more  
21 housing than they said they were going to

1 start with, and I was part of those  
2 neighborhood agreements long, long, long ago  
3 and all those long struggles, it just steams  
4 me to make an agreement on a height for a  
5 neighborhood with a developer and then to  
6 come back some years later and say they've  
7 got to have more without offering anything,  
8 more to anybody.

9 Forest City says that this building  
10 should be part of Mass. Ave. because it's  
11 more -- that part of Mass. Ave. is more like  
12 the section where the Novartis building is  
13 than it is the other part of Central Square.  
14 Well that's just a matter of opinion. In my  
15 opinion it's more like the other part of  
16 Central Square, and I think my opinion as a  
17 person who's lived here since 1979 should  
18 count just as much. And they didn't give any  
19 evidence for that assertion. So if you give  
20 this additional height to Forest City, it  
21 sets a precedent. I would like to see the

1 completion of the whole simple square  
2 advisory group process before this petition  
3 is completed, and I hope that you will reject  
4 this petition and I'd be fine to discuss this  
5 petition after the Central Square process is  
6 completed and there is some kind of general  
7 idea of what we're trying to accomplish for  
8 Central Square.

9 Thank you.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

11 Jonathan King.

12 JONATHAN KING: Who's is this?

13 Could you guys remove it?

14 Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of  
15 the Planning Board. My name is Jonathan  
16 King. I live at 40 Essex Street, Cambridge,  
17 Mass. I'm an officer of Essex Street  
18 Neighbors' Association and also Chair of the  
19 Zoning Committee of the Area 4 Coalition.

20 Just a little background. In the  
21 period when the original agreement between

1 Forest City was negotiated, my wife and I  
2 lived south of Mass. Avenue. Various ly at 35  
3 Brookline Street, One Kelly Road, and Five  
4 Gordon Place. We spent long hours after  
5 working on weekends at numerous meetings  
6 having to do with what was going to be built  
7 on the former Simplex wire and cable site.  
8 We even hosted neighborhood meetings on that.  
9 This was a difficult and protracted process.  
10 I believe some of you were around during that  
11 period, I'm not sure. I wasn't somebody who  
12 came to Planning Board meetings. I just  
13 followed it in the newspaper. That's one.

14 The other thing I want to say is I've  
15 been for 40 years taught and run by a  
16 biomedical research laboratory at MIT. My  
17 students work at Millennium and Wyatt and  
18 Amgen and Merck. I'm intimately and  
19 professionally familiar with the needs of the  
20 pharmaceutical and biotech industry in  
21 eastern Massachusetts. And in fact

1 nationally. Now, I want to articulate  
2 five points, each of which provides in itself  
3 a complete and sufficient basis for rejecting  
4 this petition.

5 One, this proposal reneges on the  
6 original agreement made with Forest City that  
7 involved thousands of hours of citizen  
8 effort. The Planning Board should reject the  
9 Forest City petition on this basis alone.  
10 They're coming back with nothing, saying dump  
11 what was negotiated over years and years and  
12 years.

13 Two, the city is spending hundreds of  
14 thousands of dollars of staff time. I  
15 believe that Mr. Murphy is getting paid for  
16 this time. Thousands of hours or thousand  
17 hours of 40 members of the two volunteer --  
18 those two Kendall Square committees and the  
19 Central Square committee, hours and hours and  
20 hours of serious citizen time. They have  
21 been taking seriously, right, the planning

1 for K2C2. Now Forest City comes in, they  
2 want to circumvent this process the city has  
3 put in place. You've contributed to putting  
4 in place. On this basis alone the Planning  
5 Board should reject this petition.

6 Three, when Forest City came in with  
7 their original proposal to renege on the  
8 original agreement; right? It's not clear  
9 who sent them back. The minutes of your  
10 meeting imply that you've said we need more  
11 housing. Some City Councilors have said we  
12 told them go back to put in housing. And  
13 people at CDD told us, we told them to go  
14 back and put in housing. They came back to  
15 you with this outrageous proposal to take the  
16 public park and put in a 14-story tower that,  
17 you know, shades the park and totally out of  
18 scale with the firehouse, and then of course  
19 it goes down because it's so outrageous they  
20 pulled it off the table. Now they're coming  
21 back to you with the exact proposal that

1 you've already rejected on the grounds of no  
2 housing. There's already housing on that  
3 block. There's Ashdown House, there's  
4 housing across the street. There's no reason  
5 they can't putting housing into that site,  
6 the All Asia site, they don't want to do it.

7 My last two points, thank you. You  
8 know, and I understand these type of things,  
9 but you have to think about all the hours  
10 that we have listened to these Forest City  
11 and nobody ever says to them it's time. But  
12 let me -- sorry.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, we do.

14 JONATHAN KIN: So anyway you  
15 haven't -- they haven't incorporated housing,  
16 they could. There's no reason they can't.  
17 You should reject it on that part.

18 Lastly, many of us -- I've learned  
19 about this petition, four of us from the  
20 Essex Street neighbors were coming down to  
21 the Planning Board to listen to the K2C2

1 presentation. That's how we learned about  
2 the Forest City presentation. They didn't  
3 come to the Area 4 Coalition. They didn't  
4 come to Essex Street Neighbors. They didn't  
5 come to the Cambridgeport Neighborhood  
6 Association. They didn't come to the  
7 Alliance of Cambridge Neighborhood Tenants.  
8 We are all listed with e-mail and name  
9 contacts on the CDD website. And they didn't  
10 even come to the faculty committee at MIT  
11 who's been monitoring these developments. So  
12 on that grounds, the complete absence of any  
13 even -- even a symbolic gesture, this  
14 Planning Board should reject the petition.

15 Let me close with saying that, you  
16 know, this project, it doesn't speak to any  
17 need of the community; not residential, not  
18 education, not scientific, not artistic, not  
19 cultural. No group in Cambridge has called  
20 for it. We biomedical scientists have not  
21 gone to Forest City and said oh, we're dying

1 for space. Cambridge is full of unleashed  
2 biotech space. Right? We're not short of  
3 that. It comes from Forest City. There's no  
4 community benefit. No community need. It  
5 ought to be rejected on the face of it.

6 Thank you very much.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

8 JONATHAN KIN: And by the way,  
9 shadows, you know, there's one thing,  
10 shadows. Some of us also like to see the  
11 sky. It's true that it won't cast a shadow  
12 on the park. But when you're sitting on Jill  
13 Brown-Rhone Park, you try to read the  
14 newspaper and look up, you're going to see a  
15 big building rather than sky. Sorry, sorry  
16 for going over. Thank you for listening.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: People have been  
18 applauding. That's really not helpful.

19 JONATHAN KING: What?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: I'm not speaking to  
21 you. I'm speaking to the residents.

1 Lydi a Vi ckers i s next.

2 LYDIA VICKERS: Thank you,  
3 Mr. Chai rman. My name i s Lydi a Vi ckers and I  
4 I live at 45 Cherry Street which i s the  
5 abutti ng Area 4 nei ghborhood. I don' t thi nk  
6 I have much to add to what the people have  
7 sai d before me, thanks to Jonathan Ki ng. I  
8 certai nly want to add my support to  
9 overwhel mi ng opposi ti on to the rush to up  
10 zone Mass. Avenue. I don' t understand really  
11 qui te what the hurry i s. And one of the  
12 thi ngs that bothered me a great deal was that  
13 evi denti ly Forest Ci ty spoke a great deal ,  
14 thought i t was making outreach to the  
15 nei ghborhoods by speaki ng wi th Communi ty  
16 Devel opment and a Board that was set up by  
17 the Ci ty Manager, but on -- but no one from  
18 the nei ghborhoods was i ncl uded on -- i n those  
19 di scussi ons and we' ve been tol d -- I forget  
20 what i t i s that we' ve been tol d, but MIT had  
21 pretty much fi ni shed i ts di scussi ons wi th the

1 neighborhoods, that was about two weeks ago.  
2 So, I do think that until all the city  
3 neighborhoods have had a chance to discuss  
4 this thing and consider what up zoning really  
5 means for them, that the Planning Board could  
6 hold off at least a little while and give us  
7 a moratorium. That's really all I have to  
8 say.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.  
10 Heather Hoffman.

11 HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi. My name is  
12 Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street  
13 which is closer to Kendall Square than to  
14 Central Square and so I've seen the march of  
15 the up zoning as it goes from Kendall Square  
16 down to Central Square. When the Goody  
17 Clancy study was announced, there was a  
18 stampede of up zoning petitions and you all  
19 know this because you've heard them. This is  
20 only the latest. It's definitely not the  
21 first, and at the very least it's unseemly.

1 Why are we spending this money to study when  
2 what we're getting is decisions before the  
3 study. I thought it was supposed to be the  
4 other way around. Why are we selling our  
5 souls to developers who are taking away our  
6 green space, our sky, our streets, our quiet,  
7 because biotech comes with a drone, and it  
8 doesn't matter that there's a noise  
9 ordinance. They don't care because no one  
10 enforces it. All you get is a lot of noise.  
11 So why are we doing this? We say well, the  
12 city needs more tax money. At some point you  
13 kill the goose that laid the golden eggs and  
14 that's what we're doing. We're building on  
15 parks already. Just because this park has  
16 gotten a reprieve doesn't mean that it's not  
17 gonna happen in the future. So we're  
18 building on our parks, we're taking our sky,  
19 and I will point out something that I believe  
20 Mr. Tibbs said long ago in another meeting:  
21 This is not a project, this is a Zoning

1           Petition. That's all it is. It's just a  
2           creation of something that, that governs the  
3           size of what they can build, not what they're  
4           gonna build. So any pretty pictures they've  
5           shown you, to the extent that you find them  
6           pretty, are nothing more than pretty  
7           pictures. So I strongly urge you to let the  
8           planning happen first before we make the  
9           decisions. It's -- it is the least we can  
10          do. And just talking to Goody Clancy is  
11          really insufficient. Goody Clancy is not the  
12          whole thing. I've been to these meetings.  
13          There are an awful lot of people who are not  
14          Goody Clancy and they're not being talked to.

15                    Thanks.

16                    HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

17                    The next name on the list is Sherry  
18                    Tucker.

19                    SHERRY TUCKER: I didn't say to  
20                    speak, though.

21                    HUGH RUSSELL: That's what I was

1 going to ask you.

2 James Williamson.

3 JAMES WILLIAMSON: Stuart, before  
4 you start the clock, I'd like to ask you to  
5 put on a different slide, please, if you  
6 would or would you, Forest City?

7 PETER CALKINS: Which one do you  
8 want?

9 JAMES WILLIAMSON: If you go back.  
10 One day, Robert, maybe you'll get to chair  
11 the meetings.

12 If you go back a little, please, to  
13 the -- yes, that. Okay, thank you.

14 James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place.  
15 There seems to be a lot of hocus-pocus going  
16 on here tonight, and I'd like to get a little  
17 clear about some of it. Did CDD -- did the  
18 Community Development Department ask for this  
19 monstrosity? Does the Community Development  
20 Department work for Forest City or do you  
21 work for the people of the City of Cambridge?

1 I'd like to get that straightened out  
2 eventually, but I'm not sure we ever will.

3 What's going on here would be spot  
4 zoning if it weren't for the manipulation of  
5 the revitalization district by that dotted  
6 line which goes out and reaches out for  
7 something that was not part of the  
8 revitalization zone to allow for this what  
9 would otherwise be spot zoning. That's a  
10 game that's being played. Otherwise, this  
11 would be spot zoning.

12 As far as which way the buildings are  
13 going, they're coming towards Central Square,  
14 they're not going away from Central Square.  
15 It's the march of the big buildings into the  
16 historic retail core of Central Square. Is  
17 this planning or is this poaching? This is  
18 poaching. We have -- do we have planning?  
19 You're the Planning Board. Do we have  
20 planning in Cambridge or do we have poaching?  
21 We have -- do we have planning for Mass.

1 Ave.? Is this consistent with any plan that  
2 exists for Mass. Ave.?

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Excuse me, sir,  
4 could you just move back just a little bit?

5 JAMES WILLIAMSON: Yeah.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: I'm sorry, it's  
7 just resonating.

8 JAMES WILLIAMSON: Okay.

9 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

10 JAMES WILLIAMSON: Is it consistent  
11 with any known plan for Kendall Square? Is  
12 it consistent with any known plan for  
13 Cambridge? It is not because we don't have  
14 such a plan yet and that's what others have  
15 spoken to. The Central Square Advisory  
16 Committee is meant to come up with at least  
17 the beginnings of some kind of a coherent  
18 plan. If you look at Mass. Ave., what's the  
19 height? What's the roof line height? The  
20 cornice height for Mass. Ave.? It is not  
21 115 feet. It is 65 feet. It is

1 four stories. Those stories were knocked  
2 down to two stories, let's put them back up  
3 to four stories. That is what the character  
4 and scale of Central Square is. It is not  
5 115 feet. This was originally designed to  
6 have a buffer. The zone did not go to the  
7 Mass. Ave. because there was meant to be a  
8 buffer. 70 feet is -- the building that  
9 Asgard is in is 70 feet. That was meant to  
10 be a buffer against all of this stuff down  
11 here. And now you're gonna let them get away  
12 with completely obliterating that by doubling  
13 the size and the height of this monstrosity.

14 As far as the shadow, the only lawyer  
15 who showed up at the Ordinance Committee was  
16 the lawyer not for Jill Brown Park but the  
17 lawyer for the Miracle of Science. They're  
18 concerned about the shadow because they will  
19 get the shadow from this building.

20 Now, I would like to ask for our city  
21 to take this off the table. It can be

1 re-filed. It should be taken off the table.  
2 It's an outrage that we are in the middle of  
3 a planning process, and Forest City are going  
4 to be allowed to slip in you such an out of  
5 scale, totally inconsistent with anything  
6 that could possibly be imagined for Central  
7 Square. And I have to submit for the record  
8 the Urban Land Institute study on  
9 transportation issues, what's gonna happen to  
10 the transportation? You guys, are you  
11 thinking about that? Does it matter? Maybe  
12 not. And can we please just stop all the  
13 fancy dancing here and be honest about what  
14 is really going on here? And I, too, would  
15 like to ask you to keep the oral testimony  
16 part of the public hearing open for all the  
17 people who were here earlier and had to  
18 leave.

19 Thank you.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

21 Next speaker is Charles Teague.

1 CHARLES TEAGUE: Charles Teague, 23  
2 Edmunds Street in beautiful North Cambridge  
3 and that's a tough act to follow. And I  
4 guess, I guess the question you'd have is why  
5 do I care? And I care because of the process  
6 and the precedent being done here affects me,  
7 it affects us all. And we, and we, and part  
8 of the process is that there's little  
9 itty-bitty portions, get this and get that,  
10 and the thing that's really troubling here is  
11 that we actually -- in this area we're  
12 actually doing the right thing and we're --  
13 we got the product, we have the plan coming  
14 forward. And you just can't do this, you  
15 know? It just here we are, we're going to do  
16 the right thing, which we don't have in North  
17 Cambridge, we don't have the big plan and you  
18 just can't do this. So -- and the other  
19 reason why I care is because as the Central  
20 and Kendall get built, people go through  
21 North Cambridge and they go through all parts

1 of Cambridge. We're all connected. This is  
2 six square miles. You just -- we should have  
3 the true master plan. So once again we're  
4 developing a plan. This has to wait. I  
5 don't see that there's any choice.

6 Thank you.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

8 Mr. Winters, do you want to speak?

9 ROBERT WINTER: I wasn't really  
10 planning to speak here, but I'll just say a  
11 couple of quick things.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Go ahead.

13 ROBERT WINTERS: Robert Winters, 366  
14 Broadway. One is that I actually have copies  
15 of the original studies for Forest City, and  
16 this area actually was originally part of  
17 what was the plan that just didn't end up  
18 being in there, the end. So it's not  
19 especially inconsistent with what the  
20 existing University Park to extend it to this  
21 section here.

1           As far as taking a position on this,  
2           I'm not going to take a position on this. I  
3           will simply trust the judgment of the  
4           Planning Board and eventually the City  
5           Council in terms of the Zoning aspects of  
6           this. My chief concern is primarily about  
7           the design and the retail component of what  
8           eventually is going to happen there at  
9           whatever scale, and that's a process that we  
10          can take up in the other Central Square  
11          Advisory Committee, hint, hint, as well as  
12          future Planning Board meetings.

13                 Thank you.

14                 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

15                 Kathy Hoffman, do you wish to speak?

16                 KATHY HOFFMAN: Hi. Kathy Hoffman,  
17                 57 Pleasant Street, wanting to just add a  
18                 voice from the Cambridgeport neighborhood,  
19                 someone who has been part of Ward 5 for about  
20                 25 years until just redistricted it ever so  
21                 slightly in the last year. So that kind of

1 leaves me still within my neighborhood, but  
2 not in the same technical way, but someone  
3 who also has been in the neighborhood since  
4 1978 and remembers very much the legacy of  
5 the Simplex Steering Committee and the  
6 struggles that have gone on for many, many  
7 years to get the things that we have. I'm  
8 not someone who is celebrating taking the  
9 housing off because to me it was a whole kind  
10 of ruse to begin with where housing was  
11 demanded because that is clearly a  
12 neighborhood priority, a city priority. And  
13 so the proposal for housing was put forward  
14 but put forward with market rate single  
15 bedroom 14-story, clearly something that was  
16 gonna be objectionable. So then the  
17 community objects, housing was taken off, and  
18 Forest City proceeds with what they wanted  
19 all along to begin with. So this is not to  
20 me a cause of celebration at all. It's also  
21 very disturbing to hear that we can't talk

1 about the fact that there are no communi ty  
2 benefi ts because, Hugh, you' ve menti oned the  
3 fact that the communi ty benefi ts have al ready  
4 been prepaid. Well, I don' t think that  
5 there' s any way that we can then say so that  
6 means they can do whatever they want because  
7 communi ty benefi ts have al ready been taken  
8 care of. Thi s makes no sense whatsoever.  
9 You know, the thi ngs that have been gotten  
10 through struggl e wi th Forest Ci ty have been  
11 gotten wi th great, great, great, sweat and  
12 tears and love and effort on the part of  
13 peopl e from al l the neighborhoo ds surroundi ng  
14 thi s area. And to sort of say that therefore  
15 gi ves them cart blanche to do what they want  
16 now, I don' t think real ly respects the ki nd  
17 of words and care that you' ve been heari ng.

18 I al so think that, you know, many of us  
19 remember a Central Square years ago wi th  
20 corporate i n the center of i t and factori es  
21 and l ots of mi xed use, and i t was a worki ng

1 class downtown of Cambridge. Well, that's  
2 been eroded and eroded and eroded. It's been  
3 eroded from one side, it's been eroded from  
4 another. And to me this looks like Kendall  
5 Square coming to Central. That's what we're  
6 seeing with Novartis. It's frightening to  
7 see this is happening. And as people have  
8 pointed out only too eloquently, this then  
9 becomes the new standard, the new norm;  
10 right? So if we put this building in, then  
11 the next person who comes along and says  
12 well, look at this, this is what -- this is  
13 what Mass. Avenue looks like now. And so it  
14 has to be stopped before we've slid into  
15 something establishing a precedent. And I  
16 think the other thing that's just been said  
17 over and over again, you know, it doesn't  
18 make sense to decide planning owner by owner,  
19 bit by bit. That's not -- I mean we're  
20 talking all of Mass. Avenue. We're talking  
21 about these transition areas. There is a

1 process underway. Let's have that process be  
2 much more explicit before granting something  
3 like this.

4 On a tiny little note I've just been --  
5 we've been learning about the moving of the  
6 Harvard Co-op, a kind of -- and the ending of  
7 Clear Conscious Cafe sold out, you know,  
8 that's the end of that in Central Square. So  
9 Co-op will move across the street into a tiny  
10 little space and now what's gonna move into  
11 that whole space, they're renting it to  
12 H-mart which is a high end Korean Asian  
13 market. There's one in Burlington. People  
14 come from miles and miles and miles around to  
15 shop at this particular H-mart. It's very  
16 popular. So that's now a little bit one by  
17 one by one, let's let this move and let's let  
18 that move. So the kind of traffic coming  
19 into Central Square to shop at this one high  
20 end place, the kind of place that can only  
21 afford the rents that are now being

1 recalibrating in Central Square, changes the  
2 very nature. That's just one example. So  
3 this whole kind of upscaling only says more  
4 of the same. I'm sorry we couldn't have  
5 stopped that already from happening. And I  
6 would really hope that this can be put on  
7 hold pending something much more in keeping  
8 with Central Square. We loved Harvard Square  
9 and funk to the banks. Now they're talking  
10 about the funk of Central Square or the grit  
11 of Central Square and yupsters and hipsters  
12 for retail. It's like oh, my goodness. And  
13 now we're seeing Kendall moving this way. So  
14 I would really rely on your thoughtfulness  
15 and your years of dedication to Cambridge to  
16 stop this project.

17 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

19 Does anyone else wish to speak? Sir.

20 AARON KING: Hi. I'm Aaron King and  
21 I live at 40 Essex Street. I'm 22-years-old

1 and I've lived there my entire life so I'm  
2 very interested in what's going on right now.  
3 I think like a lot of people have said that  
4 this is not just about one development. This  
5 is kind about the wave of development and  
6 setting a precedent in the future. And so as  
7 somebody who grew up in Cambridge and went to  
8 the public schools, I would like to share a  
9 personal story about what has been going on  
10 in Cambridge for a while which is kind of the  
11 wave of development.

12 So in first grade, I met a good friend  
13 of mine, who became a good friend of mine,  
14 his name was Brian Awachacu (phonetic). His  
15 family was Nigerian, and I felt that me being  
16 friends with him first, second, and third  
17 grade, was very important. You know, as  
18 somebody who wasn't understanding of his  
19 cultures and stuff like that and kind of  
20 being affected by that, was really important  
21 to growing up and being accepting of

1 everybody. His family was forced to move out  
2 of Cambridge after the end of his third  
3 year -- after third grade due to the rising  
4 prices of low income housing.

5 Another good friend of mine who I met  
6 in third grade and was friends with in third  
7 and fourth grade. His name is Sammy Banson  
8 (phonetic). He was Haitian and just another  
9 one of my very good close friends, one of my  
10 favorite people in the classes. You know,  
11 everyone liked him, very funny, very outgoing  
12 guy. His family was forced to move to  
13 Medford at the end of fourth grade.

14 My next best friend was named Omar  
15 Decos (phonetic). He was also Haitian, and I  
16 was best friends with him for maybe seventh  
17 grade through freshman year of high school.  
18 His family was forced to move to Everett at  
19 the end of his freshman year and he  
20 transferred to Everett High. You know, I  
21 don't have time to go in and try and convince

1           you guys of the relevance of this and exactly  
2           why I feel like it's relevant, but I do feel  
3           like the wave of development really is  
4           pushing people like them out of the city who  
5           are key to the diversity and the culture of  
6           this place.

7                     Just to add, you know, these kids did  
8           not grow up to be failures or anything.  
9           Brian is at Princeton and Sam is at UMass  
10          Amherst, and I feel like they were huge  
11          losses to the city.

12                    So thank you.

13                    HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

14                    Michael .

15                    MICHAEL BRANDON: I'll be short and  
16          sweet. I'm Michael Brandon, 27 Seven Pines  
17          Avenue. Cut me off at one minute, please.

18                    PAMELA WINTERS: Really?

19                    HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

20                    MICHAEL BRANDON: We're almost  
21          there. Just quickly a previous speaker

1 repeatedly pointed to this table and referred  
2 to the monstrosity. And I'm pretty sure what  
3 he's referring to is a proposed building that  
4 presumably might be built should this be up  
5 zoned. The model is great and the City  
6 Council, as some of you may know, is  
7 encouraging creations for these sort of  
8 contextual 3-D models to help the Board and  
9 the Councilors and the public understand  
10 what impacts the buildings will be. And it  
11 should also apply to large projects, too. I  
12 think that this is a very helpful tool to  
13 understand the context. It's planners. I'd  
14 also point out that you mentioned that the  
15 proposed building is Plexiglass, and I think  
16 that falls in the category of Lying With  
17 Maps, I don't know if you're familiar with  
18 that book, but you can kind of have Lying  
19 with models, too. And had that been a more  
20 solid seeming material, even the same as the  
21 other buildings or something of a different

1 color, that it makes it less easy to see the  
2 impact that the bulk is gonna have and as  
3 people are saying, the march of development,  
4 of large development close to the city.

5 Finally, just another voice from North  
6 Cambridge who's concerned about the general  
7 impact of overall over development throughout  
8 the city and piecemeal up zonings, I would  
9 hope that all you're empowered to do is to  
10 make a recommendation to the Council that you  
11 not get into all the specifics, but just  
12 listen to the volunteer citizens as you are  
13 and represent our interests of our fellow  
14 citizens and just suggest to the Board that  
15 as a Planning Board, there's a process going  
16 on for a comprehensive plan for the area and  
17 until that's finished the Council shouldn't  
18 entertain an up zoning. You know, just say  
19 no. Come back maybe, you know, after we have  
20 our master plan in place. I went over  
21 one minute. Sorry.

1 Thank you.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does

3 anyone else wish to speak?

4 Sir, come forward.

5 FRED LEWIS: Good afternoon -- good

6 evening. My name is Fred Lewis and I live at

7 249 Hurley Street. I live in Cambridge for

8 30 years coming from Barbados. My mother

9 live on River Street, and I lived there --

10 and I lived on Western Ave. for sometime.

11 The only thing that concerning me is that,

12 you know, the people and organizations in

13 Cambridge do not have no say in anything

14 they're planning. And Forest City is coming

15 forward with a big plan because they want

16 some money in their pockets, and I don't

17 agree with this. And I think that the

18 Planning Board, like the rest of the members

19 say, to put this on hold until the other

20 plans are completed, and I heard someone said

21 that Forest City had never come to none of

1 the groups and meet with them within the  
2 neighborhood of Cambridge, which is true. I  
3 have never seen anybody. And this is the  
4 first time I seen them now, but I would like  
5 the Planning Board to really look at this  
6 real good and to think about it and to think  
7 about the residents of Cambridge. We are the  
8 one that are here and paying the taxes in  
9 Cambridge, and we should have some sort of  
10 say when Forest City want to come in and  
11 slide something under the table so quick and  
12 the planning going on. So I will leave this  
13 for you, please take this in consideration  
14 very, very careful.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

16 Does anyone else wish to speak?

17 (No Response.)

18 HUGH RUSSELL: I don't see anybody.

19 So, I guess I would ask the question of  
20 the staff how does this relate to the studies  
21 that are going forward at this time? How

1 does it relate?

2 BRIAN MURPHY: I'd be happy to start  
3 and Roger may be able to provide a little  
4 bit. I think what I would do is to put it  
5 into context, that is the Council put forward  
6 both Kendall and Central Square petitions. I  
7 don't think that they anticipated a  
8 moratorium in terms of what was going on with  
9 things in the area. I think the first  
10 example you saw of that was the Novartis  
11 petition. And I think in terms of where  
12 Goody Clancy's been coming from and where the  
13 -- what's going on in the community  
14 discussion, this was presented before the  
15 Central Square Committee for discussion,  
16 evaluation as was the housing proposal. So I  
17 think what you saw from the Council was the  
18 sense that the housing tower was something  
19 that caused a great deal of consternation  
20 because of its location and size and felt the  
21 fact that there were many more questions that

1 people felt needed to be answered. I think  
2 in terms of this piece and the life sciences  
3 segment, I don't think that in terms of from  
4 the CDD perspective or from what we've been  
5 looking at that, that this is really out of  
6 context with what we were expecting. That I  
7 think the sense of how the avenue works is  
8 different, that this is not a place that  
9 would be precedential in terms of thinking of  
10 Mass. Ave. going towards City Hall, that this  
11 is more the precinct that goes to the right  
12 rather than the left if you're facing that  
13 way. I don't think that's sort of how I put  
14 it in terms of the context of what the  
15 Committee's been looking at.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Before you speak, I  
17 just -- that bothers me because what you're  
18 saying is that, you know, Goody Clancy can  
19 have some ideas and they talk to you about  
20 it, but we are the Planning Board and we have  
21 not seen that stuff, so that I just want that

1 -- that bothers me a little. And I'm  
2 beginning to feel -- I think I expressed it  
3 before, that sometimes I feel like we're  
4 either a rubber stamper or we're left out of  
5 the process. And that sometimes people come  
6 before CDC and you feel that's a-okay and  
7 somehow you can anticipate what we're saying.  
8 So I mean I guess I have some feelings about  
9 that. But I guess I think when Hugh asked  
10 for the context, I just wanted you to say  
11 that the study is at this point in time and  
12 we anticipates it's going to be done by this  
13 point in time. And, yes, you can say from  
14 your perspective that the city has not put a  
15 moratorium on stuff like that. But I think  
16 that to begin to say whether or not you think  
17 something is appropriate or not appropriate,  
18 I think that's our job here and we need to  
19 see this stuff before us so that we can do  
20 our job.

21 BRIAN MURPHY: In terms of answering

1 the question about where the study committee  
2 is. Its next meeting is tomorrow night. It  
3 has another meeting, I believe it's July 11th  
4 I think it is, which will be I think looking  
5 at the transportation issues. And then I  
6 expect they'll take a break in August. And I  
7 would imagine somewhere between, you know,  
8 one, two or three additional meetings in  
9 September would be my expected, you know,  
10 September, October -- the fall in terms of  
11 going through it. You know, what we'll  
12 certainly do is bring back, you know, have  
13 another session we do is sort of an update on  
14 the K2 process where things are with C2. I  
15 think what's perhaps some of the things that  
16 have been, that are sort of interesting in  
17 terms of where things are going through with  
18 that is I think that we still -- there's  
19 still a lot more work to be done within the  
20 committee in terms of how the development and  
21 economics pencil out. That I think some of

1 the initial assumptions aren't borne out by  
2 some of the requirements of parking in the  
3 area so that I don't -- I think it's going to  
4 be -- I think there's sort of more work to be  
5 done in terms of that area looking to, you  
6 know, the similar discussion what do we do  
7 with some of the gaps such as the role of  
8 city parking lots, whether or not there are  
9 places that look like there's some additional  
10 development. I think that there's going to  
11 be more work done on the committee in the  
12 next couple of weeks. I think one of the  
13 other pieces that's likely to get a fair  
14 amount of consideration or committee is to  
15 get a better understanding of the  
16 transportation issues. When we did the  
17 initial Kendall Square numbers, it was a more  
18 anticipated and more extreme build out that  
19 is actually borne out by the entire K2  
20 process. What we'll be looking to do for the  
21 July meeting is to sort of loop in the those

1 K2 number and what we would anticipate in  
2 Central as well. So I think sort of that  
3 sort of the sense of I think where the  
4 committee will be looking to go in the next  
5 few months.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: So, Brian, so when  
7 do you expect them to have their final  
8 recommendations about?

9 BRIAN MURPHY: In the fall.

10 PAMELA WINTERS: In the fall.

11 Great, thank you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Roger, do you want to  
13 comment?

14 ROGER BOOTHE: I'm kind of running  
15 out of steam here. But certainly we've heard  
16 from neighbors' concerns about the timing and  
17 so forth, that this Forest City plan, the  
18 original Forest City plan was quite a while  
19 ago. It's come with housing in and housing  
20 out. This is pretty similar to what was,  
21 what's under construction now at Novartis.

1           And for some people that's clearly not a  
2           happy thing, but it has been thought through  
3           quite a bit. I think since the original  
4           scheme which was quite a monolithic approach,  
5           and, again, none of these are fill-ins. It  
6           is a zoning strategy. I think they've made a  
7           lot of progress in terms of trying to have a  
8           higher portion and a lower portion, and I  
9           would think if it would go ahead in whatever  
10          form, that it would be good to have some  
11          requirements for that sort of variation so  
12          that we don't wind up with something  
13          monolithic here. And certainly the ground  
14          floor retail is very important, and I think  
15          that's unlike a lot of the biotech buildings,  
16          this one would be fitting into the street  
17          scene and have the retail. And while there  
18          were some facilities in this block, it's it  
19          isn't exactly up to what you might expect to  
20          see along the major avenue at this point. So  
21          I think it -- a lot could be done with design

1 to make this something that would fit in.  
2 It's just obviously a bigger question about  
3 whether this is a right use here. But I did  
4 speak with David Dickson today knowing that  
5 we have the hearing tonight, and he felt that  
6 the scheme that's being shown here meets a  
7 lot of the urban design considerations that  
8 we're looking at throughout the process and I  
9 feel that way as well.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: The report will be  
11 out. I suppose that report comes out and  
12 roughly around the same time there's actually  
13 a plan, a request for the building. And  
14 let's supposing that the report says  
15 something particular about how the Mass.  
16 Avenue elevation has to be constructed about  
17 setbacks and heights and things like that,  
18 there's nothing that prevents us from saying,  
19 yeah, that's what we want; right?

20 BRIAN MURPHY: Correct.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And we would

1 anticipate that information coming to us  
2 before we're reviewing the project or before  
3 we complete our review of the project.

4 BRIAN MURPHY: Yes, I mean, I don't  
5 know what -- if you were to approve -- if the  
6 City Council were to approve the Zoning in  
7 July, which, you know, again, I don't know  
8 whether that's happening or not. I don't  
9 know what Forest City's timetable would be.  
10 But again I would anticipate the Central  
11 Square Committee will be completing its work,  
12 like I say, in the fall.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And if it's a  
14 -- what's the time frame for our review of  
15 the proposal? It's built into the this  
16 chapter of the Ordinance; right?

17 STUART DASH: For Article 19 kind of  
18 review is that what you're asking?

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, it's --

20 ROGER BOOTHE: How long would it  
21 take?

1                   STUART DASH: This Ordinance.

2                   HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, the section of  
3                   the Ordinance that is being extended to cover  
4                   this site has certain time frames for design  
5                   review.

6                   ROGER BOOTHE: Design frames for  
7                   design review with Article 19. I think it's  
8                   just like any Special Permit.

9                   HUGH RUSSELL: This is with the  
10                  Cambridgeport.

11                 LIZA PADEN: The CRDD.

12                 HUGH RUSSELL: It has a different  
13                 process.

14                 LIZA PADEN: Right. It's a design  
15                 review process, and CRDD and the  
16                 Cambridgeport Revitalization.

17                 ROGER BOOTHE: This would be a  
18                 project for Special Permit, would it not? So  
19                 that would have the normal time frame.

20                 HUGH RUSSELL: That's my question.

21                 LIZA PADEN: So there's nothing in

1 the Zoning Proposal that would exempt it from  
2 going through project review from Article 19.

3 Is that what you're saying, you're asking?

4 JEFF ROBERTS: I was just going to  
5 say what Liza said.

6 LIZA PADEN: Oh, sorry.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: So an Article 19  
8 review is a Special Permit and that follows  
9 the --

10 JEFF ROBERTS: There is a particular  
11 design review process in Article 15 which is  
12 this district which was put in place I  
13 believe prior to the Article 19 project  
14 review Special Permit provisions. So, I mean  
15 technically they both would apply, but I  
16 think in sort of realistically in terms of  
17 process, it would be the Article 19 project  
18 review process would more or less supersede  
19 the other design review elements. Of course  
20 the design standards and guidelines that  
21 apply in the CRDD would also be incorporated

1 into that process. That's my understanding  
2 of how the process would work.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: So that time frame is  
4 that an application is filed. We have  
5 65 days for a hearing and 90 days from the  
6 date of the hearing for a decision subject to  
7 extensions if there's mutual agreement.

8 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: So that's a process  
10 that is a five-month process.

11 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: And so that would  
13 give us sufficient time to get -- hear the  
14 Central Square if it continues on track.  
15 That's really -- I'm just trying to determine  
16 -- right. What do other people want to  
17 comment on?

18 Pam.

19 PAMELA WINTERS: Well, the hour is  
20 getting late and are we supposed to make a  
21 recommendation to the Council? Because my

1           recommendati on would be that we wait until  
2           after the Central Square study is done. Are  
3           we supposed to make a recommendati on tonight  
4           to the Council?

5                        HUGH RUSSELL: We -- the way the  
6           Ordinance is written, we are requested to  
7           make a recommendati on. If we fail to make a  
8           recommendati on in a time frame which has  
9           already elapsed, the Council is free to act.  
10          We can make a recommendati on that would say  
11          that we feel they should not act on it, and  
12          we could make, you know, we could make  
13          whatever recommendati on in our judgment is  
14          appropri ate.

15                     Sure, Ted.

16                     H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I don't  
17          think I can in good faith make a  
18          recommendati on that this be adopted by the  
19          City Council now. I don't think it's the  
20          wrong building in the wrong spot. It may  
21          indeed be the absolute right building. I

1 have maybe some questions about the 115 feet,  
2 but I like tall buildings and I think tall  
3 buildings on Mass. Ave. make sense, and I  
4 think it makes sense with the Novartis  
5 building. I would like to see more  
6 residential than lab, but I just think we're  
7 so close to a conclusion about the Central  
8 Square study and it just seems to me not  
9 right to do this at this particular time.  
10 It's unlike, you know, Special Permits that  
11 have been requested to us while Zoning  
12 petitions are pending. I think, you know,  
13 they came at the timing of the proponent and  
14 we had to deal with them, but where we're  
15 being asked to make a recommendation to the  
16 City Council, I just don't think it's the  
17 right time to do it. I'm not -- as I say,  
18 I'm not sure -- I'm not saying it's the wrong  
19 proposal in the wrong place, but I just think  
20 it's the wrong time for it to happen. And I  
21 agree with, you know, Bill that this is a

1 major planning issue. The whole city,  
2 Central Square, Kendall Square is a major  
3 planning issue that I think we should be more  
4 a part of, and that I think that this is a  
5 large component -- or the piece of it that  
6 ought to be reviewed by us and by the City  
7 Council in light of whatever comes out the  
8 study.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Comments, Tom?  
10 Steve?

11 STEVEN WINTER: Bill's got his hand  
12 up.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: I would say that I  
14 agree with Pam and with Ted. I just think  
15 it's good -- we are Planning Board and I  
16 think it's good planning if we know that the  
17 city is putting a lot of time and effort into  
18 a study, that we respect that, and that say  
19 that we should really understand those  
20 things. You know, on this Board I've always  
21 been a person who has always talked about

1 context, and I would like to see the context  
2 or have some discussion about the broader  
3 context. And I just may or may not be a very  
4 appropriate within that context, but I think  
5 we would be jumping the gun by doing that.  
6 I'll be honest, I was a little -- I think I  
7 even mentioned this at the time of the  
8 Novartis one, but then it was way too early  
9 because the process was just getting off.  
10 And I was quite frankly a little bit  
11 uncomfortable even doing that in light of the  
12 fact that we had -- we're starting this  
13 thing, to really look at it. And I just --  
14 this would be just one more piece of the pie  
15 from a Zoning perspective. I understand,  
16 Hugh, that we had some project review options  
17 there, but from a Zoning perspective we're  
18 just plugging in without having that context  
19 there. So I would agree with Ted and Pam.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

21 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,

1 Mr. Chair. I concur with my colleagues who  
2 have spoken so far. I don't -- I'm not sure  
3 that I have any problems with the proposal.  
4 I don't have any problems with the proponent  
5 and how it's come forward, but where I -- and  
6 I think, you know, our challenge is to make a  
7 calm and rational decision about an issue  
8 that has people very heated, and but for --  
9 where I go to is I see -- I can see no  
10 compelling reason for this Board to act today  
11 to recommend this change. There's no  
12 compelling reason for the land, for the land  
13 use, for the property around it, for the --  
14 if the company, if the proponent has a  
15 compelling reason, that doesn't factor in  
16 here. There's no compelling reason for the  
17 health of the economic health of the city. I  
18 don't, I just don't see a compelling reason  
19 that would say, Steve, you have to move on  
20 this today and doing something today. So I  
21 think I would -- and I also think that this

1 Board has a history of moving forward with  
2 decisions on projects and that not always in  
3 tandem with community processes, and we've  
4 made decisions on permits that where the  
5 community had said but we're still talking  
6 about this however it came -- the project was  
7 under review, it was in the process and we  
8 made decisions on it. I think I concur with  
9 Ted, this is a little different and I, I  
10 don't see why we can't wait on this.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Tom.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: I feel stronger  
13 than my colleagues. Not only do I think the  
14 timing is wrong but I do not find the Zoning  
15 parameters that are being proposed  
16 persuasive. I thought -- I have a lot of  
17 confidence in Forest City. I like the way  
18 they do their planning. I like the people  
19 who have done it. I think we've had a good  
20 working relationship with them. I think they  
21 understand urban planning very well. I

1 actually thought the proposal that they came  
2 up with with the residential was interesting,  
3 not because I thought it was the right  
4 solution but because they were trying hard to  
5 balance different considerations. And I  
6 remember the discussion although I don't  
7 remember the words anymore, and I thought  
8 they were really thinking hard about  
9 different approaches to it. Well, I think  
10 they still need to go back and work it out  
11 one more time in a way that fits what we've  
12 heard here tonight. There were a lot of  
13 convincing points made, and I'm with them on  
14 this. I do not see the necessity for a  
15 building of that magnitude at that site and I  
16 don't think that it follows from the Novartis  
17 Zoning that we have. So I would, I would  
18 think that we ought to go deeper than just  
19 waiting for whatever report comes down which  
20 may not or may tell us something helpful. I  
21 think here on this spot, we can do better on

1 the Zoning. And I would like to see the  
2 Zoning not only -- if there is to be rezoning  
3 at all on this site, and on the other site as  
4 well, I think they fit together and I am  
5 dismayed that we have to do this piecemeal  
6 the way it's been done. And I think we can  
7 do better and I think Forest City can do  
8 better. I'd like to see them give it another  
9 shot.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my own  
11 feelings about this are that a -- the use  
12 proposal, it seems to me perfectly  
13 reasonable. The -- how Mass. Avenue is  
14 treated is something I would like to hear  
15 more advice on. I don't think this sets a  
16 precedent. And I think at this point there  
17 are very few soft blocks across the street  
18 but it's a funny shaped triangular block  
19 that's not going to end up with a big biotech  
20 building on it. So, I'm not opposed to the  
21 what my colleagues have said as a

1           recommenda ti on.

2                   STEVEN WINTER:   What are you hearing  
3           as that recommendati on?

4                   HUGH RUSSELL:   Whi ch i s that we  
5           woul d say that we -- the Board i s not  
6           prepared to recommend thi s favorabl y.   We  
7           want to hear the resul ts of the study for  
8           Central Square before we act and we  
9           understand that that means that we wi ll not  
10          be able to act -- we' re not wi lling to act on  
11          the peti ti on before us and Council wi ll  
12          ei ther go ahead wi thout us or wi ll take our  
13          advi ce and not act and then we' ll get  
14          re-fi led again i n the fall .

15                   STEVEN WINTER:   Yes, I' m good.

16                   HUGH RUSSELL:   Is there a moti on to  
17          make a recommendati on of that sort?

18                   WILLIAM TIBBS:   So moved.

19                   HUGH RUSSELL:   Second?

20                   PAMELA WINTERS:   Second.

21                   HUGH RUSSELL:   Okay.   So al l those

1 in favor.

2 (Show of hands.)

3 HUGH RUSSELL: And all members  
4 voting in favor. Good, thank you.

5 So thank you for coming and giving us  
6 your advice. And those of you who are  
7 skeptical about the public process may be  
8 slightly less skeptical and we will be  
9 adjourned.

10 LIZA PADEN: There's actually --  
11 sorry. The timing extension request was  
12 withdrawn, but there still is the request in  
13 front of the Board for a use at Cambridge  
14 Research Park. There are people here who are  
15 representing the proposed use. And in a  
16 nutshell the Planning Board granted uses as  
17 part of the PUD and then there are uses that  
18 are allowed under the PUD. The use that  
19 they're proposing which is a temporary  
20 spinning facility in the skating warming hut  
21 is not something that the Planning Board back

1 in 1999 put down as a list of acceptable  
2 uses. So they are here to answer any  
3 questions you have about that and to possibly  
4 get your determination as to whether or not  
5 this is an acceptable use at Cambridge  
6 Research Park.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Did spinning even  
8 exist in 1999 or whatever you said?

9 LIZA PADEN: I don't think so.

10 STEVEN WINTER: Liza, are there any  
11 staff comments that might be objectionable  
12 about this? Because I can't see any  
13 objection.

14 LIZA PADEN: The staff has no  
15 comments. I'm just saying that the people,  
16 the proponents are here.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, if you could  
18 fetch the proponents that would be useful  
19 because I have at least one question.

20 LIZA PADEN: Staff has no objections  
21 to this particular use so if there's any

1 questions about the spinning itself, the two  
2 proponents are here.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Tom, do you have a  
4 question?

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: Let's see what  
6 they have to say.

7 MARK MALONE: Good evening. I'm  
8 Mark Malone. I'm a property manager with  
9 Biomed Realty Trust. I manage the Kendall  
10 Square site at the Cambridge Research Park.  
11 What we're coming here for is for spinning  
12 classes in Pavilion B where the ice ring  
13 holds their rent operation during the  
14 wintertime. Kate Dwyer is the proprietor of  
15 Recycle Studios in the South End and if you  
16 have any questions about the studio you can  
17 ask her.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I have a question.  
19 Is this going to be visible from the outside  
20 or is it closed off from visibility by the  
21 people who are in the outdoors?

1                   MARK MALONE: It will be visible.  
2                   The pavilion is built with hangar doors on  
3                   it, and the operation would probably involve  
4                   opening the hangar doors during the classes  
5                   which would be mornings and more in the later  
6                   afternoon.

7                   KATIE DWYER: And it will be down  
8                   one end.

9                   HUGH RUSSELL: And what will people  
10                  see when that happens?

11                  KATIE DWYER: Just people, you know,  
12                  riding the stationary bikes.

13                  WILLIAM TIBBS: I just wanted to say  
14                  that spinning didn't exist when the uses were  
15                  put in -- when we said, you know, set up the  
16                  uses for this, and even if you were spinning  
17                  yarn, it would be okay with me. So having  
18                  spun myself, I think it would be great.

19                  KATIE DWYER: Thank you.

20                  THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm somebody who  
21                  feels just the other way.

1 KATIE DWYER: Okay.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: I really dislike  
3 looking at people through windows on aerobic  
4 machines. It exists on Dartmouth Street on  
5 the second floor. I really dislike looking  
6 at it from when I drive along I guess it's  
7 Huntington Ave. It exists at Northeastern on  
8 Huntington Ave. again. I think it's again on  
9 the second floor, you look up and you see  
10 these people working on those machines. I  
11 think it is a very unpleasant site.

12 STEVEN WINTER: You find Lapis  
13 slightly irritating.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: Where is Lapis?

15 PAMELA WINTERS: Near Ri al to?

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, you know,  
17 that one I haven't seen so clearly. I don't  
18 know why I haven't passed by there. But I  
19 don't like it. I think it doesn't animate  
20 the street at all. I think it is a sight  
21 that I find unpleasant, unattractive, and I

1 think it belongs in a gym. I think it's  
2 certainly a wonderful use, but I think it  
3 belongs behind closed doors in areas where  
4 you really are not putting yourself out and  
5 forcing yourself on other people to look at  
6 it. And so I'm going to vote against this.  
7 I don't think it is a use that is going to  
8 animate the area.

9 I find the whole area a little bit  
10 disappointing I must say. I wish you do away  
11 with the Sky Bowl and fix that which is  
12 another aspect of that whole area. And it is  
13 a different subject, but I will just say that  
14 it has been disappointing to me the way that  
15 has shaped up, but this -- I can't imagine  
16 how this could possibly be a plus so I'm down  
17 on this. And I'm -- I won't be surprised if  
18 I'm in a minority of one on this but that's  
19 how I feel.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any other  
21 comment?

1                   STEVEN WINTER:  Actual ly, wi th Tom' s  
2                   concern, coul d you descri be to me exact ly  
3                   what these apparatus look li ke?

4                   KATIE DWYER:  Absol utel y.  They  
5                   li teral ly look li ke the servi ce moderati on of  
6                   a bi cycl e, and they' re j ust, you know, set up  
7                   so they' re not movi ng.

8                   STEVEN WINTER:  So they' re  
9                   stati onary and i t looks li ke a bi cycl e?

10                  KATIE DWYER:  Exact ly, yep.

11                  WILLIAM TIBBS:  The way i t works i s  
12                  you have a, they usual ly have an i nstructor  
13                  or someone, a faci li tator or whatever you  
14                  want to call i t, and they gi ve you, you move  
15                  on the bi cycl es i n uni son sometimes wi th  
16                  musi c and i t' s an exerci se thi ng where you,  
17                  where you, you know, they gi ve you routi nes  
18                  to do and di fferent i ntensi ti es and i t' s  
19                  pretty --

20                  THOMAS ANNINGER:  What are you goi ng  
21                  to do about the extremel y loud musi c that

1 goes with it with those open doors?

2 KATIE DWYER: Well, we've made sure  
3 that we've taken that into account and so the  
4 sound will be adjusted accordingly. And  
5 we're also going to have sound tiles  
6 installed in the ceiling to help with the  
7 absorption.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: So is it going to be  
9 audible to people who are outside?

10 KATIE DWYER: I mean slightly but  
11 not like there's a concert series that goes  
12 on as well, it won't be nearly as loud as  
13 that, you know.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: It will be the  
15 sound of those cars that go by with very loud  
16 speakers who are thumping, boom, boom, boom,  
17 that's what you're going to hear.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: I disagree, Tom.

19 MARK MALONE: The location of the  
20 pavilion where it's going to be will be  
21 between 675 and 650 East Kendall, pretty deep

1 into the site. There are no residences  
2 directly adjacent to it, and the pavilion is  
3 stationed is facing towards the Sky Bowl,  
4 that area is constantly been active with  
5 music including for the ice rink concert  
6 series and just general din of the lunchtime  
7 crowds that won't be an adverse effect of the  
8 effect of the music playing for the spinning  
9 studio.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: We don't have a plan  
11 in front of us but it seems to me you're  
12 saying that if you want to go out and sit on  
13 the chairs and tables and they're supposed to  
14 be sitting where the rink was you're now  
15 going to be listen to spinning music.

16 KATIE DWYER: It's only going to be  
17 two classes a day. So it's not like a  
18 constant -- this is a difference between a  
19 gym and a studio. These are not classes that  
20 are ongoing throughout the day. So, you  
21 know, when there aren't classes, the bikes

1           won' t even be vi si bl e and they won' t  
2           i nterfere wi th anyone' s l unch, wi th anyone' s  
3           breakfast, wi th anyone' s di nner.

4                     STEVEN WINTER:   Mr. Chai r, may I  
5           make a poi nt?

6                     You know, I thi nk the i nteresti ng poi nt  
7           is that thi s may not be an ameni ty to some of  
8           us, but I thi nk there' s a l ot of peopl e for  
9           whom thi s is an ameni ty.   And for thei r sake  
10          I' m happy to l et thi s use occur.

11                    HUGH RUSSELL:   I' m -- I don' t  
12          di sagree that i t' s a good use.   What I don' t  
13          understand is what i t is useful i mpact the  
14          other uses on the si te.   You know, and i t  
15          sounds to me l ikely that there mi ght be 50 or  
16          60 or 70 deci bel musi c that woul d cl early  
17          affect a si gni fi cant area of the North Pl aza  
18          and woul d -- i f you happen to l ike that  
19          musi c, that' s fi ne.   I f you happen to not  
20          l ike that musi c, and I suspect I woul d not  
21          l ike that musi c, then i t woul d si mply make,

1 you know, there's significant impacts to  
2 other users and I don't think this has been  
3 thought through clearly enough at this point.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do you think that's  
5 an operational issue? Obviously if they're  
6 going to be annoying a lot of people, people  
7 are going to tell them you're annoying you  
8 and they'll have to adjust what they're  
9 doing.

10 PAMELA WINTERS: And we have a noise  
11 ordinance, too.

12 STEVEN WINTER: Bill, I'd like to  
13 add something on top of that. And that is  
14 clearly that you have a history of producing  
15 an ambience in that area that's worked. You  
16 have a lot of things going on. Right?

17 MARK MALONE: Yes.

18 STEVEN WINTER: We have to trust  
19 your good judgment that if there's something  
20 happening there that's offensive to passersby  
21 or to people who are sitting on benches, my

1 guess is that you put a stop to it.

2 MARK MALONE: Correct.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Even though you  
4 signed a lease with somebody and they've made  
5 substantial improvements to make their use, I  
6 don't think so.

7 KATIE DWYER: It's very, like,  
8 minimal build out so that would be...

9 STEVEN WINTER: Is the space leased  
10 to the -- to this person?

11 MARK MALONE: Depending on the  
12 decision.

13 KATIE DWYER: Pending this.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Can't be. They have  
15 an agreement but not a lease.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: May I ask a  
17 question? Have you figured out how many  
18 decibels the music will come out of the  
19 building? Have you figured that out?

20 MARK MALONE: No, we have not  
21 figured that out. If there is a decibel

1 level that we want to abide by whether it was  
2 by noise ordinance, we would follow that and  
3 track that.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: You have to  
5 understand that people cannot spin on unless  
6 it is loud. I've been to these classes.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Well, I did not  
8 know that.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, it is true.  
10 I've gone to these classes and they do not  
11 turn the music down for you. I've asked them  
12 to do that for my tender ears. It doesn't  
13 work because people can't get their heart  
14 rate up high enough if they don't hear the  
15 boom, boom, that innovates them to get to  
16 that level. So it is, it is somewhat  
17 circular. You cannot really spin without the  
18 loud music.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Tom, have you spun?

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, I have. And  
21 I spin no longer because it hurts my ears. I

1 have used earplugs but it's no fun using  
2 earplugs so I don't do it anymore.

3 PAMELA WINTERS: I didn't know that.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think it's, it's  
5 what the ambience is, and I think you're  
6 making some interesting points in terms of --  
7 because you've got public people and just  
8 kind of more random people there. Obviously  
9 the -- I'm used to being in places where that  
10 ambience is -- people know it's there and so  
11 when you do hear it, even if it's just --  
12 it's okay. And as I envision this, it's one  
13 of those things it's another activity and  
14 people will understand it. And if there's a  
15 problem with it, you are going to be the  
16 first person to hear it. So I, again, as I  
17 think of a sense of allowing a use, unless we  
18 all feel, you know, unless you feel that it  
19 really is a detriment of some sorts, I just  
20 don't know, well, I've already said I don't  
21 have a problem with it. So...

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I think  
2                   whenever the music is playing, it's going to  
3                   be heard over a substantial area and it will  
4                   affect a substantial area. It's not just a  
5                   little building. It's the plaza area around  
6                   it, and I think it will be a substantial  
7                   detriment to people who don't like that  
8                   music. And I mean I haven't asked what  
9                   you're playing, but I'm guessing it's not  
10                  chamber music, it's not classical music, it's  
11                  kind of aerobic music that is. You know, so  
12                  if I'm trying to take a break from my desk  
13                  job, I mean it probably would be heard -- you  
14                  would be able to hear it inside the  
15                  buildings.

16                 KATIE DWYER: We're not -- I'm  
17                 sorry.

18                 HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, if the doors  
19                 are going to be open, you have no control of  
20                 the sound. Now I'm somebody who overhears  
21                 Harvard Square and, you know, I'm a hundred

1 feet away from musicians which are fairly  
2 lightly amplified, and it does interfere with  
3 my work, you know. I've not sufficiently  
4 interfered -- the real problem with the  
5 Harvard Square musicians is a musician who  
6 has two-hour performance everyday for  
7 180 days a year for 20 years and has  
8 20 minutes of repertoire. And I've heard  
9 those songs endlessly and I suspect that is  
10 the case of spinning that there is a  
11 repertoire.

12 KATIE DWYER: No, not at all.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: And people who are  
14 nearby are going to start hearing it again  
15 and again. So I would not vote to support  
16 this without essentially coming to me saying  
17 that you're not going to have this  
18 substantial noise pollution of the whole  
19 area. And I don't know whether it's  
20 possible.

21 PAMELA WINTERS: Hugh, may I say

1 something? Well, first of all, I sort of  
2 encourage this because I encourage the health  
3 benefit of this and I'm wondering if there's  
4 a way that it could be monitored, that we  
5 could give maybe a temporary whatever and it  
6 could be monitored so that if it is a  
7 problem, we can take away this -- what is it,  
8 a Special Permit?

9 LIZA PADEN: It's a determination  
10 that it's an appropriate use.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: Use. Well --

12 LIZA PADEN: Appropriate for  
13 Cambridge Research Park.

14 PAMELA WINTERS: Is there any way  
15 that's possible that we could do it, you  
16 know, that we could monitor it in some way?  
17 Like a time restriction type of thing?

18 LIZA PADEN: I don't think that  
19 there's anything that precludes us from doing  
20 that, but this is already seasonal because  
21 it's used as a skating -- there's the warming

1 hut in the winter. I don't know, how long do  
2 you want to try it for?

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Well --

4 LIZA PADEN: And whether or not  
5 that's worthwhile for you to try something  
6 out over a period of time. If that's --

7 MARK MALONE: The current terms of  
8 our lease would be based on the determination  
9 Board, so basically we're thinking July  
10 through end of October.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, so just a few  
12 months?

13 MARK MALONE: Yes, for this use.  
14 Because we do have to clear away around  
15 November for the ice rink.

16 KATIE DWYER: And as I said, we're  
17 not -- these are not going to be continuous  
18 throughout the day. It's really, it  
19 shouldn't interrupt anyone's workday or, you  
20 know, daily life.

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: I think for the

1 people who might be opposed to hearing the  
2 music, there are probably an equal number of  
3 people who would be just as happy to hear the  
4 music. I think there's music playing during  
5 the ice skating. I think there's music that  
6 comes out of open door restaurants, and I  
7 think the market will control if it becomes a  
8 problem to the buildings around it and I  
9 don't mind seeing the people exercising at  
10 Health Works or on Mass. Ave. and I wouldn't  
11 mind seeing people exercising there, too, and  
12 I support the idea that exercise is good.  
13 And I don't see anything inappropriate with  
14 it for the location.

15 STEVEN WINTER: I want to respect  
16 both Hugh and Tom's concerns because they're  
17 always good concerns. Is there any way that  
18 we can allow this use for a season and then  
19 ask the proponent to reassess?

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

21 JEFF ROBERTS: As a condition?

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's so clear  
2                   that it's going to change the character of  
3                   that plaza and in a way that will be  
4                   detriment to a significant number of people.  
5                   It's noise pollution. Yet the skating rink  
6                   is noise pollution, but it's in the middle of  
7                   the winter and you can choose to come skate  
8                   or not; all right? It's going to change the  
9                   character of that plaza and I don't think  
10                  it's a positive one. So I would not vote to  
11                  support it. But if someone would like to  
12                  make a motion, we'll take a vote.

13                  THOMAS ANNINGER: How many do we  
14                  need to pass?

15                  PAMELA WINTERS: I think it's going  
16                  to be split is my feeling.

17                  LIZA PADEN: I think you're going to  
18                  need five members of the Board to vote to  
19                  grant or to accept this determination -- to  
20                  make the determination.

21                  PAMELA WINTERS: So we're not going

1 to have that?

2 LIZA PADEN: Right.

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I'd move  
4 to allow it as an appropriate use.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there a  
6 second?

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I second.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Any more discussion?  
9 All those in favor?

10 (Show of hands.)

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Four in favor.

12 (Tibbs, Winter, Winters, Cohen.)

13 HUGH RUSSELL: All those opposed?

14 (Show of hands.)

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Four members voting  
16 in favor and two members voting against.

17 (Russell and Anninger Opposed.)

18 HUGH RUSSELL: And we did not find  
19 it was an appropriate use.

20 Now we're done.

21 (Planning Board Adjourned At 11:45 p.m.)

## ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

The original of the Errata Sheet has been delivered to Community Development Department.

When the Errata Sheet has been completed and signed, a copy thereof should be delivered to the Community Development Department and the ORIGINAL delivered to the Community Development Department, to whom the original transcript was delivered.

## INSTRUCTIONS

After reading this volume, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself.

REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN RECEIVED.



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BRI STOL, SS.

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
my hand this 9th day of July 2012.

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

My Commission Expires:  
April 23, 2015

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