

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, September 11, 2012

7:05 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
- H. Theodore Cohen, Member
- Steven Winter, Member

Community Development Staff:

- Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for
Community Development
- Susan Glazer
- Liza Paden
- Roger Boothe
- Jeff Roberts
- Iram Farooq
- 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
131 Harvard Street
2. Update, Brian Murphy,
Assistant City Manager for Community
Development
3. Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PB#273, 54R Cedar Street, the applicants request a Special Permit (Section 5.53) in the Residence B district for a second structure on the lot further than 75 feet from the street line. LaCourt Family, LLC, applicant.

PB#272, 165 CambridgePark Drive, to permit the construction of a new residential building containing 244 multifamily dwelling units. The proponent requests special permits pursuant to Section 19.20 - Project Review, 20.95.34 - Waiver of yard requirements, Section 20.97.3 - parking gross floor area waiver, Section 20.70 - Flood Plain Overlay District and Section 6.35.1 - Reduction of the required parking. Hines Interests Limited Partnership, applicant.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Kendall Square Discussion

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Sitting members: Hugh Russell, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, H. Theodore Cohen.)

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

LIZA PADEN: This evening we have Mr. Hope who is representing a group who is going to develop the housing site on Harvard Street. I sent out the materials to you electronically today, and I didn't know how much of a discussion you wanted to have on this BZA case, but Mr. Hope is here, and Mr. Chilinski to answer any questions or if you'd like them to briefly review the proposal.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess my question would be what sort of relief is being sought, and given that what are you asking us to tell the Zoning Board?

1 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: So I wanted to
2 just clarify. Good evening, Mr. Chairman, to
3 the Planning Board. So this is a proposal to
4 do 20 units of rental housing with 20
5 underground parking spaces. I'm actually not
6 representing the group, I'm actually co-owner
7 in the project. This is my partner Jason
8 Core (phonetic) and this is project architect
9 Dave Chilikinski. We're going before the
10 Zoning Board on September 27th. And for a
11 project of this size, oftentimes the Zoning
12 Board does like some type of design review by
13 the Planning Board. So it was a decision,
14 since we don't need Planning Board relief,
15 that we would come and present the project.
16 We have worked with Community Development in
17 terms of the design of the building. What
18 you're looking at now is three stories that
19 is 20 units. The initial proposal we started
20 off with was with 28 units and it was at four
21 stories. And we actually brought that down.

1 One of the reasons why was parking in the
2 basement. We wanted to meet the one-for-one
3 parking requirement as well as the bicycle
4 parking. And we're actually working with
5 Traffic and Parking to figure out some of the
6 turning preferences. Also, there was a
7 family style, two and three bedrooms.
8 Initially we had more one bedrooms. Right
9 now we sit at 16, 2 and three bedrooms or 80
10 percent of the units are family style.
11 Family size two and three bedrooms. So I
12 think those two things constrained the
13 project you see before you tonight.

14 Because of the site is 10,000 square
15 feet and it's the Res. C-2B, the setbacks
16 apply above and below grade. So there is a
17 fair amount of relief. One, as you can see,
18 the project is built to the property line.
19 Very similar to a project that was before
20 you, the CASCAP project in 2007. They're
21 actually similar in size of lots. Although

1 this is not a comprehensive permit. This is
2 straight ZBA application.

3 It's a rental project as well. We've
4 applied to the Affordable Housing Authority
5 for funding. We had a favorable
6 recommendation, but obviously part of this is
7 to go for Zoning relief, and then on to our
8 application to the Department of Housing for
9 funding at the state level.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so the floor
11 area is like 15 percent more than permitted,
12 and the rest of it is set back?

13 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. I mean,
14 also the floor area per dwelling unit, the
15 code would allow 18.6 with the density bonus,
16 and we're at 20 units. And so we're closing
17 with the overall density of 2.5. We're
18 asking for 2.33. So there is relief, but one
19 element of relief we're not asking for is
20 height. The height is 45 feet in the
21 district. This is 34. I would have the

1 Board note there is a deed restriction of 29
2 feet for this project when it was deeded to a
3 neighborhood group almost 15 years ago. And
4 so we've contacted Biomed Realty Trust is the
5 abutter in the rear, and we reached out to
6 them and talked to them, and they actually
7 signed a letter of support for the ZBA which
8 we'll have in the file to be able to amend
9 the height restrictions to allow for the
10 additional four feet. We're looking at 34
11 feet, so additional five feet. So we've
12 worked with them.

13 We've reached out to the print shop
14 abutters. We held a meeting there. We're
15 gone to the air (inaudible) coalition this
16 week. And we're hosting an open meeting at
17 one of the neighborhood churches the
18 following week. We're doing our outreach now
19 and we'll be heard on September 27th.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you locate
21 this for me on Harvard Street? Just give me

1 a sense of where it is.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: The big building
3 there is the one we talked about two meetings
4 ago.

5 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. So this
6 is at the corner of Harvard and Moore Street.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Harvard and --

8 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Moore Street.
9 It's Moore and Davis and then Portland
10 Street.

11 BRIAN MURPHY: Near the garment
12 district.

13 JASON CORE: I can pull up a Google
14 map.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can we turn up the
16 lights? It's very dark in here.

17 JASON CORE: Let me know if this
18 network works. I don't know if this is
19 helpful. This is the print shop condos over
20 here. The tennis courts are over here.

21 DAVID CHILINSKI: It's bio med

1 bui l di ng where we' re addi ng offi ces.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: Harvard Street. I

3 see the added bui l di ng on Broadway.

4 JASON CORE: Broadway is up here.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: Broadway is up

6 there, and thi s i s the other end of i t.

7 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes, right

8 across the street i s Washi ngton.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thi s i s south

10 of -- yes.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: Do you have any

12 other vi sua l s of the surroundi ng

13 nei ghborhood?

14 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: We do.

15 PAMELA WINTERS: You know, from a

16 pedestri an' s poi nt of vi ew?

17 HUGH RUSSELL: I thi nk the bi ggest

18 argument i n favor of thi s i s actual l y the

19 constructi on of the adj acent bui l di ng for

20 housi ng l ast year.

21 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: And al so, I

1 didn't mention, this site specifically was
2 deeded for community uses, so it's a
3 gymnasium, affordable housing. So it was, it
4 was designed and deeded to be built with some
5 kind of community use. And we now have the
6 site under agreement to do that.

7 I also believe in the packet that we --
8 that you might have received, does it have
9 the adjacent site plan on it?

10 PAMELA WINTERS: So the community
11 will be allowed to use the gym?

12 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: It's not going
13 to be a gym. There was a myriad of uses, one
14 of which was a gym. There's actually a gym
15 not far from here. This proposal is just for
16 affordable housing.

17 PAMELA WINTERS: I see.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: (Inaudible).

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: What was the
20 purpose of the -- what was behind the 29-foot
21 restriction? That's not a very round number.

1 What was going on?

2 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes, I believe
3 it was the height of Washington Elms Housing
4 Development across the street. So these
5 units here they're about 29 feet, and so that
6 was what the height was. It wasn't to exceed
7 that. Just in terms of having a marketable
8 project, being able to get the number of
9 units, you know, we needed that additional --
10 but we did come down from a fourth floor.
11 These are two-and-a-half story. You can say
12 they're three stories about there. We kept
13 the stories about the same and stepped down
14 from the print shop which is at four floors.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I understand
16 better now.

17 And the materials of the design, can
18 you just go back to a picture of it?

19 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Sure.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Is that brick at
21 the base?

1 DAVID CHILINSKI: Yeah, it's --

2 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Do you want to
3 come up here?

4 DAVID CHILINSKI: David Chilinski of
5 Prelwitz Chilinski Associates. The base, a
6 little bit sort of a nonage to where our
7 neighbor across the street, Washington Elms,
8 which has a brick base and stucco above. The
9 notion here is to wrap brick, and you can see
10 at the ends both here facing Moore Street and
11 at the entrance and facing the print shop.
12 We actually bring the brick up the building
13 as well, and separate the two types of fiber
14 cement board. One is a panelized with reveal
15 detailing which you can see here which faces
16 the bow building. And then on Harvard Street
17 there is the ship lap painted version here
18 which you can see on the corner. And then in
19 the middle at the entrance is a sort of
20 combination of those two aesthetics. Double
21 hung aluminum windows.

1 And in terms of the entrance, we
2 articulated the building here to break the
3 length, the overall length of the building
4 down into sort of two elements on the street
5 as opposed to one long facade. And the
6 building recesses because it is, you know,
7 fairly tight on the sidewalk so that the
8 front entrance area has a --

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Where's the front
10 entrance on this picture?

11 DAVID CHILINSKI: The front entrance
12 is on that canopy.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: Oh, I see.

14 DAVID CHILINSKI: That gives us room
15 for a couple bike storage options. And this
16 is -- yep, actually, and this -- if it would
17 help. No, that's okay.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: How do you have
19 all that green above the entrance?

20 DAVID CHILINSKI: I'm sorry?

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you go back

1 one? That's a tree, I see, in front of the
2 entrance.

3 DAVID CHILINSKI: That's an existing
4 tree -- that's a major existing tree is the
5 taller one. We are planning on adding the
6 other street tree along Harvard. And then we
7 would, at the request working with the print
8 shop, there's a serious sort of evergreen
9 hedge that they know that runs along Biomed,
10 and we've agreed with them to sort of plant,
11 equal distance between our two buildings,
12 another strong coniferous edge, not a -- you
13 know, not a tree that would drop its leaves,
14 but something that is going to stay there all
15 winter. Because their, their units are
16 actually within five feet of their property
17 line and we're set back 15. So we are kind
18 of within 20 feet of each other and this
19 seemed to be a reasonable way to give us both
20 a little bit of privacy where we overlap --
21 the two buildings overlap.

1 THOMAS ANNINGER: Remind me what it
2 is that we're being asked to do?

3 HUGH RUSSELL: We're being asked to
4 support this application to the Zoning Board.
5 It's affordable housing, because it's in
6 scale with other buildings. And the relief
7 that's being sought is not huge except for
8 maybe the setbacks. And the setbacks are
9 sort of justified because that's the way that
10 block is developed.

11 Roger, do you have a comment to make?

12 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. We've looked at
13 this site for quite a while since it was part
14 of the arrangement with the Area 4 Coalition
15 probably over a decade ago. I think it's a
16 good solution in that it brings housing here
17 right next to the print shop which is felt a
18 little bit lonesome I'd say on Harvard Street
19 with that kind of empty lot there. And it's
20 kind of a modest scheme, but I think it fits
21 well on the site. And it's, you know, a

1 straight forward scheme so I don't see any
2 problems with it.

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Roger, what was in
4 the empty lot before?

5 ROGER BOOTHE: Before it became an
6 empty lot?

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Before -- right
8 before this one.

9 ROGER BOOTHE: It was a parking lot
10 for many years.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: It was a parking
12 lot?

13 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I don't know
14 what --

15 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

16 ROGER BOOTHE: It was probably an
17 industrial building a few years ago, I'm not
18 sure what the history was.

19 PAMELA WINTERS: So is the parking
20 lot being used?

21 ROGER BOOTHE: No, it's been vacant

1 for years because of this agreement to do
2 housing on the site that's worked out with
3 the Area 4 folks a while ago. It's been
4 fenced off.

5 PAMELA WINTERS: Thanks.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't see any
7 reason why we wouldn't support this. It
8 seems to me to be a handsome, respectful fit
9 and a good use for the site in its -- in the
10 way that it's been laid out. It looks, it
11 looks actually better than fine to me. It
12 looks very good.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. There's no
14 objection, then I would ask Liza to send a
15 letter to the Zoning Board.

16 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Thank you.

17 LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

18 PAMELA WINTERS: I particularly like
19 the rounded, the rounded corner. I like that
20 touch. It's nice. Just mention that.

21 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Thank you.

1 LIZA PADEN: There's another case on
2 the BZA agenda for Thursday evening that is
3 the Genon Kendall. It's the second one on
4 the agenda for installing air cooled
5 condensers. I sent you some materials
6 electronically on this one as well. And
7 Mr. Rafferty's representing this applicant if
8 you have any questions about this alteration,
9 which is the non-conforming structure.

10 (William Tibbs and Steven
11 Winter seated.)

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Is the structure is
13 an historic structure?

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, the --
15 this, pardon me. James Rafferty.

16 This is, this really involves the
17 placement of rooftop mechanical equipment on
18 a building that was constructed in 1949. We
19 went back and forth with the Building
20 Department whether this represented an
21 extension of a non-conforming use. And it's

1 a system by which the electrical production
2 system water gets cooled. Right now it
3 discharges --

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. That wasn't my
5 question. My question was: It's a handsome
6 business indicative of the city recognized
7 that as a historic building?

8 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The answer
9 to that would be no.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: And then the second
11 question I have is: What's the level of
12 noise that's going to be generated by this
13 piece of equipment?

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: The noise
15 generated here has been the subject of a lot
16 of discussion. It's being specked in
17 accordance with the Noise Ordinance
18 requirements, and this was approved by the
19 Energy Setting Board and the City of
20 Cambridge and the applicant have entered into
21 a monitoring agreement. They will monitor

1 the agreement for 12 months to ensure that
2 the equipment meets the representations of
3 the specs.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, at least
5 looking at the equipment it looks like
6 they're very similar to cooling towers, I
7 mean, when you look at them from down below.

8 And is the water actually outside or is
9 it contained? Is there any spray I guess is
10 my question?

11 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, no,
12 there's no spray. The water -- those are
13 just the compressors on the roof. The water
14 is contained in piping that goes up there,
15 but the water never discharges. There's a
16 thermal effect, and the heat rises and that's
17 also part of the monitoring agreement.
18 Overall it's seen as an ecological plus,
19 because instead of discharging hot water back
20 into the Charles River it's now going back
21 into the air and that's why it's been well

1 received. But there is this Zoning issue
2 about whether a function that was occurring
3 in the building is now occurring outside the
4 building.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Were there any
6 pictures submitted of what it looks like?

7 LIZA PADEN: What it looks like now
8 or what it's going to look like?

9 HUGH RUSSELL: What it's going to
10 look like. I opened the attached files, I
11 didn't see that.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: There were pictures.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: I opened four files
14 and I didn't see any pictures.

15 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Here's the
16 -- may I?

17 LIZA PADEN: Yes, go ahead.

18 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: This is
19 the after. It sits right here with an
20 acoustical -- with a screen right in front
21 it.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Before?

2 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Before,
3 right. That's the roof of the building.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So the only thing is
5 oriented towards the commercial uses and not
6 towards the residential uses it would appear?

7 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's
8 correct. It's the building furthest away
9 from the residential use. There's an
10 earlier -- there's an aerial photo that shows
11 the equipment itself. It's very much akin to
12 the type of mechanical equipment you'd see on
13 a life science style building.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. In this case
15 they've made the effort to try to blend in
16 with the colors and --

17 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: And the architecture.

19 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Exactly.
20 Both in color. And the location was -- one
21 of the advantages of the location is they

1 looked at different spots, there's actually a
2 notch in that portion of the building, so
3 other portions of the building are actually
4 higher behind it, so I wish I had the before.

5 LIZA PADEN: Okay? Are there any
6 comments?

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I think this is going
8 to be for the Zoning Board. It appears that
9 the issues we might be concerned about would
10 be before them.

11 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

12 And are there any other cases on the
13 agenda for the 13th that you wanted to look
14 at?

15 PAMELA WINTERS: Were there any that
16 stuck out for you?

17 LIZA PADEN: No.

18 PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

20 Brian, would you like to update us?

21 BRIAN MURPHY: Sure.

1 There will be no meetings on September
2 18th or 25th. So the next Planning Board
3 hearing will be October 2nd. There will
4 public hearings on the Yanow Petition as well
5 as the private way off street parking
6 petition. And also coming before for the
7 first hearing will be the Major Amendment for
8 Planning Board No. 179 for North Point. And
9 under General Business, there's extension for
10 112-114-116 Mount Auburn Street.

11 October 16th there will be a public
12 hearing on the re-filed Trolley Square
13 Petition as well as Planning Board No. 174
14 for 51 Cedar Street. And the second hearing
15 for North Point, as well as design review for
16 the first residential building at North
17 Point.

18 And then on October 30th at this point
19 it's -- there's nothing nailed down. It may
20 be a continuation of the public hearing for
21 165 CambridgePark Drive. That's what we've

1 got for now.

2 And on October 3rd will be the first
3 hearings of the Ordinance Committee for both
4 the Yanow petitions and the off street
5 parking so they'll be happening
6 contemporaneously.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you tell us
9 what's 112-116 Mount Auburn?

10 BRIAN MURPHY: That's the conductor
11 building.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: So that's coming
13 back to us because it's got new ownership?

14 BRIAN MURPHY: Right. That was a
15 joint venture by two developers. And my
16 understanding is that the Carpenter Company
17 is now the exclusive owner of the site. I
18 believe they're looking to try to go forward
19 with plans pretty much as it had been before.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: But not exactly.

21 ROGER BOOTHE: It's just minor

1 updates.

2 BRIAN MURPHY: Is there someone in
3 the house who may have more information?

4 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Just
5 briefly, that's a request -- the Special
6 Permit on that expires in November so it is
7 true, we'll update you on the new ownership
8 entity, but the real purpose that's before
9 the Board is to request an extension.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

11 Li za, are there any transcripts?

12 LI ZA PADEN: No, we're caught up.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We'll go on to
14 the next item on our agenda which is a public
15 hearing, Planning Board case 273, 54R Cedar
16 Street.

17 LI ZA PADEN: And could we just --

18 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening,
19 Mr. Chair.

20 LI ZA PADEN: One moment. There's
21 only six board members here tonight. There's

1 only six board members here tonight so I
2 wanted to make sure that was noted and
3 accepted.

4 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes.

5 Good evening, Mr. Chair, members of the
6 Planning Board. For the record, Attorney
7 Sean Hope, Hope Legal Offices in the City of
8 Cambridge. I'm appearing tonight on behalf
9 of the Petitioner LaCourt Family, LLC, and
10 also with the project architect Mr. Jai
11 Khal sa who will walk you through the plans.

12 This is an application to construct a
13 three-story single-family residence in the
14 Residence B pursuant to a 5.53 Special
15 Permit. The lot is known as 54R Cedar
16 Street, and it's approximately 8,400 square
17 feet. The existing structures on the lot
18 include a two car garage as well as a -- it's
19 a two car garage and as well as there's an
20 existing single-family. Both the garage and
21 the single-family are greater than 50 feet

1 from the lot line so that you can see the two
2 structures. That's the garage and the 54,
3 that's the existing single-family. And both
4 of those, the garage and the single-family,
5 have access through a drive or a passageway
6 which is actually abutting the property line.
7 And next to the passageway is 54 Cedar.
8 That's a separate lot. So, it's an odd
9 shaped lot, but the total area being 8,400,
10 it's a decent size. Unlike many of these
11 5.53 Special Permits that are before the
12 Planning Board, normally you'll have an
13 existing house at the front of the lot and
14 then you'll have a long, narrow lot and then
15 you'll be, you're requesting relief to add
16 additional houses. Usually one of the two
17 houses, two or more houses that are added are
18 conforming except they go -- they extend
19 greater than 75 feet from the property line
20 requiring relief. In this case the proposed
21 structure is conforming and is actually -- is

1 well in front of 75 feet. But it's a corner
2 of the existing single-family that is
3 triggering the relief. And so on the
4 proposed planning, you can actually see I
5 believe it's A020 in your packet that shows
6 that corner of the existing single-family
7 that is greater than 75 feet. So this is a
8 conforming structure. The proposed
9 single-family is a conforming structure.

10 This is also unique because this lot is
11 also controlled by a Variance granted in
12 1973. And this is to allow three parking
13 spaces for 55 and 57 Norris Street to park
14 three cars on the lot. 55-57 Norris Street
15 was a two-family and they granted a Variance
16 to convert it to three units subject to
17 providing these spaces on the lot. So that
18 these spaces will continue even though
19 they're under the new ownership. Those
20 existing spaces, as well as the spaces
21 necessary for the existing single-family,

1 hence the single-family proposed, kind of
2 controlled the siting of the existing
3 building. In general the proposal, as I
4 said, this will be a three-story,
5 four-bedroom house and it will be
6 approximately 3700 square feet and two
7 parking spaces.

8 Now the existing -- the footprint of
9 the existing garage, the proposal is to
10 demolish that garage, and not exactly on the
11 footprint but very close to the two
12 additional parking spaces. Both those
13 parking spaces will service the two
14 single-families, so there's just meeting the
15 one-for-one requirement. There's no
16 additional extra parking on the lot. And Jai
17 will talk a little bit more about this, but
18 the siting of the building was controlled by
19 one zoning. We wanted this to be a
20 conforming, a conforming addition. And as I
21 said before, the project would be conforming

1 obviously subject to building review, but it
2 would be conforming except for the existing
3 house.

4 Also there's a preference in the urban
5 design guidelines as well as the criteria of
6 5.53 to screen parking away from the public
7 way and adjacent lots. And so by locating
8 the building where it is, those two
9 additional parking spaces would be partially
10 screened. And also by placing the
11 single-family house near the front of the
12 lot, it's more consistent with the
13 neighborhood character of the area. You
14 rarely see these vacant lots in the area
15 without a house. This would move the
16 single-family up to the lot line.

17 If you look at the -- there's a deed
18 from 1901, there's actually -- it showed that
19 there was a structure on that lot. And the
20 one lot today was actually three lots. And
21 if you look at it, there is Lot C, and then

1 there' s Lot D which i s a passageway, and Lot
2 A.

3 And i f you look at Lot C, Lot C has a
4 house on i t i n the front and a structure
5 there on i t as well. So i t' s not the exact
6 footprint, but these are l ocati ons of the
7 structures. Those are no l onger there. And
8 i f you drive by you, see that i t' s a vacant,
9 i t' s a vacant l ot except for the existi ng
10 si ngl e-fami l y house.

11 In addi ti on to the Speci al Permi t
12 cri teri a appl i cabl e to al l projects under
13 10. 43, 5. 53B speci fi cal l y has cri teri a for
14 the Pl anni ng Board to consi der. The cri teri a
15 i s that the Pl anni ng Board may permi t more
16 than one structure contai ni ng a pri nci pal
17 resi denti al use on a l ot where al l porti ons
18 are greater than 75 feet from the l ot l i ne.
19 And i n thi s case the si ngl e-fami l y i s not.
20 Speci fi cal l y, though, part of the cri teri a i s
21 that two or more structures may provi de

1 i denti fi abl e benefi ts shoul d the constructi on
2 occur i n a si ngl e structure. So the
3 i denti fi abl e benefi t -- so the one existi ng
4 structure that coul d be added woul d be the
5 exi sti ng si ngl e-fami ly house that' s there.
6 One, i f you added the proposed -- i f you
7 added the proposed si ngl e-fami ly to that
8 house;
9 One, i t woul d be greater than 75 feet
10 from the lot l i ne.
11 Two, i t woul d block access -- l i kely
12 block access to the parki ng spaces al ong
13 those three parki ng spaces as well as i t
14 woul d, i f you di dn' t have the parki ng spaces
15 there, i t woul d push the parki ng spaces to
16 the front of the lot whi ch i s i nconsi stent
17 wi th the cri teri a and the desi gn gui del i nes.
18 So, part of the rati onal e for that was a
19 l ocati on was the actual si ti ng of the
20 si ngl e-fami ly to the front of the property
21 l i ne.

1 Additionally in terms of the impact,
2 5.53B asked the Planning Board to consider a
3 series of criteria for their impact. One was
4 the preservation of contiguous open space.
5 And as you see under the proposal, the open
6 space in the rear yard setback is left mostly
7 untouched, and those two parking spaces were
8 -- where the -- are close to where the
9 existing garage was. The 75 feet is
10 preserved except for parking, so there's no
11 building there. And also part of the
12 proposal is to add screening and landscaping
13 to the perimeter of the lot on the sides and
14 also in the rear.

15 The second criteria is to incentive, to
16 locate buildings and parking in the front
17 half of the lot. Due to the size and shape
18 of the lot, we've actually oriented the
19 single-family to the front of the lot, and
20 the parking that was an existing garage is on
21 the same side. So I think we achieved one of

1 the two of those goal s.

2 The last one is the opportuni ties to
3 reduce vi sual i mpact by pl aci ng the
4 si ngl e-fami ly structure i n the front of the
5 lot. We do block a good porti on of the
6 parki ng that' s there, as well as the three
7 parki ng spaces are actual ly blocked by the
8 exi sti ng si ngl e-fami ly house.

9 Those are the cri teri a. I' m now goi ng
10 to turn i t over to Jai and he' s goi ng to wal k
11 through the pl ans.

12 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Good eveni ng.
13 I' m Jai Si ngh Khal sa wi th Khal sa Desi gn
14 Archi tects. And Sean' s covered most of the
15 sal ient poi nts. I' m goi ng to go over a
16 l i ttle bi t on the maps so you' ve got an
17 ori entati on of where we are.

18 Thi s i s the lot here, sort of a classi c
19 pork chop shaped lot fronti ng on Cedar Street
20 here. Thi s i s Norri s Street here. You' ve
21 got Mass. Ave. down here j ust to ori ent you

1 for the neighborhood. I'm sorry, Rindge Ave.
2 down here.

3 You've got some photos from the
4 neighborhood. The site is over here. And
5 you've got a variety of photos looking, you
6 know, different directions throughout the
7 neighborhood. I'm not going to spend a lot
8 of time on that. But you've got
9 two-and-a-half and three-story homes
10 throughout the area.

11 This is your existing site plan. There
12 is a passageway here where there is --

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Excuse me, could you
14 go back to those photographs? Because in our
15 printout we can't see the red line. I for
16 one had a very hard time getting oriented
17 with your photographs.

18 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I would have to
19 zoom in here quite a bit to orient you on
20 this.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just tell us what

1 the photographs are pointing to or what
2 they're showing.

3 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I'm going to have
4 to zoom in to tell you. So, give me a
5 minute.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do you not know? Do
7 you need to refer to that, too?

8 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I do need to
9 refer to it, yeah.

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, I'm sorry.

11 JAI SINGH KHALSA: No. 6 is looking
12 directly into the site.

13 FROM THE AUDIENCE: No, it's not.

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: No, it's not
15 correct. No. 7 is looking directly into the
16 site. So this is the house in the
17 background. This is the house next-door here
18 and the house -- the garage on the adjacent
19 property there. This is the garage here back
20 in our site that we're proposing to demolish.

21 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I ask

1 a questi on, pl ease?

2 Is the house immedi ately behi nd the
3 tel ephone pol e, is that Mr. Bi ngham' s house?

4 JAI SINGH KHALSA: That' s correct.

5 STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thank you.

6 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Okay, and that' s
7 the garage next-door there.

8 No. 8 is looking on the other side of
9 the street from thi s shot here. So i t' s ki nd
10 of across the street. As you pull out our
11 dri veway and look down to the side, thi s is a
12 vi ew you woul d have there as you woul d be
13 pul ling out.

14 And No. 6 is adjacent to our lot. You
15 can say here' s Mr. Bi ngham' s house, here' s
16 the garage, and here' s the house that' s
17 adj acent to us there.

18 FROM THE AUDI ENCE: Mr. Corri veau' s.

19 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I' m sorry?

20 FROM THE AUDI ENCE: Mr. Corri veau' s.

21 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Mr. Corri veau' s

1 house.

2 And then the other shots are just
3 general shots around the neighborhood.
4 They're not specific to the abutting homes.

5 You've seen the existing site plan
6 here. This is the perimeter here of the
7 site. You have a passageway here which
8 there's a descriptive easement of the
9 passageway which is not vehicular passage but
10 it's just general passage to gain access to
11 the entrance of this house here. And this is
12 the area where we're proposing to put the new
13 home. That's existing home, that's the
14 garage that we're proposing to demolish.

15 I went and pulled some historic maps
16 just to get a context of what used to be in
17 the neighborhood. This is the existing
18 house. This is Mr. Bingham's house here.
19 There was no garage at one time back here,
20 but there was a house here and a garage on
21 the property here from the Sanborn series.

1 And this is approximately 100 years old or so
2 from the Sanborn map.

3 Additionally there is the map from --
4 whoops, let's go back up one. There is the
5 map from 1901 I believe it is. Yeah, 1901
6 here. Which shows a home here, another
7 structure here. At this point this was
8 Mr. and Mrs. M. J. Darrell and this is J. T.
9 Darrell, so they were relatives. And then
10 you have the other house back here on
11 essentially what was four different lots.
12 Our parcel has lots A, D, and C in them now.
13 Okay? So just for historic context.

14 And this is where we're proposing to
15 put the new structure here, and we're
16 proposing to use a pervious pavement,
17 pavement that will allow water to go through
18 it. To plant the yard with grass, and then
19 to fortify the perimeter with a variety of
20 deciduous and evergreen plantings around the
21 perimeter. This is a walkway exiting out so

1 street, you're allowed to go another, I
2 believe it's three feet or three and a half
3 feet, I'd have to look more closely at the
4 diagram to see exactly which, with a bay in
5 this area here. So if you, you know, if you
6 manipulated this building here and you
7 chopped off the corner and you made that into
8 a bay, then we wouldn't be having this
9 conversation. But the owner felt that they
10 didn't really want to, want to chew up that
11 house in that manner to do that.

12 The home as it sits here, sits within
13 the setback line requirements. You've got a
14 twelve-and-a-half-foot setback here and a
15 seven-and-a-half-foot setback on this side.
16 So it's seven-and-a-half, some 20. You are
17 allowed to have bay projections for 25
18 percent of the facade length, which we have
19 in this area here and here. And we have a
20 little front entrance, not entrance but a
21 little bay along the front streetscape as

1 well. That being your front setback line
2 here and that being your bay setback line
3 there, so we're pulling a stoop out of the
4 front which is below the four-foot or
5 three-and-a-half-foot height level. We have
6 a deck in the back below that height level as
7 well. A bulkhead that goes down into the
8 basement and we're proposing in this location
9 to put in a four-bedroom single-family home.

10 The home will have a full basement with
11 a mechanical room and washer/dryer area,
12 staircase up from the basement. Here's your
13 front entranceway, front porch. You have a
14 nice size living room. The staircase
15 wrapping up and down. A half bath here. A
16 closet, another closet, and a large eat-in
17 kitchen with a deck off the back.

18 Next floor up you have two bedrooms
19 plus a study area and one full bath and ample
20 closets. And then your top floor is two
21 bedrooms with another two bathrooms. Okay?

1 And then the house itself, we wanted to
2 do a traditional look of a bay front triple
3 decker type of a look along the street, which
4 I think we've accomplished here. We've
5 lightened up the top of the house by using a
6 panel type of a system with batons rather
7 than clapboards and broke down the length of
8 the side of it with a series of mock bays in
9 terms of bringing the paneling down to break
10 up the length of the clapboards. And it's a
11 pretty simple building, and I think it
12 presents itself well. And that's it. It
13 meets all zoning requirements. We're not
14 asking for any relief on the building itself.
15 We're really here on the technicality of the
16 existing building being more than 75 feet
17 from the street.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Are there any
19 questions by the Board before we go to public
20 testimony?

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: Just a quick

1 question. What is the width of the building?

2 JAI SINGH KHALSA: The width of the

3 building, I'll tell you in a minute.

4 Depending on where you are, it will vary from

5 17 feet down to about 14 feet in width. I'm

6 sorry, 16 feet down to about 13 and a half

7 feet in width. It varies. There you've got

8 13-foot, two and a quarter at the bay. And

9 at the narrowest point it's 11, 12, 13 --

10 approximately 13 feet at its very narrowest

11 point where you don't have bays.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Shall we go on

13 to the public testimony?

14 PAMELA WINTERS: Sure.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: So is there a sign-up

16 sheet?

17 And then the procedure for public

18 comment is I'll read the names on the sheet

19 and then I'll ask if there are additional

20 people who haven't signed up. So don't worry

21 if you haven't signed up on the sheet.

1 When I call your name, I would like you
2 to come up, give your name and address. We'd
3 like to get the spelling of everybody's name
4 correctly, so if you could assist by giving
5 the spelling of your name if it's something
6 that the transcriptionist might not
7 recognize. And then we ask people to limit
8 their comments to three minutes. Pam will be
9 keeping time and she will make a signal to
10 you at the end of the three-minute period.

11 So the first name on the list is Wayne
12 Bingham.

13 WAYNE BINGHAM: Good evening. My
14 name is Wayne Bingham, B-i-n-g-h-a-m. Before
15 we start I'd like to, um, pay homage, express
16 my sympathy and praise for the victims of
17 9/11/2001. This is an historic day in our
18 history. So before I start.

19 I live at, I live at 54 Cedar Street
20 and have been there for 37 years.

21 I've lived at Cedar Street, like I

1 said, for 37 years, and I've had right of
2 passage. Along the driveway there's three
3 entrances; there's a front door, a rear door,
4 and there's a bulkhead. Okay?

5 The front door has a porch, it overlaps
6 on to the property. It's four feet wide,
7 okay? The architect may say it's three, ten.
8 I may say it's four, two. It's four feet
9 wide. It was also mentioned that the setback
10 is 12 feet, six inches. So if you subtract
11 the four feet from the 12 feet, six inches,
12 we're talking a width of 8.6 inches. Okay?

13 So now the right of passage and access
14 to my home and my property is limited. Now
15 we talk about snow. It's gonna be even more
16 narrow. Okay? We could be talking six feet
17 wide. We could be talking five feet wide
18 because snow is not gonna be plowed exactly
19 up to the property line. So it's going to be
20 limiting access to my property.

21 Now, that leads to the most important

1 issue and that's a safety issue. Fire trucks
2 in Cambridge, my son's a Cambridge
3 firefighter, they're between 8, 9, 10, 11
4 feet wide. A fire truck cannot get through
5 that access. I've had five trucks come out
6 to my house because I had a blocked chimney.
7 They had to break the door down. You know, I
8 understand that firefighters can hook up to a
9 hydrant and pull the hose in, but it could
10 be, you know, a difference between saving
11 somebody's life and someone passing away
12 because if this building is there, they won't
13 be able to get in there with the width of the
14 driveway that I have enjoyed, if that's the
15 proper term, for the 37 years that I've been
16 there. Okay?

17 So, my main focus, and I have other
18 issues, safety and its access to the
19 property.

20 The -- if you look at the drawing,
21 which isn't up there, right in the middle of

1 the drawing there's this horizontal line --

2 MICHAEL BRANDON: Mr. Chair, could
3 we have the site plan up there because it's
4 very hard to follow because we don't have
5 copies of what he's discussing.

6 WAYNE BINGHAM: Yeah, excuse me,
7 sir. Mr. Khalsa, can you put up the site
8 plan? Can you kind of stop the three
9 minutes?

10 PAMELA WINTERS: That's okay.
11 That's okay. We actually lost our clock so
12 I'm using my cellphone.

13 WAYNE BINGHAM: But, you know, the
14 issue is a safety issue. And I have other
15 issues. Access to getting in to the property
16 which I've had as long as I've owned the
17 property. I bought it in November of '75,
18 okay? So now with this building, a fire
19 truck can't get through there. Okay? Maybe
20 a large SUV cannot get through there. A
21 snowplow may not be able to get through

1 there. Okay? A couple weeks ago I had a new
2 refrigerator sent to me, and they could get
3 in there and out.

4 Actually, can you bring the other --
5 right, right. Actually, go back a little
6 bit, please.

7 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Just give me a
8 second and I'll hand it over so you can see
9 what's going on.

10 WAYNE BINGHAM: Right there. Right
11 there. Right in the middle where it says 12
12 feet, six inches, that horizontal line,
13 that's four feet out. So that brings me down
14 to eight feet, six inches or more because the
15 drawing is showing 12, 6, you know. So once
16 again, it's narrow. It's totally narrow and
17 it's going to cause a problem. Why create a
18 problem where as one has not existed?
19 Someone can say, well, you know, nothing will
20 ever happen. It only has to happen once and
21 then there's a problem. We don't need to

1 build something. Additionally, if you look
2 in the lower right-hand corner of the lot,
3 the lot has enough dimension to move the
4 building back so I can have unincumbent
5 (sic), unfitted access to my property which
6 I've enjoyed for 37 years. Okay?

7 They still would be able to have, you
8 know, the parking that -- the five spaces
9 that they require. The five spaces, three
10 come from 57 Norris Street, one comes from
11 the existing dwelling at 54 and a half/54R,
12 and one would come from the new proposed
13 building.

14 Now, Special Permits at 63 and 49 Cedar
15 Street, they exceed the 75-foot rule. Okay?
16 There's another building, 61, I couldn't find
17 that. I believe that's a Variance building
18 where they have dwellings in the rear.
19 There's no reason to put that building right
20 there when it's going to affect a situation
21 -- my family and me put us in harm, you know,

1 when this -- there's an opportunity to bring
2 the building back. And once again, I
3 understand -- once again, my son's a
4 firefighter, sometimes, you know, you don't
5 have the space for a truck to get in there,
6 okay? So they have to pull the hoses out,
7 and I'm being redundant. This, you don't
8 have to build a problem. There is a
9 resolution to this problem.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you very
11 much.

12 WAYNE BINGHAM: Thank you.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: And next is Delia?

15 LILLA JOHNSON: Lilla.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Lilla. Johnson.

17 LILLA JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Lilla
18 Johnson, L-i-l-l-a J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I live at
19 22 Rice Street. I've got a couple of points.
20 The width of the building is, it's a large
21 building for the space. The second issue

1 that I have is the parking. Why is the
2 garage being demolished to be replaced by two
3 parking spaces? I would also ask that all
4 parking spots in this property be designated
5 for the residents of the property and not for
6 any other properties owned by
7 Doctor Rishkallah or LaCourt Family Trust.
8 There are two single-family residences with
9 five spaces, that's more than what the Board
10 usually requires.

11 And thank you very much to the Board
12 for your careful consideration of this.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

14 Next is Paul L. C --

15 PAUL CORRIVEAU: C-o-r-r-i-v-e-a-u.

16 I live in -- the garage that's
17 next-door, that's my garage. The building to
18 me is just too big for what's in that spot.
19 I'm having a hard time -- again, I haven't
20 done all my homework, but I'm trying to get a
21 gazebo in and they're not going to let me.

1 There's less there than what I've got, and
2 they're going to allow this to put that up
3 there? It's too much building to put just in
4 that area. I agree with Mr. Bingham, they
5 should put the house in the back if anything.
6 I don't have a problem with that. But up
7 front like that it's just too much building.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Where is your
10 garage? I'm sorry, I didn't see it. Can you
11 point on the map?

12 PAUL CORRIVEAU: The 75 foot line
13 comes.

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Right there.

15 PAUL CORRIVEAU: Thank you.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Ed Kelly.

17 ED KELLY: Good evening. My name is
18 Ed Kelly, I actually live at 117 Montgomery
19 Street but I grew up on 77 Rice Street and
20 that deed is now in my name with my brothers
21 and sisters. My mother still lives there.

1 We' ve l i v e d t h e r e s i n c e 1949. T o g i v e y o u
2 s o m e i d e a, i t' s b a s i c a l l y a b o u t t h i s t r a c k
3 r i g h t h e r e, a n d i t c o m e s b a c k o u t o n t o --
4 c o m e s b a c k o u t o n t o R i c e S t r e e t. I a g r e e
5 w i t h m y n e i g h b o r s a r o u n d s o m e o f t h e
6 l o g i s t i c a l p i e c e s t h a t h a v e b e e n p r e s e n t e d
7 t h i s e v e n i n g, b u t w h a t s t r u c k m e w a s, l i k e,
8 w h y p u t a b u i l d i n g i n t h a t s p a c e? A n d w h e n
9 y o u l o o k a t i t, t h e y' r e h e r e a t t h e P l a n n i n g
10 B o a r d i n s t e a d o f t h e Z o n i n g B o a r d b e c a u s e i t
11 v i o l a t e s s e v e r a l Z o n i n g O r d i n a n c e s. A n d w h e n
12 y o u l o o k a t t h e d e s i g n o f t h e b u i l d i n g, a n d
13 i t' s c l e a r l y d e s i g n e d t o f i t i n t o t h a t
14 l i t t l e, t i n y s p a c e, a n d i t h a s n o t h i n g t o d o
15 i n m y o p i n i o n, i t a d d s a b s o l u t e l y n o v a l u e t o
16 t h e n e i g h b o r h o o d. A n d i t r e a l l y i s p a r t o f a
17 b i g g e r p l a n f r o m o t h e r r e n t a l p r o p e r t i e s t h a t
18 a r e b e i n g d e v e l o p e d i n t h e n e i g h b o r h o o d. A
19 f o u r - b e d r o o m h o u s e t h a t g o e s a l o n g w i t h a
20 b u n c h o f o t h e r r e n t a l p r o p e r t i e s b e i n g
21 d e v e l o p e d, d o e s n' t r e a l l y b u i l d a

1 neighborhood. So, my concern is abutting my
2 mother, the walkway against our fence will be
3 a group of people that I will never really
4 know having grown up having known everyone on
5 that street. So there's a part of this
6 that's just counterintuitive to the entire
7 process. And I would simply ask you to
8 consider that in terms of there are still
9 some people that live in that neighborhood
10 that hold that neighborhood in high regard.
11 The house is described as a row house. I'm
12 not aware of a single row house in North
13 Cambridge. There just isn't one there.
14 There may be something close to it on
15 Cogswell Ave., but the row houses are on
16 Comm. Ave. and Beacon Street and so on and so
17 forth.

18 I appreciate your time.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

20 Mike Fowler.

21 MIKE FOWLER: Hi, thank you for

1 taking the time this evening. Mike Fowler --
2 Foreman-Fowler. That's
3 F-o-r-e-m-a-n-F-o-w-l-e-r. My wife and I own
4 the home at 58 Norris Street which is just to
5 the back of this lot here at 54R. So we abut
6 on the back side next towards where the
7 garage is now.

8 Our concern with the proposal that we
9 see here is mostly around lighting, what kind
10 of lighting might there be in that back
11 parking area, if any, and how will it impact us?
12 And we see the shrubbery and the trees that
13 are proposed. That seems reasonable to us.
14 But we would be concerned with any kind of
15 fencing that would go in. We are not opposed
16 to fencing or to shrubbery or lighting as
17 long as it's respectful to the existing, the
18 way the neighborhood is laid out and it
19 doesn't interfere with the use of our
20 property. This is the first time I've seen
21 the plans. So I can't go into much more

1 depth than that, but I would appreciate an
2 opportunity to talk with the developer about
3 those things as he moves forward. And it
4 seems like I'm getting to know his process
5 and you all pretty well since he's putting so
6 many things into our part of town.

7 Thank you.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

9 Dick Clarey.

10 RICHARD CLAREY: My name is Richard
11 Clarey, 50 Brookford Street, North Cambridge.
12 This project is the latest iteration of the
13 gold rush that is -- through which developers
14 are seeking to fill every open lawn in the
15 North Cambridge neighborhood. And this one
16 is more ridiculous than most of them because
17 the -- it's a three-decker which is not much
18 wider than the space between these two
19 windows. So if you live there, there's going
20 to be a lot of climbing and you're going to
21 have to be in a lot better shape than I am to

1 navigate that house.

2 It violates every relevant section of
3 the Ordinance that governs your duties. For
4 example, Section 10.43, the section that
5 begins by saying that the permits ordinarily
6 are allowed if all the provisions are
7 complied with. It says that Special Permit
8 should not be allowed when the proposal
9 raises questions of congestion and access and
10 egress to the lot. It certainly squeezes
11 everyone in. When it adversely affects
12 adjacent uses, which it certainly does. It
13 towers over all the much smaller houses
14 around it. It impairs the integrity of the
15 neighborhood in the sense that it towers over
16 everything around it. And it denigrates from
17 the purpose of the Ordinance. Another
18 criteria for not allowing a Special Permit.
19 And the purpose of the Ordinance in Section
20 1.30 is to lessen congestion, to provide
21 adequate light and air, to prevent

1 overcrowding, to avoid undue concentration of
2 buildings, and this proposal violates every
3 single one of those criteria and it doesn't
4 satisfy 5.53 either. 5.53 the 2A talks about
5 it will not significantly increase the impact
6 of -- the new construction should occur in a
7 single structure. I can't understand how it
8 satisfies that criteria because it is
9 increasing the impact at least on the
10 neighbors of -- versus whether it was done in
11 a single structure. And, of course, it
12 couldn't possibly satisfy Section 2B because
13 it doesn't preserve open space. It's not
14 compatible with nearby houses. It does not
15 enhance the living environment. Those are
16 three of the relevant criteria in 2B. So, it
17 strikes out on every single provision of the
18 Ordinance as you're enforcing.

19 Thank you.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

21 John Hickson.

1 JOHN HICKSON: Good evening. I'm
2 John Hickson. I live at 41 Norris Street.
3 I've lived there 30-something years. And
4 here we're facing, again, as people have
5 pointed out, another addition of a housing
6 unit and more cars when we haven't even seen
7 the effects of the conversion of the school
8 yet. Already Norris Street there's no
9 parking spaces to be had and yet we haven't
10 even seen people move into the school. And
11 here we're talking about adding yet more uses
12 and more cars in an area that doesn't really
13 have any more room for them. So, we hope you
14 will consider denying this proposal.

15 Thank you.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
17 Does anyone else wish to speak?

18 CHARLES TEAGUE: Hi, I'm Charles
19 Teague, 23 Edmunds Street. This is a moment
20 I wish I had Bob here from Cottage Park
21 Avenue. He would say this is ridiculous.

1 It's out of a cartoon version of a building.
2 It's clearly a rental building because
3 there's no master suite in it. You know, I
4 just have to say just because you can really
5 -- and I admire the calculations. It's just
6 really intricate and delicate. And as you
7 said on one site, it looks like a Swiss
8 watch. It just all, it all fits in somehow
9 and it's just really, really clever but
10 that's not a really good reason to do it
11 because as they say, it just doesn't fit in.
12 If you walk down Cedar Street, this, this
13 this will leave like a little Disneyland
14 building and just popped up in there and it's
15 just not right.

16 Thank you.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

18 YOUNG KIM: Mr. Chairman, and also
19 members of the Board, my name is Young Kim.
20 Y-o-u-n-g K-i-m. I live at 17 Norris Street.
21 I'm sorry was a little late so I did not see

1 the presentation by Mr. Khalsa, but I like to
2 stress that the overriding criteria for any
3 new project should be how well the project
4 will preserve the fabric of neighborhood as
5 we kept bringing up when 40 Norris Street
6 project was discussed. And it should have a
7 minimum negative impact to the neighbors.

8 I have several concerns. First and
9 most important is that as Mr. Bingham
10 eloquently stated, it was definitely impact
11 his quality of life in negative way and worst
12 way to have five cars going back and forth in
13 front of his house all the time. And by -- I
14 did not have a chance to look -- dig deeper
15 into it, but when I look at the GIS map on
16 the property database, not only is the steps
17 and the bulkhead encroach into the 54R
18 property, it seems some of the front part of
19 the house itself is inside the building. So
20 first concern is the negative impact on his
21 quality of life.

1 Second thing is if the house is
2 guaranteed to be used for family use, we have
3 a four-bedroom and three-and-a-half bathroom,
4 it should be a wonderful house to raise
5 children. Master bedroom for the parent, two
6 bedroom for the children, one bedroom for
7 guest room, it would be great. But there is
8 no guarantee that it should be used for
9 family use. If you can -- you can very well
10 imagine at the very least, four unrelated
11 single people can room there, and then there
12 could be more. It is large off to house well
13 over four people. So, again, it does not fit
14 into the character of the neighborhood.

15 The third one is that, again, it was
16 brought up before, that the development is
17 going to have five parking lots, parking
18 spaces. I understand that three of them is
19 for 57 Norris Street which I have a BZA
20 ruling on, and one is for the currently
21 existing house and one is for the addition.

1 How do we guarantee that it should be
2 allocated in that way and not being used as
3 an ancillary parking space for other
4 properties that Doctor Rizkallah might have
5 around the neighborhood? Like the 40 Norris
6 Street, like the one in the Rice Street, and
7 I don't know what other -- if he has any
8 other properties in the neighborhood.

9 Finally, there are several other
10 details that's not quite clear from looking
11 at the plan. No. 1, is very important years
12 that the -- since there's going to be parking
13 there for five cars, I don't know whether the
14 plan showed the lighting plan, but the
15 pollution from the lights and from the
16 headlamp has to be mitigated. And one person
17 that I've been in contact with who is
18 next-door to me, Mr. Fowler, unfortunately
19 they are in Brazil, away for a month and they
20 had no opportunity to input their concerns.
21 So that needs to be more thoroughly thought

1 out.

2 PAMELA WINTERS: Sir, sir,
3 unfortunately your time is up. If you could
4 just wind -- do you wind up your comments?

5 YOUNG KIM: Yeah. And utilities
6 like air conditioning system, the air
7 conditioning system, or is it going to be a
8 rental unit for four bedrooms which create a
9 noise problems and so forth.

10 PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

11 YOUNG KIM: Thank you very much.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish
13 to speak?

14 THOMAS FLYNN: My name is Thomas
15 Flynn. Madison Avenue, North Cambridge.
16 Lifetime resident North Cambridge. In fact I
17 used to walk by this site on the way to
18 school. And I have to say that this building
19 is going to be detrimental to the look of the
20 street, the neighborhood. A friend of mine,
21 who wasn't able to be here today, said if you

1 put glass on both sides of it, you could call
2 it an ant farm.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: A what?

4 THOMAS FLYNN: An ant farm.

5 So it just doesn't go. It can be moved
6 back in the lot and fit in with the
7 neighborhood.

8 And as far as the parking spaces that
9 they show, right now there's a garage with
10 two parking spaces. They say there's a deed
11 requirement for parking spaces or from people
12 on Norris Street. I don't see any license
13 with the city for open space parking off
14 site. Meaning that the parking is being used
15 by people on another site, and that requires
16 a city license. So, all I see allowed there
17 is two parking spaces; one for the existing
18 unit and one for the new unit. The three
19 that are supposed to be deeded and are
20 showing extra spots on there are not going to
21 be legal. You people can check it for the

1 ci ty, but open space parking and garages
2 requi re a li cense. I mean, bank garages
3 requi re a li cense wi th the ci ty.

4 Thank you.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

6 Does anyone el se wi sh to speak?

7 Mi chael .

8 MI CHAEL BRANDON: Thanks a lot,
9 Mr. Chai r and members of the Board. I'm
10 Mi chael Brandon, B-r-a-n-d-o-n 27 Seven Pi nes
11 Avenue. I'm the clerk for the North
12 Cambri dge Stabi li zati on Commi ttee. And
13 Mr. Khal sa was ki nd enough to attend our last
14 meeting and run through the plans, and
15 unfortunatel y Mr. Hope coul dn' t joi n us and
16 answer some of the leg al questi ons that have
17 been rai sed about the appli cation. But the
18 reacti on I woul d j ust report to you was very
19 si mi lar to what you've heard here wi th some
20 of the same peopl e and others total ly
21 obj ecting to thi s proposal. In my vi ew, i t's

1 a really whacky one. Somebody talked about
2 it being described as a row house as it was
3 by the architect. Well, my understanding of
4 a row house is it's situated in a row of
5 similar structures. There is another one, at
6 least I know of, that was built within the
7 last ten years at the corner of Russell
8 Street, and it's a very different concept
9 from what this little -- somebody called it
10 and said it's an ant farm. I heard it
11 described as it's going to look like an oil
12 well. It's so narrow. You know, 13 and a
13 half feet wide. It's just gonna be bizarre
14 adding that to the streetscape.

15 You're familiar with the developer.
16 Same developer who is redeveloping the school
17 building, 40 Norris Street, formerly North
18 Cambridge Catholic, where we've had a similar
19 thing where he comes in and he attempts to
20 overbuild a lot. Here he's really trying to
21 shoehorn an inappropriate building into an

1 inappropriate part of the lot. Although the
2 lot has a lot of space, he's chosen to design
3 it this way. Our understanding from the
4 presentation to our group was that in fact
5 the reason that it was designed this way was
6 to try to come up with the project that
7 conformed with all of the dimensional
8 requirements of the Zoning. They thought
9 they had done it, and they went to pull their
10 Building Permit, and told by Ranjit at -- the
11 Inspectional Services Commissioner, that
12 after they analyzed it and they found at
13 least, at least this one anomaly that it
14 violates this section of the Ordinance. I
15 believe it may violate others. It's a little
16 hard to tell, and I admire you folks for
17 being able to absorb that presentation,
18 because much of what was presented to you is
19 not in the application that were filed. Some
20 of the material is required to be in there.
21 It's in your instructions. It's actually in

1 the Ordinance, some of it.

2 The Landscaping plan that was shown is
3 not available. So it was flashed up here.
4 There was no chance to look at that. And
5 actually I ask that be put up again because I
6 notice one section that seems to not comply
7 with the Ordinance.

8 The -- there was no section addressing
9 the specific Special Permit that's before
10 you. Those criteria, although the other
11 sections are addressed, and I don't agree
12 with the assertions, but the sections that
13 were described are mentioned by Mr. Hope and
14 Mr. Clarey were not in the written
15 application. So there's really no fair
16 chance to respond to him.

17 Quickly -- I'm skipping over things.
18 Oh, the Variance that was mentioned. That's
19 a critical part of this, you know, why are
20 there five parking spaces on this lot? That
21 Variance is not in there. I just saw the

1 neighbor who had it, it's not clear to me
2 that -- we were told, you know, that those
3 are required to be here. Well, that's not
4 true. The Variance is for a different
5 property. Mr. Flynn raised a good point
6 about it may be that they're not even being
7 used adequately. I think Mr. Bingham
8 mentioned to me, and he didn't mention it to
9 you, that apparently the existing
10 single-family house is now being rented and
11 there are already three cars.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Could you wrap things
13 up, please?

14 MICHAEL BRANDON: Yes.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And I think you're
16 way over your time.

17 MICHAEL BRANDON: Okay, thank you.
18 I'm sorry. I'll just --

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

20 MICHAEL BRANDON: I'll just stop.
21 Thank you. Sorry for going over.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish
2 to speak?

3 HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi, my name is
4 Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurlley Street
5 in East Cambridge where we have a lot more
6 lots narrow like this, and I wasn't going to
7 speak, but as I looked at this, it reminded
8 me so much of the two disastrous buildings
9 across the street from me that I had to say
10 something. The -- they were designed for a
11 parcel wider than this. A little more than
12 30 feet, and they take advantage of every
13 possible loophole in being wider. And I've
14 been in them. They're unlivable. There is a
15 reason that during a hot real estate market
16 there wasn't even a single offer on them.
17 The -- it seems to me that if you're building
18 a building, you want to do more than just
19 comply with Zoning. You want to build
20 something that people will want to live in,
21 because it does nothing for a neighborhood to

1 have an empty house. And it also seems to me
2 that this is such a perfect case for a
3 Variance. As people said, if you push it
4 back to the wide part of the lot, you can
5 actually do something that will enhance the
6 neighborhood and that the neighbors will
7 support. So I hope that you will suggest
8 that they do that.

9 Thank you.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

11 Does anyone else wish to speak?

12 (No Response.)

13 All right. So we're getting to the
14 portion of the meeting where the Board
15 discusses this. Now, I will remind the Board
16 that we have another hearing tonight and so I
17 think we need to kind of hit the high points
18 now. I don't think we're under any pressure
19 to make a decision tonight, but who would
20 like to start?

21 Bill.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: I have a few high
2 points, so I'll just quickly go over them and
3 not belabor them although they may be things
4 that we can discuss later or the proponent
5 can add some clarity to.

6 I guess my first issue is one of the
7 things we have to make a ruling on is whether
8 it's within a neighborhood context. And the
9 information you have presented does not give
10 us a good sense of that. So I think that I
11 would like to see at least a plan which shows
12 the adjacent houses with -- even if it's just
13 a roof plan, seeing how this just really fits
14 in. Also maybe an elevation on the street
15 which actually shows how the house actually
16 looks on the street.

17 I assume -- you don't have to talk
18 about it now, but I was just interested in
19 the encroachment of the 54 into the lot. I'm
20 reading the site plan at least. It looks
21 like some of their property is actually --

1 and maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong, it
2 looks like a little bit of their property is
3 actually on your site. It's on the survey.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, maybe it is a
5 good time to see what you believe to be the
6 case. How much does that porch go beyond the
7 property line?

8 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Jai Singh Khalsa.
9 The porch here, as Mr. Bingham describes, is
10 about four feet. About two feet of it
11 encroaches --

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: You have the survey;
13 right?

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I'm pointing to
15 the survey right here. It's a little light.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I'm looking at
17 the Boston Properties survey.

18 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I can bring that
19 up.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, I think it
21 actually shows the encroachments.

1 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Yeah, I thought
2 it was important to just show the context of
3 what we were proposing. To show that we're
4 not building in the area where there's the
5 right of passage, but I'll go back to the
6 original survey.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: And while you're
8 doing that.

9 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Here we go.
10 Okay, the area of encroachment is right
11 here.

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you zoom in a
13 little?

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Sure.
15 And it's 2.2 feet where it encroaches.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: And it's on this
17 owner's property. And I guess I want to get
18 an understanding of the legalness of all that
19 and what -- how you're dealing with that.
20 And then a better understanding of a right of
21 passage or a right of way or if there is one

1 or there isn't one. Again, I'm just going
2 through issues and I need some clarity on.

3 I think the issues that folks brought
4 up about the parking is a good one in terms
5 of I think five parking spaces for two
6 dwelling units is enough. And, again, you
7 mentioned there was a kind of an historical
8 thing going on here. But I think you need to
9 explain that or the rationale for that, for
10 me a little bit better so I understand it.

11 I would like to see and have a better
12 idea of a landscape plan so I can understand
13 how this all fits together. And I for one
14 want to actually go and look at the site
15 myself. So obviously until I do that, I may
16 have some other questions after I do that.

17 And I think that hits most of my core
18 questions in terms of the things I'm
19 interested in. I can't say that I did,
20 thanks to my iTechnology here, I did get a
21 satellite view of the neighborhood. And this

1 is a very, very narrow building which is --
2 as I scanned the whole, I did a satellite
3 view of all the various buildings around, and
4 it's very hard to see how anything that's
5 anything like it anywhere near the
6 neighborhood. But....

7 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Actually,
8 interestingly enough the footprint of
9 Mr. Bingham's house is almost identical to
10 our footprint of our building.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, if you -- it
12 didn't look like that to me, but again if you
13 gave me more context, you can make that case.

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Well, if we go
15 back to the design site plan, you can see the
16 two next to each other.

17 Can I take a minute to address a couple
18 things or do you want us just to come back
19 later?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: The material, too.

21 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Okay.

1 The encroachment here is 2.2 feet. The
2 area of passageway is this ten foot, four
3 here coming down on this line here, okay?

4 BILL TIBBS: Okay.

5 JAI SINGH KHALSA: And you've got
6 this 15 foot, five over here. Except for one
7 little corner of our proposed building in
8 this area here, we are well away from that
9 area of passageway. And which is, you know,
10 the legally defined area of passageway for
11 the building. We're proposing actually to
12 pave up to the edge of the building, the
13 proposed building on that site, which would
14 increase the effective use of the area of
15 passageway up to the edge of the building.
16 So I think that's important to see. The
17 thing about the five parking spaces is it was
18 before this owner owned the property back in
19 1972 I believe it was, someone else owned
20 this property and a property on Norris
21 Street. Was it Norris or Rice? I'm sorry,

1 on Norris Street. They went and got relief
2 to be able to change that from a two-family
3 and three-family.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Over there --

5 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Over there. And
6 when they got that relief, they were required
7 to put the parking on this lot. That's where
8 the five come from.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: Well, that's good.
10 And, again, when you come back, you really
11 need to sell the outline which of those
12 parking spaces are, you know, satisfying some
13 of this other thing and which are satisfying
14 the lots in some way.

15 And --

16 JAI SINGH KHALSA: And I'm sorry
17 that you don't have the landscape plan. We
18 did submit those. I don't -- they might have
19 been submitted late. I don't know.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Again, we're not
21 going to act on it tonight so we have time to

1 sort this out.

2 JAI SINGH KHALSA: We'll get you
3 copies of the landscaping plans. Additional
4 ones.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: And one last thing,
6 and you don't have to answer it now, you can
7 talk about it when you come back. But did
8 you consider a house in the rear lot? I know
9 it was very clear, and you did -- you were
10 trying to really work within the dimensional
11 requirements. But as a person who was on the
12 Planning Board when we kind of came up with
13 this building in the rear yards, I think the
14 goal there was really to try to get something
15 that worked in the neighborhood and not just
16 something that dimensionally sort of worked.
17 So that's what I'm thinking about as I look
18 at this. So I mean how much, how much does
19 just working within the dimensions get you to
20 do something that is compatible in the
21 neighborhood? And, again, you don't have to

1 address it now. I'm giving you --

2 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I did give it
3 some thought if you could indulge me for just
4 a minute.

5 I had a number of concerns about trying
6 to put a building in the back. And one was
7 that I believe it would push us to the Zoning
8 Board for Variances. And I didn't want to, I
9 didn't want to go to the Zoning Board quite
10 frankly for Variances. And that the parking
11 would wind up in the front yard between the
12 building and the street if you put a house in
13 the back.

14 Also, the area, you know, you wouldn't
15 be in conformance with rear yard setback
16 requirements. And, again, I was concerned
17 about that and maintaining as much open space
18 in the rear yard as possible, which the
19 Ordinance requests to leave the open space
20 open. So, for those reasons I didn't, I
21 didn't consider putting it in the rear of the

1 property.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Other comments by the
4 Board? Questions?

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: A number of points
6 have been raised that are good ones. I guess
7 the one that bothers me the most is the sense
8 that this is being jammed into a very narrow
9 area, and it is a building that seems bizarre
10 in its width. And so I'm unhappy about that.
11 I would like to visit the site to see if I
12 can imagine it, but what is it, a 14-foot
13 building, 13?

14 JAI SINGH KHALSA: It varies from 14
15 to 16 feet, yes.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: I would try to
17 picture that in there, but on its face it
18 seems, it seems awkward to me and I, I'm
19 sensitive to what you just said about putting
20 the parking in the front and the building in
21 the back, that's a legitimate argument. I'm

1 not entirely convinced that that's the only
2 way to do it. There may be other solutions
3 to that parking. I actually wonder whether
4 you are bound by that three parking spaces on
5 Norris Street after so many years, and
6 whether you might not want to consider
7 rethinking that arrangement because it really
8 is unfortunate to have one street burdened by
9 another.

10 JAI SINGH KHALSA: I would just
11 recommend that when you're out there, look at
12 the width of Mr. Bingham's house because
13 that's what we're talking about in terms of
14 the building size on this lot.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: With that height?

16 JAI SINGH KHALSA: No, we're going
17 to be at a greater height.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. This isn't a
19 round table.

20 JAI SINGH KHALSA: Sorry.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

1 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,
2 Mr. Chair. I do concur with my colleagues'
3 comments and won't repeat those.

4 I do want to say that if we are making
5 a very narrow building and putting it on this
6 place of the lot which is the large lot, I'm
7 having trouble finding the compelling reason
8 to do that. Like, what's the compelling
9 reason to place that building where we've
10 proposed? Where it's proposed? And I just
11 can't get my head around -- I just can't
12 stand on anything really solid that tells me
13 that, and I would ask for a little bit of
14 help from the staff in helping us to
15 understand what, what other options might
16 there be for a -- for placement of a house on
17 that, on that lot that would, that would fit
18 with the design of the neighborhood and it
19 would, and it would -- I'm not asking for it
20 right now. I just -- I think I need to be --
21 I need to be a little more educated about

1 what fits there? What fits there in terms of
2 the neighborhood, and is there a compelling
3 reason to place that narrow building up
4 front? That's what I'm having trouble with.

5 And let's see, that and I'm also very
6 concerned about the parking spaces. Because
7 I'm still, I'm having trouble understanding
8 if we're required to support that if that's a
9 requirement, an Ordinance, a Law, that we
10 must in fact abide by or not.

11 Thank you.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

13 Ted.

14 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I concur
15 with everything that's been said before,
16 although I don't necessarily oppose a
17 building being in the front here. I think
18 this is not -- the current design does not
19 appear to be a building that is in context
20 with the rest of the neighborhood at all. I
21 haven't had the opportunity to go and look at

1 the site, and I do intend to do that and to
2 look at all the neighborhood context and
3 Mr. Bingham's house.

4 I am concerned, I don't know that I
5 would really be in favor of moving the house
6 to the rear if that means there's going to be
7 parking in the front. Because I think we've
8 been trying to avoid that situation
9 throughout the city whenever we can.

10 It also seems -- I'd like more
11 information about the parking because it
12 seems that there have been five parking
13 spaces to date for a lengthy period of time,
14 and so, you know, whether that has to stay,
15 will the five spaces be any different from
16 what they have been so far? But I think all
17 the concerns that are really valid and, you
18 know, the concept of this single row house
19 that's not part of a row. It just seems very
20 strange.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: So I just want to
2 say I concur with what my colleagues have
3 said, and it seems as though we are very much
4 like minded here. I also, just a couple of
5 things. Mr. Kim's issue about will the
6 parking spaces be used only for that
7 property? And, again, I am a little
8 questioning about the five parking spaces if
9 we are, if that's written in stone. And also
10 the lighting plan, the landscaping plan, and
11 whether or not there's going to be AC units
12 and how much noise and where they're going to
13 be located and the noise that they're going
14 to be giving out. So that's something that's
15 maybe we can discuss that at the next
16 meeting.

17 Thank you.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I don't feel
19 as strongly as my colleagues about the issues
20 here, but I think they've identified them
21 all. One of the interesting things about

1 North Cambridge is that there are really tiny
2 houses in North Cambridge. A story and a
3 half and, you know, then two rooms
4 downstairs, two rooms upstairs. This is not
5 a small, tiny house. You know, I think the
6 cornus line of this house is about 32 feet,
7 31 feet above ground. I think Mr. Bingham's
8 cornus line is probably something like 15
9 feet above the ground. He has a picture, so
10 it's a different shape.

11 If it looked kind of like Mr. Bingham's
12 house from his presentation of the street, I
13 think we would be able to say it's within
14 context. I don't -- I can't do that with
15 sort of the architecture trickery. You
16 actually have to take a story off this
17 building to accomplish that.

18 I'm actually quite curious that the
19 people who abut the property, several people
20 who are abutters on Norris Street and Rice
21 Street said that they thought maybe a house

1 in the back was the right thing to do.
2 They're the ones who would be more impacted
3 by a house back there. So I wonder if it's
4 worth asking for a little more thought about
5 that concept to see just to test it out, what
6 would actually happen with the parking, with
7 the house, and all the rest. I suspect this
8 proposal will look better in contrast when
9 they're actually working out the house in the
10 back, but I think it would be important.
11 You've got some thoughtful, concerned people
12 that you can keep talking to them. You may
13 be able to find a way between all of you,
14 come up with something that everybody can
15 live with. Admittedly it may require a trip
16 to the Zoning Board, but if you have these
17 people with you at the Zoning Board, that's a
18 very different kind of visit. And I'm
19 curious to know how we think about those
20 three parking spaces. And I don't think in
21 the plan you've given they're overwhelming or

1 partic ularly a probl em.

2 I guess I'd also comment on the fact
3 that the fire department can't drive their
4 fire truck down between the houses. I can't
5 imagine the fire department wanting to drive
6 their fire truck down between two houses that
7 are 12 feet apart. They don't want to risk
8 their hardware, and they don't have
9 maneuvering room to actually access the truck
10 and fight the fire. When they want to drive
11 their truck, they want 18 feet of pavement
12 and that's why you have a 18-foot fire lane
13 to reach one or two houses is very unusual.

14 So, there are many, many houses where
15 you -- most houses in the city you can't
16 drive a fire truck beside them, and we have
17 an excellent fire department and they manage
18 to serve as well.

19 So is that -- I think we'd like to send
20 you back for some more thoughts and more
21 conversations and some more information.

1 STEVEN WINTER: Would we recommend
2 more communication with the neighbors and the
3 community?

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, yes. Because
5 it's -- I can't imagine how this would come
6 out if we would try to take a vote based on
7 how it is now.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: So if there's nothing
10 further, then we'll take a short break and
11 this will be -- sir?

12 MIKE FOWLER: Is there an
13 opportunity to comment on one of your
14 comments now?

15 HUGH RUSSELL: No. There is an
16 opportunity to comment in writing. We're
17 always happy to receive things. We would
18 prefer to receive them before the day of the
19 hearing. And they should be sent to Liza so
20 that everybody sees them.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: You might want to

1 comment that we have not closed the hearing
2 so that when we come back the next time there
3 will be an opportunity again.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, that's true.
5 Right.

6 I think our hope on this side of the
7 table is that when you come back, you'll show
8 something that's significantly improved and
9 the people behind you will be saying, yep,
10 that's what we were hoping for or most of
11 them.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm attempted to
13 say one thing about the parking in front. If
14 you -- because the depth of the lot is as
15 large as it is, the cars can be set back
16 quite a distance from the street and can be
17 hidden by landscaping. So there are
18 opportunities, and I think the biggest
19 concern is when they're very close to the
20 street, but I think here they would go quite
21 a ways back.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe. But the
2 narrowness of the lot and the required
3 dimensional, you know, for aisles and things
4 is probably going to be a long drive with a
5 series of cars parked along it. Parallel
6 parking.

7 Okay, so I think we're finished with
8 this discussion tonight, and we'll take a
9 break and when we come back, we'll hear case
10 272.

11 (A short recess was taken.)

12 HUGH RUSSELL: So eleven minutes of
13 our ten-minute break having elapsed, I'd like
14 to get going again. Roger wanted to show us
15 something before we get started to sort of
16 put this in context with other developments
17 that we've approved recently.

18 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, the Board will
19 remember that the Concord/Alwife plan of a
20 few years ago envisioned quite a bit of
21 change in the area, mixed use throughout, and

1 certainly housing being an important
2 component. And I thought it was useful, I'm
3 sorry, I just have this board. I'll pass it
4 around to the neighbors as well once we see
5 it. We're now looking at another project on
6 CambridgePark Drive right across the street
7 from the one that you just saw recently at
8 160 CambridgePark Drive. So the project
9 tonight is right across the street down near
10 the end of the CambridgePark Drive. And if
11 you look at the whole context of Alewife, we
12 obviously have the residences at Alewife, the
13 former faces site under construction, and
14 recently the Board looked at 70 Fawcett
15 Street which came back to the Board for some
16 revisions. And the Wheeler Street project
17 also has had some challenges, but it was
18 approved by the Board maybe back for
19 revision. So it just kind of shows that
20 really we have quite a bit of change in the
21 area, and these are all housing project, all

1 rental projects. And part of what the
2 Concord/Alewife plan was envisioning was the
3 importance of getting the mix of uses, the
4 vitality, the housing brings, and also the
5 fact that they tend to produce traffic that's
6 not peak hour the way R&D use was developed
7 in the 80's were. Just trying to give a
8 little bit of context then, and I've asked
9 the developers to kind of pick up on that in
10 their presentation to show how this fits in.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you,
12 Roger.

13 So we are going to proceed with
14 Planning Board case 272, 165 Cambridge Park
15 Drive.

16 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.
17 Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the
18 Board. For the record, my name is James
19 Rafferty. I'm an attorney with offices at
20 130 Bishop Allen Drive. And I'm appearing
21 this evening on behalf of the Applicant,

1 Hines Limited Partnership. The members of
2 that company are the nervous looking
3 gentlemen in the front here. They're nervous
4 because they rely upon me to predict how
5 things will go. And I said, oh, you just got
6 this little single-family house in front of
7 you, that will take just a few minutes and
8 we'll get started right away. But I
9 explained that we have been coached by
10 Ms. Paden, as she always does, that the
11 longer we talk, the less time we leave for
12 the Board to deliberate. So mindful of that
13 we're going to attempt to move as
14 expeditiously as possible through our
15 presentation. Primarily because we labored
16 over our submittal, and I hope the Board
17 members found it informative and illustrative
18 of the plan. The project, as you know, is
19 located in the Alewife Overlay District, and
20 as Mr. Boothe just indicated, if you rezone
21 it, they will come. And certainly we're

1 seei ng evi dence of mul ti -fami l y housi ng that
2 i s emergi ng. Certi n l y Cambri dgePark Drive
3 as envi si oned 25 years ago, and i s currentl y
4 devel oped, has a very di fferent context than
5 what' s now taki ng shape. Thi s project
6 combi ned wi th Mr. McKi nnon' s project across
7 the street and Archstone housi ng across from
8 Cambri dgePark Drive real l y create a cri ti cal
9 mass of peopl e that wi ll be l i vi ng on thi s
10 street. And i t' s exci ti ng to thi nk about the
11 character of thi s street changi ng i n the not
12 too di stant future. The Ci ty has a rol e i n
13 that as wel l . We' ve been taki ng to the
14 Traffi c Department.

15 Currentl y there i s no on street parki ng
16 on the street. Al l the parki ng i s i n
17 control led pri vate l ots. And so as peopl e
18 are wal ki ng these si dewal ks eveni ngs and
19 weekends, and I thi nk the opportuni ti es to
20 real l y change the character of the street,
21 i t' s a -- i ts whole context wi ll

1 significantly be changed. That's the
2 excitement of this proposal. It builds on
3 the success of some other projects. As you
4 know, on the other side of the Alewife
5 Reservation is additional housing appearing
6 on Route 2. And one of our early images in
7 the package that we submitted really gives
8 the big context picture. You can see what's
9 happening on Fawcett Street with the Cabot
10 Forbes project you approved. You can see the
11 housing project out on Route 2. And this is
12 definitely creating some opportunities to
13 really enliven this and think of this area in
14 a very different way.

15 Hines is not a new company. In fact,
16 they've been around quite a while. They've
17 done some work in Cambridge before. People
18 might recall the university place across from
19 the Harvard Square Post Office, is a Hines
20 project. Similarly the office buildings at
21 One Main Street as you come over the

1 Longfel low Bri dge were devel oped by Hi nes.
2 They have i nvestments and devel opment
3 acti vi ty throughout the country and
4 worl dwi de. They do mul ti -fami ly housi ng i n
5 other markets, but thi s i s thei r fi rst
6 mul ti -fami ly project i n Cambri dge, so they' re
7 exci ted about that. One of thei r seni or
8 offi cers toni ght wi ll j ust tel l you a l i ttle
9 bi t about thei r vi ew of the si te and how to
10 i nform thei r sel ecti on of the archi tect,
11 because one of the chal l enges that they saw
12 here was the opportuni ty to add to the
13 archi tectural di versi ty of the street and
14 come up wi th somethi ng that' s a l i ttle bi t
15 di fferent. The desi gn i tsel f, I trust wi ll
16 be -- wi ll be ful ly expl ai ned by Ed Hodges.
17 Mr. Hodges i s wi th Di Mel l a Shaffer. He
18 l i kewi se has experi ence i n Cambri dge. Some
19 of the Board mi ght recogni ze hi m from hi s
20 work at Uni versi ty Park, i ncl udi ng the 23
21 Si dney housi ng bui l di ng and a few other

1 buildings in University Park.

2 This site is a real challenge and a
3 real opportunity because it -- its
4 relationship to the reservation is very
5 different than some of the other surrounding
6 properties. And you'll see through the use
7 of balconies and on grade courtyards, a real
8 attempt to engage this building with the
9 surrounding context. Particularly the
10 reservation side. But even at the street
11 edge as this image illustrates the -- because
12 the building is below the allowable FAR there
13 was an opportunity here to use GFA for
14 balconies in places where when it gets tight,
15 we see projects not able to have as generous
16 a balcony because it's costing square footage
17 of the buildings. This is not the case here.
18 So, I just want to briefly identify why we're
19 here in terms of the five types of relief we
20 need. Because of the size of the project,
21 obviously we have an Article 19, project

1 review Special Permit. That means at the end
2 of our presentation Mr. Ham will give you his
3 usual traffic analysis, and it's pretty
4 consistent with what you've seen lately. But
5 we always save the best for last. Mr. Ham
6 will be our final presenter.

7 There are some design requirements in
8 the Alewife Overlay District that the
9 building responds to. We've laid those out
10 in narrative form, and Mr. Hodges will walk
11 you through those as well.

12 The parking in this district, you may
13 recall, can be located at grade and not be
14 included in the GFA because of flood plain
15 issues. So we're seeking that relief as
16 well.

17 We also have a flood plain overlay
18 Special Permit because the portion of the
19 project is located in the flood plain. The
20 Conservation Commission has already issued an
21 order of conditions in this case so that they

1 have weighed in as they're required to do in
2 flood plain cases. And I know from speaking
3 to Ms. Paden today she's in receipt of the
4 material, but their approval took place early
5 this summer in June.

6 Finally, the application also seeks a
7 reduction of the required amount of parking.
8 It's proposed to 244 units with 232 parking
9 spaces. The bicycle spaces coincidentally
10 are one to one at 244. But the -- it's about
11 a 0.95 ratio, which we've reviewed with the
12 Traffic Department. And I trust you've seen
13 the memo from Ms. Clippenger supporting that
14 request, and that the underlying demands can
15 be satisfied.

16 There's one design constraint that's,
17 that caused us to lose some spaces in the
18 garage, but which is a focal point of the
19 project that Mr. Hodges will go through. And
20 that's the on-grade courtyard. If we went
21 across with an elevator courtyard, you could

1 park in that area. But it's really almost a
2 key component of the design, both as the
3 visual impact as you enter the building, as
4 you see from the street, from the sidewalk
5 through to the building, it really creates
6 essentially two separate garages. So we lose
7 a few spaces as a result, but it's a very
8 modest amount of spaces and everyone is
9 mindful of the fact that we've got very good
10 proximity to transit here.

11 So given all that, I think I would
12 introduce the project, but first I know that,
13 David, you're going to --

14 DAVID PERRY: Yes.

15 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: David is
16 going to say some things about the selection.

17 DAVID PERRY: Thank you, Jim.

18 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, it's a
19 pleasure to be here tonight. It's been
20 sometime since 124 Mount Auburn Street was
21 developed so we're pleased to be back and

1 sorry i t' s been so long.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Can you give us your
3 name?

4 DAVID PERRY: Davi d Perry.

5 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Wi th
6 Hi nes.

7 DAVID PERRY: And j ust one
8 cl ari fi cati on on Ji m' s remarks. We were not
9 the devel oper of 101 Mai n Street, but we were
10 the owners from 2001 unti l 2004.

11 During which time we were the reci pi ent
12 of the Go Green Busi ness Award i ssued by the
13 Ci ty of Cambri dge for our achi evements i n
14 energy conservati on and recycl i ng whi ch we' re
15 qui te proud of.

16 But what bri ngs us here today i s the
17 opportuni ty on Cambri dgePark Dri ve, and we' re
18 extremel y exci ted about i t. And as Ji m sai d,
19 there' s several proj ects that are sl i ghtly
20 ahead of us i n the pi pel i ne, but of course we
21 thi nk we have the best proj ect and the best

1 location of them all, so we're hopefully
2 going to convince of you that tonight.

3 But we've, we've been doing business in
4 Boston for over 30 years. Some of our other
5 projects you might be familiar with are 222
6 Berkeley Street in the Back Bay that was
7 designed by Robert Stern. And 500 Boylston
8 was also a phase of that project designed by
9 (inaudible) Johnson. Specifically how we
10 arrived at our intrigue with the site,
11 there's really, you know, several drivers.
12 There's a tremendous need for rental housing
13 both market rates and also arguably a crisis
14 for affordable housing. So this project
15 addresses two critical market needs. It also
16 has the advantage of being three blocks from
17 the Alewife MBTA Station, and within a short
18 walk of over two million square feet of
19 office space. So, it is as a low impact an
20 opportunity as one can hope to find in
21 Cambridge, and it also has the huge advantage

1 of being adjacent to the Alewife Brook
2 Reservati on which was a key factor in us
3 pursuing thi s si te, and also a key
4 consi derati on of ours in thi nki ng about the
5 desi gn i n sel ecti ng an archi tect. And as Ji m
6 sai d, we i ntervi ewed several archi tects and
7 we sel ected Di Mel l a Shaffer i n l arge part
8 because of thei r i nsti nct that the
9 reservati on was an i ntegral part of the
10 success of thi s proj ect. And we' ll el aborate
11 on that i n j ust a second.

12 So, from an urban pl anni ng perspecti ve
13 and for marketi ng reasons, we thi nk i t' s
14 i mportant to di fferenti ate thi s proj ect from
15 the other podi um stye bui ldi ngs that are
16 comi ng to the market i n Cambri dge. And so
17 you wi ll see what we' ve accompli shed, and
18 we' ve also gotten excel l ent i nput from
19 communi ty devel opment through thi s process
20 that' s made. We fel t i ni ti al l y was a real l y
21 good proj ect and we thi nk i t' s made even

1 better without further ado I'll turn it over
2 to Ed Hodges and Rob Adams, Halvorson
3 Design the designer for the project.

4 ED HODGES: Thanks, David. I'm Ed
5 Hodges, principal with DiMella Shaffer.
6 Roger kind of went through the overview for
7 this, but I just wanted to make a couple of
8 points, again, about the location. I'm an
9 Arlington resident so I come through this
10 area quite a bit. Real estate in Arlington,
11 you always see backs up to the Minuteman
12 Bikeway, direct access to the Minuteman
13 Bikeway. So here's the site which has access
14 to four bikeways, so this is a fantastic
15 thing. The other thing you see a lot East
16 Arlington, you know, proximity to
17 transportation as David mentioned, you know,
18 we're just a few blocks from the Alewife
19 Station. And then if you go to a place like
20 Concord, it's, you know, the site backs up to
21 reservation land, conservation land. So

1 those three things in real estate, this site
2 happens to have. And the fact that it's in
3 this, you know, fairly dense area of
4 Cambridge is when you walk out there, you
5 know, you realize you really have an
6 opportunity that not many places have in
7 terms of developing housing on the site.

8 Just to remind you the site's 96
9 percent impervious right now. It's not often
10 that we do a development where we can
11 actually improve that. I'm aware of the
12 issues around flooding, you know, being a
13 neighbor. So that was a big concern of ours
14 in trying to develop the design that we also
15 address that. To the site views today is
16 largely a blank wall warehouse and office
17 building. Looking east back towards the
18 Alewife Station, looking down towards Pfizer.
19 The other thing is these magnificent weeping
20 willows, we were struck by them, and wanted
21 to make them a key feature of the project as

1 well.

2 You know, zooming in on the triangle
3 piece of the Alewife Triangle Overlay, when I
4 got the call about this site and I went out
5 there on a Sunday afternoon, I had not known
6 that they had cleared all this and you were
7 able to walk right out to the river, and it
8 was in October and November, towards the end
9 of the day and the sun was setting in the
10 west and it was glinting down the river. And
11 I was, like, this is an even more incredible
12 opportunity than originally thought because
13 the reservation always seemed relatively
14 impermeable because the vegetation was so
15 thick, and now that it's actually opened up,
16 you can actually get in and sort of
17 participate with it and the stuff that's
18 happened on the Discovery Park side as well.

19 And you had this long view of the
20 reservation down the river, so the ability to
21 look this way, and it -- your kind of vision

1 is almost like you're looking down a river in
2 New Hampshire. So, again, that makes this
3 site, you know, really an amazing thing for
4 housing.

5 And here's a view of how that's kind of
6 changed. That's the bike path right there,
7 and so this is one of the retention basins.
8 And so you can see how it's opened up and
9 permeable. And the other thing is, you know,
10 because of the flood plane of having the
11 parking, you get up and elevated and so your
12 ability to see even further down the
13 reservation is a benefit.

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Tell him
15 what the buildings are.

16 ED HODGES: That's --

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's Discovery
18 Park.

19 ED HODGES: Yes, that's Discovery
20 Park. And this is the Forester building, and
21 I am not sure who is in that.

1 So as I mentioned, in the design of the
2 building the drivers were the fact that we
3 had this unique opportunity with the
4 reservation. So how can we really bind the
5 building with the reservation and make them
6 sort of interrelated with each other and at
7 the same time improve the urban condition
8 along the street? So these diagrams sort of
9 illustrate that, that we're making an edge,
10 we're making the back permeable and we're
11 really trying to draw the green space into
12 the arms of the building and have the
13 building reach out. So we have a street
14 wall, some lower elements, and then on the
15 back side you see we have all these nice
16 views looking down that long part of the
17 reservation, and the building actually steps
18 down as it comes towards the west.

19 As Jim and David had mentioned, I felt
20 it was really important that if we're going
21 to draw the reservation and the site

1 together, we had to have some space at grade.
2 It couldn't all be up a level on the parking,
3 and so we made that sort of a tenant at the
4 beginning that we draw this courtyard so that
5 there's landscape on our site which connects
6 directly to the landscape in the reservation.
7 And these are those two weeping willows right
8 there, and this is courtyard at grade. And
9 we'll show you a view of that in a minute.
10 So it connects you to the reservation even
11 from the street. And there's elevated
12 courtyards in the other two wings.

13 We also recognize that there's
14 development going on across the street. This
15 building sets back. Our building holds the
16 street edge there and then opens up and draws
17 you in the entry as that building draws back
18 to the street, and then the building comes
19 back and orients, and this actually takes
20 your eye to the Pfizer building at the end of
21 the street.

1 So at the podium level is parking. You
2 know, this is a big sort of thing that Hines
3 has allowed us to do is to create these two
4 garages because they felt that the open space
5 at grade was really important. The lobby,
6 everything, all the solid walls are oriented
7 in this direction so that you can see right
8 through the building here.

9 There's bike parking, one per unit,
10 along here, along the street. And you come
11 in and there's a courtyard in the front,
12 landscaped courtyard, and a retention basin
13 there, and then you have the lobby and some
14 guest bike parking there.

15 The second level is the pool deck which
16 faces west, so it will get the light all day
17 long. And the amenity spaces and then a mix
18 of units from studios, the three bedrooms,
19 and then a large elevated vegetative
20 courtyard on the right-hand side of the slide
21 here.

1 So then looking at the street view, you
2 see that where we were holding the street
3 here, and as Jim mentioned, a lot of these
4 buildings today don't get balconies because
5 they count as FAR. And luckily we're
6 building a smaller building than allowed so
7 we're able to get the balconies on the street
8 and get some eyes on the street and some
9 activity that the building has some
10 permeability to it and those people are
11 looking over. This is the bike parking down
12 here. There's an entrance down here to a
13 core so that people can come out and go down
14 to -- down to the station. And the loading
15 dock is just off the street back here, and
16 that's how the move-ins will happen. But
17 you'll see your eye comes down the street
18 here and then this other bump out at four
19 story to bring the scale down draws your eye
20 into the entry, and this is what we call the
21 boomerang. It's kind of the background

1 building that's set back.

2 So another view which shows the
3 development of that courtyard with seating,
4 the bio retention basin in here. The ability
5 to come up to the entry and have drop off
6 and, again, how your eye is brought into
7 here, you can see in this view how that piece
8 stops you and holds you to the entry as the
9 building bends away from you.

10 And then looking directly through what
11 I talked about before, here's how you see --
12 because the sun is behind us facing south,
13 it's going to light up the reservation. So
14 as you look through the entry, you'll see the
15 lit landscape in the distance. So it's
16 really nice as you go down the street,
17 instead of these podium buildings that are
18 visually. You can see a park on the other
19 side.

20 And then as I mentioned, the way the
21 building integrates with the reservation, the

1 fingers of the building come out and the
2 landscaping goes in. These are those willow
3 trees with the at grade courtyard going in
4 there, and then the upper courtyard is here.
5 And you see how we have eyes on the
6 reservation. So it will be a nice thing that
7 the reservation will have these people living
8 right on it so that you get some constituents
9 that are really interested in it. It's not
10 everyone bailing out, and these people live
11 with it everyday so there's additional safety
12 on the bike path.

13 In terms of height, we're allowed 85
14 feet under the Zoning. We're going to go
15 just under 70 feet. You can see the 125
16 Cambridge Park Drive. There's kind of a
17 horizontal orientation to a lot of the
18 street. We've chosen to echo that horizontal
19 orientation in our building for a couple of
20 reasons.

21 One, because we have really landscaped

1 views. So we have long sort of horizon
2 views. And if you've been in a lot of
3 apartments now they have the kind of hole in
4 the wall at the end of the living room. And
5 so here the windows will sort of go wall to
6 wall in the living room. So that sets up
7 this horizontal relation which relates to the
8 other buildings on the street. And then
9 there's public access to the reservation
10 here.

11 A little diagram of how the lobby works
12 from the street. There's a two-story lobby
13 so that you really can see through. And
14 here's the willows at the end of that
15 courtyard.

16 The materials, we're using fiber cement
17 siding that has a texture (inaudible) with
18 some resin in-fill panels to give that group
19 the windows together. The fiber cement rain
20 screen on the white portions that come out
21 and then forward. And then storefront

1 glazing that's translucent where the bike
2 parking is and visual glass where the lobby
3 and the access points are.

4 On the reservation side there are
5 balconies on the end of those wings with a
6 lot of glass looking out onto the
7 reservation. There's a vertical wood screen
8 on the garage so that it's more like a garden
9 wall than a garage wall.

10 So this brings you back to that view,
11 sort of the sum of all of those design ideas
12 of how the building holds the street and
13 kicks out to turn your edge and picks up with
14 the Pfizer building, and then the lower
15 levels bring the scale down. There's a
16 planted buffer along the street. If you look
17 at this side of CambridgePark Drive, most of
18 it are set back a little bit. So we're set
19 back 15 feet to have that sort of landscape
20 buffer for the experience and then, you know,
21 people in there you'll be able to see that

1 acti vi ty at night and it will make it quite
2 di fferent than it is today in terms of 24
3 acti vi ty.

4 I'm going to turn it over to Rob.

5 ROBERT ADAMS: Good evening. My
6 name is Robert Adams. I'm a seni or associ ate
7 at Hal vorson Desi gn Partnershi p. We' re
8 Landscape archi tects. We' ve had the pleasure
9 and opportuni ty to do a lot of work here in
10 Cambri dge and New Engl and. Hopeful ly some of
11 you are fami li ar with our work. I' ll be
12 bri ef mai nly just to introduce mysel f and
13 answer questi ons. Ed has covered a lot of
14 the mai n poi nts, but we' re exci ted to be
15 worki ng on thi s project. It was a great
16 opportuni ty not only to bring the, you know,
17 bring our good nei ghbor the reservati on in
18 for the benefi t of our project site, but also
19 as Ed sai d, make those connecti ons to the
20 l arger communi ty.

21 The plan, the Landscape plan or the

1 open space plans are fairly simple and
2 materials try to be cohesive. We -- I have a
3 front space here which is -- tries to
4 maximize the amount of green space and create
5 a little bit of a seating niche for the
6 general public and for users and visitors to
7 the building. The at grade courtyard in this
8 location, the raised courtyard and pool deck.
9 A lot of the plant material was chosen to
10 have a natural appearance, but also to be
11 maintainable. So to walk that fine line to
12 making that connection of the reservation
13 without being too wild.

14 And so in the front you can see the
15 angled parkway -- or the angled walkway and
16 the idea of seating and some small seating
17 niches to make a pocket up front. And the
18 raised courtyard -- I'm sorry, the at grade
19 courtyard is really as Ed has said, the focus
20 of this. It makes that connection from the
21 street level through the space, through the

1 lobby, through our courtyard, and back to the
2 reservation. And the idea is to create a
3 habitable space, but also a visually pleasing
4 space. A little bit of a viewing garden if
5 you will.

6 And then lastly the Level II courtyard
7 which is about tenant use. It's not open to
8 the public, but again, does a good job of
9 making unified appearance of the space and
10 making the visual connections out to the
11 courtyard.

12 And that's it. And now I'll hand it
13 over the discussion on traffic.

14 GILES HAM: Good evening. Giles
15 Ham, Vanasse and Associates. Traffic isn't
16 quite as exciting as the architecture, but
17 I'll briefly go over the traffic study.

18 The traffic study was certified on June
19 21st of this year. The project, as we said,
20 is really ideally situated. We have the
21 transit, multi-use pass, as well as the

1 access to Route 2. It really is a perfect
2 site for development and low impact.

3 Down here we chose five intersections
4 to work with as the study area, really
5 looking at Alewife Brook Parkway at Route 2,
6 Cambridge Park Drive, Rindge Ave., and then
7 along the Alewife Station access road, the
8 two intersections there. So that's kind of
9 the study area that we looked at in detail
10 with city staff.

11 In terms of traffic generation summary,
12 we assumed 37 percent transit usage, eight
13 percent walk trips, and three percent bicycle
14 trips. And that correlates into vehicle
15 trips of about 800 on a daily basis. 400 in,
16 400 out over a 24-hour day. In between 61
17 and 75 just during the peak hours. I would
18 tell you based on our experience that those
19 are conservative numbers. The numbers are
20 likely to be lower than that based on our
21 experience in the area.

1 With regard to the Planning Board
2 criteria, we really had 95 kind of test
3 criteria to look at with this project. We
4 satisfied most of those. We satisfied 86 of
5 those. And the ones we do exceed, they're
6 very minor. We exceed a criteria at Rindge
7 Ave. during the morning peak hour. It's
8 really a timing issue and it's not
9 significant there at all, and that will be
10 re-timed as part of planned roadway permits
11 in the area.

12 And then the other -- the eight
13 criteria are really pedestrian level sources,
14 signalized intersections. But quite frankly,
15 those are existing conditions. They're not
16 impacted by our project at all. They're just
17 out there today in terms of the function of
18 the timings that's out there, and the delay
19 that it takes to cross in the crosswalk.

20 And then just finally in terms of the
21 transportation management program, we'll be

1 joining the local TMA. We'll promote car
2 sharing programs on-site with some spaces
3 reserved for car share spaces.

4 The parking fees will be separate from
5 the rent, which is important. We keep
6 pushing for that. We talked about bicycle
7 and racks on-site, and encourage the
8 pedestrian community in the area.

9 Post-transit schedules at a centralized
10 location. And, of course, we have the T
11 station right there, which is kind of a
12 built-in mitigation where everybody's going
13 to be -- most people agree to use transit to
14 get to work.

15 And then finally, we'll be contributing
16 a hundred thousand dollars towards the
17 pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks
18 that's in the planning stages.

19 Thank you.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

21 Do we have questions or should I go to

1 public testimony?

2 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I know
3 Ms. Clippinger is here. I know she speaks of
4 her memo.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: We'll get to that.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: The memo was very
7 helpful. Nobody signed in. However, does
8 anyone wish to speak on this project?

9 Mr. Brandon.

10 MICHAEL BRANDON: Thank you. I'm
11 Michael Brandon. 27 Seven Pines Avenue. I
12 think people have given up on the idea of
13 coming to speak because we seem like broken
14 records in my view and others who come to the
15 stabilization committee both from North
16 Cambridge but also from Arlington and
17 Belmont. There's a sense that the entire
18 Alewife area, and more recently particularly
19 the triangle area, is being overdeveloped.
20 The environmental impact, the infrastructure
21 limitations cannot support what the city,

1 both through its Zoning and through its
2 permitting process is allowing to occur
3 there. In my view it's folly, I said this
4 before, to be building anything in a such an
5 environmentally sensitive area that's prone
6 to flooding. And I understand that the
7 engineers will tell you they're improving the
8 situation because they're taking up some
9 pavement. I don't think so. I think I will
10 be proven right probably within most of our
11 lifetimes, maybe not, when we get the big
12 storm and the streets flood and the garages
13 flood and the storm waters spread pollution
14 throughout the Alewife reservation.

15 As far as -- I would disagree with the
16 proponents about the wonders that this is
17 going to bring to the reservation. In my
18 view, the reservation, although it's largely
19 already been destroyed because of the city
20 policies, mainly the intrusion of the
21 reservoir that's being built to create a

1 natural reservoir to try to improve upon
2 nature, but particularly the impacts on the
3 rare urban wild that is there, that is
4 increasingly going to be destroyed by the
5 proximity of so much development. The
6 impacts are so many on wind, on shadow
7 changes, on people. It's really being
8 gradually changing or recreational area
9 rather than a nature preserve. That kind of
10 reser -- it's a different kind of reservation
11 that's evolving. And what's lost is the
12 habitat that the animals require to survive.
13 So even during the construction, and they
14 tell you well, we're going to comply with the
15 Noise Ordinance. Well, if you lived within a
16 couple miles of the Faces site, while that
17 was being built, the pile driving which went
18 on for extensive periods, was driving
19 neighbors in Arlington, across Route 2
20 already have the noise there.

21 PAMELA WINTERS: Michael, your time

1 is up unfortunately.

2 MICHAEL BRANDON: Okay, I'm sorry.
3 Let me see if there are any points. Well,
4 the traffic study in its scope is
5 problematic. Just the transportation
6 infrastructure cannot handle. Either the
7 roadways or the T, both the Red Line and now
8 the busses, which are trapped in the traffic.
9 And even the bicycle, which it's good that
10 we're planning for eventually a bridge to
11 connect the triangle and the quadrangle.
12 We're going to have thousands and thousands
13 of people living there and you're not
14 creating a neighborhood. That's my final
15 last point. I made this better on the other
16 project, the need for retail space and a lot
17 more lively streetscape. And it's good that
18 the city is looking at providing parking on
19 street that would support retail, but it
20 should be required as part of the project.
21 Mixed use. This is dumb growth, it's not

1 smart growth.

2 STEVEN WINTER: Michael, I have one
3 quick question for you. Mr. Chair?

4 MICHAEL BRANDON: Sure.

5 STEVEN WINTER: Are you representing
6 the North Cambridge Stabilization Committee
7 with these comments or are these your own
8 comments?

9 MICHAEL BRANDON: Well, it's kind of
10 a combination because the proponents did come
11 and present to us. This was our only summer
12 meeting. And we had the other controversial
13 Cedar Street and two other things. So, we
14 didn't have a chance to fully discuss it, but
15 I can -- and so we did not particularly vote,
16 you know, that this is the official position,
17 and that's why we didn't communicate in
18 writing.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thank you very
20 much.

21 MICHAEL BRANDON: Thank you.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish
2 to speak?

3 Mr. McKinnon, please come to the
4 microphone.

5 RICHARD MCKINNON: My name is Rich
6 McKinnon. I live at One Leighton Street in
7 Cambridge, and I'm the developer of the
8 project across the street at 160
9 Cambridge Park Drive. I have a slightly
10 different take on it than Michael.

11 I've known the Hines Company for about
12 30 years back when Jack Greavon (phonetic)
13 was their local representative and they did
14 the beautiful project in Harvard Square.
15 I've also known Jim Dunlop from the Hines
16 Company who used to be my boss when he was at
17 Archstone. The first project I ever did in
18 Cambridge I had Frank DiMella of DiMella
19 Shaffer as the architect down at One Memorial
20 Drive. We are really delighted to have
21 people of this quality doing the project

1 next-door to us and delighted with their
2 selection of architect. We -- all of us, I
3 think, really enjoyed the project that they
4 designed at 23 Sidney. And this one here I
5 think is a nice offset to the work that we
6 did at 160. So we're very supportive of
7 welcoming them in as a new neighbor.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

9 Does anyone else wish to speak?

10 (No Response.)

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one.

12 I think I'm going to -- last time I
13 spoke last, this time I think I'll speak
14 first, and maybe since one of my important
15 views was sparked by Sue's comments maybe.
16 So I think this is by in large an excellent
17 project that's by in large a handsome
18 building. I think it does not meet the
19 street properly. I think it's -- the way it
20 meets the pedestrian connector is really
21 awful going back aside, and I don't know what

1 the flood strategy is. And so without any
2 real submittal on the flood it would be very
3 difficult to get a flood plain permit.
4 There's no engineering. There's no
5 description. I don't know what you're doing
6 with Atwater. I'm sure you do and I'm sure
7 it's been approved, but I want to know.

8 So the -- and the thing that Sue
9 pointed out is well, if you look at what's
10 going on along CambridgePark Drive, across
11 the street at 160, 100 percent of the street
12 frontage has been made pedestrian friendly.
13 Your score is about 10 percent. That's not
14 good enough. You've got two garage entries
15 which Sue believes should be moved, and I
16 agree with her. You've got, I don't know,
17 100 or 150 feet of glass that you can't see
18 through at the bike storage. You've got to
19 rethink how you can do something that will
20 meet less boring than just looking at glass.
21 I think it's clear glass we're interested in.

1 Maybe it's fluted glass, something that
2 allows some amount of transparency. A lot of
3 your parking garage is just bare with nothing
4 on it, but fancy architecture is really
5 boring. Across the street the residences
6 that front the street, there is a wide area
7 of common spaces. There's a bicycle, maybe
8 bicycle's a feature and certain exposed, you
9 might look at that.

10 On the side there's a pedestrian
11 connection. And what's your response to
12 that? A driveway with open parking under the
13 building facing it. That's like the worst
14 possible pedestrian experience. Those open
15 parking spaces under the podium simply cannot
16 be there. Tandem spaces, garage doors,
17 something but it can't be that unfriendly.

18 The park frontage, it's unclear to me
19 how the grading works. If you were to look
20 at your renderings, it looks like this sort
21 of grass and trees that slope up somewhat

1 towards the elevated landscape decks, but
2 there's a driveway there. That driveway
3 didn't show in your renderings just as the
4 garage doors didn't show in your close-ups
5 and, you know -- so I think you're not
6 telling us the real, real story in some of
7 these places. And I think if we knew the
8 real story, we'd want you to do some more
9 work on it.

10 I assume that's not elevated because I
11 don't think you can make your flood plain
12 work. I don't think your drive is there. I
13 think there's a 10 or 11 foot high wall at
14 that point, and apparently you've got maybe
15 six or seven feet of planting on one side of
16 the drive, six feet on the other. That
17 rendering doesn't represent what you're
18 proposing to do. I'd like to see what you're
19 proposing to do.

20 There's also one curious thing on the
21 landscape plan that I -- it's not a big deal,

1 but when you walk out to the courtyard walk,
2 there's some sort of feature on the far side
3 of the drive that looks a lot to me like a
4 concrete wall. I don't know what it is, but
5 it's about 50 feet long.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: A stone wall?

7 HUGH RUSSELL: So I don't know what
8 that is.

9 ROBERT ADAMS: I'm happy to
10 elaborate.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: I'm just curious what
12 that is.

13 ROBERT ADAMS: So there's a series
14 of stonewalls in the courtyard. The idea is
15 to have another stone wall -- fieldstone
16 wall.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: And how tall is that?

18 ROBERT ADAMS: 30 inches.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Could you point to
20 these as we talk about these?

21 ROBERT ADAMS: Sorry.

1 So the general idea and the device
2 we're using is trying to create a foreground
3 garden, use these walls to screen out some of
4 the middle ground and to capture the long
5 vista. So we're controlling the views from
6 that lobby a little bit with low stone walls.
7 Nothing over 36 inches.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Good. Do you want to
9 hear from Sue?

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

11 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So do you have
12 the letters? I'll just go through quickly
13 some of the issues that we've talked about.

14 Hugh has talked to the issue of the
15 curb cuts. There's, there's issues we've
16 seen with several of these large buildings
17 where the fire department wants access around
18 the entire building. We've had a number of
19 conversations with the fire department about
20 exactly what their requirements are, because
21 in some cases you may not want a road there

1 and a lot of times at these conceptual level
2 it looks like a road. We're trying to
3 understand what kind of flexibility the
4 proponents could have especially in this
5 project with the back side. So that the fire
6 department just wants to be able to put their
7 riggers down on a flat surface and be able to
8 access the building. Can do that, but it
9 doesn't necessarily have to be a paved road.
10 It would be a permeable surface or something.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Isn't that the way
12 their moving trucks are going to get out of
13 the site?

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, from that
15 but that's not a very frequent use.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

17 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: And the fire
18 department wants 18 feet for their riggers.
19 So if there's a lot more flexibility for a
20 developer in terms of the materials they're
21 using, I think the goal is that it would look

1 less like a road and more like a service
2 function for -- associated with that. So
3 that's sort of a tangent because we're really
4 something we've been talking to the fire
5 department about so that we can be
6 encouraging, you know, design options that
7 proponents are able to pursue that are a
8 little bit more in keeping with the kind of
9 landscaping ideas that they have for a lot
10 these projects.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you show us
12 the four curb cuts you're talking about?

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Not easy on this
15 one.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's hard to see.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: It's hard to see,
18 right.

19 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So, there's, you
20 know, the two far edge ones which are the
21 access to on one case loading truck access to

1 the loading truck loading point, and on the
2 other side access to the parking that Hugh
3 was talking about. So those two curb cuts on
4 the far side. And then in the middle are the
5 access to each of the driveways. So there
6 are courtyard treatment which, you know, has
7 that ground level courtyard, creates the two
8 separate parking structures. So you have to
9 be able to get into each one.

10 And since we did the letter before your
11 meeting, they had also looked at a
12 modification to the access to this garage on
13 the left which --

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Here's our
15 response to Ms. Clippinger's request.

16 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: If changes to the
17 access were able to be done in such a way
18 that the parking would be replaced -- oh,
19 good, at the previous curb cut could match
20 the parking loss in order to access from
21 another location. This was an attempt to do

1 exactly that, but it's not a match. There's
2 additional loss of parking.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But given --
4 you said the actual parking for the Archstone
5 building is about 55 percent; is that right?

6 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No.

7 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: The parking
8 demands, you know, here is -- the parking
9 supply they're proposing is we think is fine
10 in terms of the demand.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I think they
12 lose another three spaces without --

13 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: You might be able
14 to. I think the other thing. There's one
15 issue that they've raised and one issue that
16 we've thought about. One issue they're
17 raising is to try to make sure that blue cone
18 is an attempt to make sure the site line cone
19 is good for vehicles that are accessing the
20 garage. The access to -- I think nobody's
21 really said, but there is a public path to

1 the left of the property line. Somebody must
2 have a thingy.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: There's a label on
4 that drawing. Sue, there's a label on that
5 in the upper corner.

6 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Okay. So right
7 here is a public access to the path that the
8 city's building, public works is building.
9 That's part of the work they're doing on the
10 reservation. And the project has a
11 connection here that will allow the people
12 who are part of the project to access the
13 reservation. And that happens to be the
14 place where their property abuts the city
15 property, because there's also a large MBTA
16 -- MBTA?

17 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

18 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: MBTA easement
19 across the back of the property, back across
20 this side, which if you were to gain access
21 to the bike path, you would be crossing that

1 jurisdiction. So this proposal shows that
2 connection happening where it's totally
3 within the control of both the proponent and
4 the city. And so then you would be putting
5 the garage exit point right at that. So it's
6 like, there's a lot of -- here's another
7 option, it's not a slam dunk.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

9 Similar thing could be done on the
10 other side.

11 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: No additional
12 proposal's been made -- no proposal's been
13 made for the other side.

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: One of the
15 reasons we rejected what we've been talking
16 about is the idea to minimize the amount of
17 activity on that road. That road is simply
18 there to accommodate the fire department.
19 One of the earlier designs had the loading
20 right on the street. It was another curb
21 cut, a visual intrusion. So as we were

1 required to put in roadway, they designed the
2 loading so it's not visible from the street.
3 So it's, it's not envisioned that that
4 particularly the back section of the road,
5 other than the occasional moving truck, the
6 desire is for that to have more vestiges of a
7 path and a row. If we start bringing cars in
8 that row, there's a concern we're going to
9 increase the amount of activity. There's
10 only one pedestrian -- I mean, the
11 pedestrian -- the street terminates as you
12 know, beyond us. And the level of pedestrian
13 activity drops off significantly. So the
14 only people walking passed the second curb
15 cut would be people heading to the Pfizer
16 building. Most of the residents of this
17 building would already be into the building.
18 So we -- I just want to show we studied it,
19 it was a good -- it was flagged for us early.
20 There was an earlier entry design that
21 actually allowed for cars to move from one

1 garage to the other, and we were discouraged
2 and said we should take another look. So
3 that's why that entry courtyard now is
4 entirely green, and it's a courtyard in the
5 green space. It had more of a, a cobblestone
6 shared auto walking thing, and the feeling
7 was that it was created conflicts with the
8 pedestrian access into the building. So I
9 guess we're a little taken aback with the
10 notion that we haven't been focussed on
11 pedestrian and how to get cars into this. As
12 Sue said, the real driver here is these
13 function as two separate garages because of
14 the on grade thing, the on grade courtyard.
15 We need two separate garage entries.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So I think
17 the obvious thing to me is you put the entry
18 as close to the street as you can and off of
19 the road you've got on the side. You don't
20 bring cars in very far, you satisfy people's
21 desires.

1 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Well, we
2 looked at that but it means loss of more
3 parking spaces.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, when you -- in
5 this case it's a loss of three spaces, right?

6 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: And then on the other
8 side you presumably, you can take three
9 spaces out of here and put them over there.

10 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I don't
11 think it's physically impossible I agree. We
12 weighed the pros on cons. We thought this
13 was a good outcome. We reviewed it with the
14 staff. We're now hearing that there's
15 different views on that, but we'll obviously
16 reexamine that.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Which does happen
18 every now and then.

19 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Part of
20 the process.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: In fact, every more

1 than every now and then.

2 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We welcome
3 it.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Sue, there's more in
5 your report.

6 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So I think --
7 just quickly I think the parking that they're
8 proposing we're perfectly comfortable with
9 the reduction in parking. The commitment
10 they're making to the pedestrian bridge, the
11 hundred thousand is fabulous. It would be
12 really wonderful if that bridge happened.
13 It's, they've made a real commitment to the
14 bike parking which has been great. It's kind
15 of neat. We have a project that has more
16 bike parking than automobile parking, which
17 is appropriate for this site and also a nice
18 improvement. There's a lot of TDM strategies
19 that have been committed to. And then
20 somewhere lost in the small print here,
21 we're, we're also asking that they take a

1 Look at the Mass. Highway -- Mass. DOT
2 project for Route 2 and 16 which is not a
3 panacea, but they are -- they do have a
4 project to try to look at some small
5 improvements to signal timing and some of the
6 paved area to say some queueing that happens
7 during peak hour doesn't quite so frequently
8 block the other moves and asking them working
9 with the proponent across the street who had
10 the same thing to look at analyzing, you
11 know, the project numbers and -- against the
12 project trying to look to see if any of the
13 Planning Board criteria exceedances are
14 impacted by that improvement. And they may
15 -- it may not be a solution, but I think it's
16 helpful for us to know what kind of relief it
17 would bring to that area.

18 So I think that's the highlight of
19 what's here unless I missed something that
20 you picked up that you had a question about.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I ask about

1 the scheduling of the improvement of 2 and
2 16, when is that on the board in terms of
3 planning?

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's, I think
5 it's like 1.9 million.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: No, not dollars,
7 calendar.

8 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I know, so that's
9 part of the question. So I think they're
10 trying to --

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: 1.9 million?

12 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's all?

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's not going to
16 do much.

17 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: No, they take a
18 phase out of the signal which is actually
19 quite significant, and they do some simple
20 paving stuff that just makes it work better.
21 It's not going to solve the problem, and I'm

1 not sure we want to fix it, because it would
2 just move the problem further into Cambridge.
3 But what it does is takes some of the safety
4 and frustration level from queues that don't
5 fit in, but it's not a big, expensive project
6 and it's -- I don't believe that it's
7 specifically funded. So I think they're
8 trying to slide it in, you know, where
9 there's an opportunity, and needs probably
10 some pushing on our part and anybody else's
11 part of the ones who are going to be pushing
12 it. So I don't know the exact schedule.

13 Any other questions?

14 H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a
15 questions.

16 How does the traffic in and out of this
17 proposed project compare to the traffic in
18 and out from what's currently there?

19 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: What's currently
20 or was currently -- what's currently there is
21 nothing. What was currently there was

1 industrial kind of use with relatively low
2 volumes. So it's probably more volumes, but
3 it's residential. It's, you know, reverse
4 peak. You know, a lot more opportunity for
5 people to use transit depending on where
6 they're trying to go.

7 H. THEODORE COHEN: And do you want
8 on street parking on CambridgePark Drive?

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. The
10 street's too wide, and I think we haven't
11 gotten to the point of sort of figuring out
12 where and what the regulations are exactly
13 and stuff, but I think as these two projects
14 come along, we're going to end up doing
15 something like that just as part of what
16 they're doing to make the street look better,
17 will be enhanced by us adding some parking on
18 there to make it a nice street.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: And it helps for
20 visitors.

21 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, and I
2 assume that's not intended to be parking --
3 all day parking for people who are going to
4 park and take the T.

5 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: No. I think, you
6 know, our preference would be resident
7 parking. You know, we sort of shy away from
8 putting resident only parking right smack in
9 front of a business. We'll have to think a
10 little bit about the mix of regulations in
11 the area.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. That could be
13 daytime meters and nighttime, things like
14 that.

15 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, yes. So I
16 mean, you know, there may not be a huge
17 demand until there's, you know, things are
18 really full. Fortunately we can make it
19 work.

20 Other questions?

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

1 ED HODGES: Could I explain the
2 grading that you were talking about?

3 HUGH RUSSELL: I think let's let
4 everybody get their comments on the table and
5 then you can answer in detail.

6 Bill.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think I agree with
8 most of Hugh's comments even though to quote
9 our illustrious Chair just a few minutes ago,
10 I don't quite so strongly as you do on some
11 of these things. In particular I just want
12 to say that overall I was just very pleased
13 at conceptually of what you're trying to do.
14 By not going -- by not using the FAR, you are
15 just able to do some things which I think
16 just gives this a very different kind of
17 residential character, particularly relative
18 to the projects that we've seen. And,
19 Mr. McKinnon, I'm not knocking your projects,
20 but they're big and they're bulky, and this
21 just has a different kind of feel that when I

1 saw it, I was just very pleased to see. I do
2 think Hugh's comments are valid, and quite
3 frankly I think a lot of them are things that
4 should be easy to fix.

5 I'm not quite as strong about the
6 residential -- the pedestrian feel along the
7 street. I -- quite frankly I found that the
8 -- even across the street, even though it has
9 a more pedestrian feel, that was hard for me
10 to grasp. You may have heard me mention that
11 just seeing the bike area there didn't seem
12 awfully pedestrian to me even though having
13 some of the units coming to the front was
14 different. But this actually has -- the
15 whole building has a pedestrian feel which I
16 think to me mitigates a little bit what
17 you're walking passed. They've gone through
18 a lot of effort architecturally to make that
19 kind of garage wall a little different. So
20 for me it's -- whereas, the other buildings
21 tended to be a little bit more formal, a

1 little bit more straight. They were just
2 using materials as a basis for giving you
3 some variety. And I think this just gives
4 you form in a way which I like. So I do, I
5 think most of the points you made are very --
6 I think that's the only one I don't feel as
7 strong as you do about that. I think most of
8 the points that you made particularly about
9 the flood plain in particular, I really would
10 like -- and that's something they can address
11 when we see them again. I would like to
12 understand exactly what you're doing with the
13 flood plain and how that works. I don't want
14 to repeat everything you said. So in general
15 I do agree with you. And definitely I agree
16 with Sue's comments. And so I just wanted to
17 just comment on that. Particularly around
18 the -- anything that you can do for fire
19 accesses and it doesn't appear that it's a
20 road that's looping around. And I guess the
21 thing I feel strongly about, you know,

1 Mr. Rafferty you commented on the fact that
2 there's not too much pedestrian activity
3 passed as you get passed because your people
4 are going in, but Sue said that they created
5 the access for Cambridge people to kind of
6 get to the -- to actually get to the
7 reservati on behi nd. And I actually thi nk
8 that -- I'd like to see the bui lding itsel f
9 acknowl edge that thi s is a pedestri an way
10 that's -- it's not just a little path, but
11 it's a pedestri an way that we're trying to
12 create. And what you see in the bui lding is
13 something that you'd want pedestri ans to see.
14 So your comments about havi ng the parki ng
15 right there and I was looki ng at that
16 elevati on, it woul d be nice if you can
17 acknowl edge it wi th some archi tectural
18 detai l. I thi nk you've done -- for me you've
19 done that in the front where you know peopl e
20 are wal king by the garage entrance, and that
21 even though it's kind of fake stuff, it seems

1 to be, you know, do it -- I think we need to
2 have something on that side for me. But I'll
3 just leave it there for the time being.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Tom, I think you're
5 up.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

7 I feel the way Bill does. I like what
8 you've done. I think it's very well
9 presented. I like the design of the
10 building. I think the colors and the
11 different plains are handsome. I think the
12 landscaping, the way it was both presented
13 and what you've done is excellent. So I'm
14 very favorably and disposed towards what I've
15 seen here. I like the low profile. I think
16 in many ways this is going to make for quite
17 a handsome street on what was, until very
18 recently, something very different. And I
19 think you're transforming a dead end street
20 into something that might, that I think will
21 be a destination.

1 I have two questions that are not big
2 ones on the street frontage. The first one
3 I'd like to understand a little bit better
4 how you decided to relate your opening and
5 entrance to the opening of 160 across the
6 street. I'm not saying that one opening has
7 to be right across the street from the other,
8 but when I see the bird's-eye view from on
9 high, it's a question that I have as to why
10 it's quite so out of kilter, one with the
11 other, and maybe you can help me understand
12 what your thinking was as to why you put that
13 there which is not where the other one is.
14 And I'm not saying that you needed to create
15 this great big space between the two of them,
16 but I'd like to understand better.

17 The other one is a question that it's a
18 modest one, but it's one that always bothers
19 me. These balconies are very handsome
20 balconies. They're spacious. They're
21 European in scope and size like we don't see

1 here. But we all know that balconies here
2 are storage spaces. They are bicycle racks.
3 They are all sorts of things that can ruin
4 what you've tried to create. And all the
5 rules in the world that you can impose on
6 tenants in their leases and whatever are
7 rarely enforced because it's such a difficult
8 thing to do, to come in and say, you know, we
9 don't like what you've done here. How do you
10 plan to manage that? Because whatever they
11 do on those balconies is going to be very
12 much a part of the streetscape. And so you
13 really can't allow that here. Something has
14 to be done.

15 That's it for the moment.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: And, Tom, also the
17 overall aesthetic for the building, too. You
18 know, if they have things hanging over the
19 balcony or bikes or whatever, I mean, it will
20 impact the way this building looks.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: Or it could enrich

1 the building. And how you keep it in the
2 enrichment mode rather than the tacky mode.

3 PAMELA WINTERS: Right, right.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well I rather
6 like the CambridgePark Drive facade.
7 However, I would like a lot more information
8 about the reservoir facade and the fingers
9 which I really don't care for in these
10 drawings. I mean, the one with the fingers
11 with two people walking on the reservoir
12 quite frankly look like Miami Beach motels
13 and hotels, and that certainly doesn't look
14 at all like the front. And so I'd like a lot
15 more detail about that and how that's going
16 to work.

17 I also, I'm curious about the
18 pedestrian feel and access and the
19 CambridgePark Drive facade and how it works
20 if we assume there is indeed auto parking on
21 CambridgePark Drive, because of all of your

1 pictures are lovely with a vast open area,
2 and I think it's going to look very different
3 with cars parked in front of it. And I'm
4 also curious -- I know, you know, parking
5 hasn't decided where the cars will go, but
6 how the access in and out of the driveway is
7 going to work with the cars parked in front
8 of the building if they do end up there.

9 Those are really my only comments and
10 concerns right at the moment and in addition
11 to the, you know, like you said before.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.

13 STEVEN WINTER: I don't always agree
14 with what Hugh says, but I do listen very
15 closely because I respect his judgment in
16 that respect.

17 I think this is, I think this is really
18 nice. I like a lot of things here. I like
19 the commitment to bike parking. Anybody in
20 Cambridge knows that in the past five years I
21 have think quadrupled might not be the word

1 too strong, but the number of bikes on the
2 street, the young people that work at my
3 office who are commuting on bikes is
4 exponentially just going forward very, very
5 fast. This is a great commitment. It's a
6 great place to be. It's a great statement by
7 the proponent. I like the visual through the
8 building. I like that a lot, to be able to
9 see on the -- through the building to the
10 preserve to the reservation in the back. I
11 think that the renderings are problematic,
12 I don't think they help me understand the
13 building. I think I've understood the
14 building in spite the renderings. I do like
15 the way the building is shaped in the front
16 and the way it meets the street, and I do
17 like the smaller balconied one, two, three,
18 four, story pieces that come out. And I
19 think it will make the pedestrians feel
20 pretty good on that.

21 I really like the, the rear of the

1 building, the way the three fingers come out,
2 the six, five, five, stories. And, again, I
3 think the renderings don't help me to realize
4 what they're going to look like, but in spite
5 of that I think they're going to be amazing
6 living spaces which is terrific, but they
7 also put eyes on the reservation, they put
8 eyes on the people who are back there, they
9 get some sense that somebody's watching them.
10 If you scream, somebody's going to hear you.
11 That's really, really positive. That's
12 really good.

13 I frequently picked up Zip cars at
14 Alewife T. I take the subway from my office
15 in Boston and I get -- pick them up at the
16 stations, Alewife is one of them, and they're
17 frequently booked. There's four out there.
18 So the addition of more would be really good.
19 It's perfect. I think, again, that's a real
20 good commitment because a lot of people are
21 doing that now.

1 And I think you're getting a lot of
2 thoughtful comments. I think that we're
3 looking forward to getting our head around to
4 what the building is going to look like, and
5 I'm not sure that we have that yet.

6 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: So shall we -- why
8 don't you, would you like to respond now?

9 ED HODGES: Just before we leave
10 this, on the balconies.

11 STEVEN WINTER: If you can pull that
12 podium right up, there's a lever. There you
13 go.

14 ED HODGES: On the balconies, you're
15 right, part of it will be a management thing.
16 One of the philosophies we have is we like to
17 let the architecture sort of dictate where
18 the balconies are. So there's not a balcony
19 on every unit. So hopefully the people that
20 love a balcony will self-select as Hugh said,
21 and be embracing the balconies. These all

1 happen to be on the south side so they're
2 next to plants and things like that. So
3 there's that design thinking behind sort of
4 where the balconies are. And the fact that
5 they're not in every unit. And the fact that
6 we have 244 bike parking spaces that are
7 secure and covered, hopefully mean that
8 people are not bringing their bikes up to the
9 apartments because they have a nice place to
10 store them down in the garage level.

11 I wanted to talk about this -- well,
12 actually... Sue pointed out a -- this, the
13 weeping willows here and all of this, these
14 trees along here, around that 35-foot wide
15 MBTA parcel, so they're not on our site. And
16 that is the attempt in this rendering is that
17 there's vegetation in here that we're trying
18 to mimic that exists that, you know, that we
19 can't cut down. And this is showing some of
20 the species that are being planted back there
21 which are, you know, wetland shrubs and stuff

1 that will get some height on them. So the
2 grade is, you know, relatively flat across
3 here, but there are some plantings. So it
4 wasn't, you know, Hugh, you're trying to do
5 this composite between the model that doesn't
6 exist in the picture that you have and so it
7 is relatively level here. And I think the --
8 we have planned that that road is permeable
9 paving, and anything less that we can do to
10 make it a road, we would certainly like to do
11 because we didn't want to have the road there
12 in the beginning because we really wanted to
13 connect the building to the reservation.

14 Location and the entrance.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

16 ED HODGES: So, in the connection of
17 this desire of saying that really to make
18 this idea work, the connection of the
19 reservation of the building, there has to be
20 one place at least where the grade comes into
21 the building and not on the podium. And I

1 think we were struck by these two willows
2 that existed here, and that that was the
3 logical place to have a view through the
4 building and in this courtyard and those kind
5 of magnificent trees. And you have to pair
6 that with the parking module that's under the
7 building and balance those two things back
8 and forth. And so that's set up where we
9 thought the best place for our entrance to
10 be. I mentioned that as we developed the
11 urban design along our side of the street,
12 the sidewalk is right at the edge of the
13 road, and then the trees are inboard as you
14 go down most of this side. So there's a
15 sidewalk and then there's often a landscape
16 portion back to the building. So we've
17 developed this building to be continuous with
18 that where there's the sidewalk, low
19 plantings, and the tree space so there's 15
20 feet here. So that wall is actually back
21 from the sidewalk with plantings adjacent to

1 the pedestrian way. But this building sets
2 back to the street opens up. So rather than
3 have the street, you know, open up again, we
4 felt it was important that our building kind
5 of hold the street edge here and then bend
6 away as this building comes back out to the
7 street and draw you in. And so the
8 combination of those dimensional regulations
9 -- requirements of the parking, the fact that
10 the trees here -- and we're really trying to
11 make the connection that our building is
12 really connected to the reservation respond
13 to this, but that's a stronger idea for the
14 project and that's how we picked the
15 entrance.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to
17 reiterate the importance of the east and the
18 west side as opposed to the north and south,
19 and just what's your feeling particularly
20 relative to the closeness of the other
21 buildings and the closeness that's around it.

1 You've put a lot of thought on the
2 CambridgePark Drive side and the reservation
3 side. I just want to make sure that you
4 really are thinking of that -- not just what
5 it means to your property, but what's the
6 urban feel that we're getting as you deal
7 with those. And I just find it interesting.
8 Well, one, I just never would have imagined a
9 few years ago that we would have the quantity
10 of housing in this particular location. And
11 it can really -- as you said, it can
12 transform this to be something that it really
13 isn't. But it is a fairly urban mix use
14 area, you know, office spaces. And so it
15 does, I don't mind a sort of urban quality
16 and character to it. But I just -- I just
17 try to imagine what it would be if you did
18 say we wanted to use the full FAR potential,
19 which it would be just a very different kind
20 of thing, and this gives it a little bit of
21 relief that I think is really going to make

1 this improve how this looks.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: With that plan
3 up there, when you come back I really would
4 like to see a full rendering of the front
5 facade with the driveways. Assuming the
6 driveways are staying there. I mean, how
7 they relate to that little pedestrian path to
8 the front door I think is really problematic,
9 and I really would like a lot more clarity on
10 how that's going to work.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I assume you
12 mean not just a flat elevation, but something
13 a little bigger to give us a sense of the
14 quality of the street as you're walking down.

15 H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, right.
16 The drawing that we have in here showed the
17 pedestrian access but don't show the
18 driveway.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: I hope they'll come
21 back and they'll have the driveways moved

1 and we'll solve that problem.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: That would be a
3 great solution.

4 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Could we
5 share with you for 30 seconds, because we
6 spent a lot of time with the prior alignment
7 which has led to this alignment, to get that
8 second driveway really away from the entry.
9 And maybe you could just identify where the
10 driveway used to be.

11 ED HODGES: Yeah. So originally we
12 talked about the fact that there were the two
13 garages. So there was an entry here. And
14 then there was a pedestrian paved, but the
15 cars could actually come across and we
16 entered the other garage here, so it was
17 perpendicular to the street so, you know.

18 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It didn't
19 face off the street.

20 ED HODGES: Thinking that, you know,
21 the cars wouldn't be, you know, if they went

1 in this garage and coming back out on to the
2 street. And then there's -- without the sort
3 of on street parking, there's a functional
4 concern that people come and, you know, they
5 see the entrance to the building and then
6 they -- the visitors need to find a garage,
7 you know, not, you know, hidden from them but
8 easy for them to find. But after talking
9 with Community Development we decided that,
10 yes, that made sense and that we would move
11 this garage down here so that it was still
12 visible to find on the street if, you know,
13 they passed to see where the entrance was.

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Roger.

15 ROGER BOOTHE: Hugh, could I add a
16 little bit?

17 ED HODGES: Sure.

18 ROGER BOOTHE: Certainly the
19 questions you're raising are ones that we had
20 as well. And I would say that we spent a lot
21 of time with them thinking about the street

1 edge. And while we never loved to have curb
2 cuts and garage entries, I actually had
3 suggested the very thing you did, Hugh, which
4 was put them around to the sides. As I think
5 more about that, I mean you realize this
6 building is 440 feet long.

7 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

8 ROGER BOOTHE: So it may not be such
9 a bad thing to have some activity coming and
10 going as much I hate cars and I hate garages.
11 The other thing I think is really working
12 well here is the sort of orthogonal treatment
13 across the street with the really subtle
14 diagonal that the architect has worked in
15 here. I think that really -- I hope these
16 two work together, and certainly I shared
17 some of Bill's concern were all of those
18 bicycles really working? But it was still,
19 it was hard -- they really worked hard on the
20 other side of the street to find some way to
21 animate it. Bicycling is like the cache

1 because it's the whole area as far as I'm
2 concerned. We're all talking about it and
3 it's real. So they had the bicycles but they
4 haven't made it such a feature. And I think
5 if you could go, Ed, to the image that shows
6 your view down the street and how you relate
7 to the street that the perspective -- yes,
8 that one.

9 You know, I think, I think this is
10 maybe something that Bill was saying, that
11 volumetrically it's really strong and you
12 know where the entry is here because of the
13 way the volumes work and the inflection
14 towards neighbors, I think it's really great.
15 Your point, Hugh, about doing something more
16 with the ground floor elevation, I'm sure
17 that they can do better on that. Going
18 around the corners, the parking under the
19 building, I agree something should happen
20 there, but I don't want to lose sight of the
21 fact that I think there's a lot of really

1 good happeni ng here and I really gi ve them a
2 lot of credi t for thi nki ng about havi ng a
3 very di fferent ki nd of archi tecture and the
4 lower el ements and the sort of qui eter vol ume
5 in the back. And I was so exci ted to see an
6 actual at grade rel ati onshi p out to the
7 reservati on. Because i f we -- al l we had
8 were podi ums here, I thi nk i t's really a
9 shame. I worry that we have too much of the
10 podi um approach out here. We had that
11 di scussi on before wi th the Board. How do we
12 do that? We are stuck wi th the flood pl ai n.
13 And i f we're out bui ldi ng here, we have to
14 deal wi th that responsi bly. And wi th these
15 ki nd of l arge scal ed bui ldi ngs, there are
16 l i mi ts wi th what you can do wi th that. So
17 I'm feel i ng pretty good about thi s wi th a l ot
18 of the great observati ons the Board has made
19 toni ght and suggesti ons for your study. So
20 we're happy to work wi th them before they
21 come back agai n, and I j ust I do thi nk

1 there's a lot of synergy here potentially in
2 terms of this project.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I certainly
4 don't disagree with all you say about the
5 strong points and what all the rest of what
6 people have said. It's a very strong project
7 and very well thought out, but I think it can
8 be a little better.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I just want to
10 agree with Ted, that this rendering, I think,
11 is a good example of the fact that we really
12 don't get a good sense of the curb cut and
13 the garage door. It's kind of masked in just
14 the angle of where things are. So being able
15 to really get a good sense of that, and quite
16 frankly I won't know how I feel about the
17 second curb cut until I actually get a better
18 sense of what is the visual pedestrian impact
19 as you're going by.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I think we've
21 said what we need to say tonight. Very good.

1 Thank you very much for bringing us
2 such a handsome building and we look forward
3 to seeing you again.

4 So I guess we have one more item on our
5 agenda. We're trying to get out of here by
6 ten o'clock.

7 IRAM FAROOQ: We will do what we
8 have to say in 20 minutes.

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: I'm going to
10 start since you guys want to get out of here
11 as fast as possible.

12 So, this is about Kendall Square, and
13 it's about Third and Broadway. And so a
14 couple of meetings ago we talked about
15 Kendall Square and I think I was asked at the
16 time do I have any worries about the
17 transportation impacts of the Zoning proposal
18 and the Zoning change? And I think I said
19 something broadly supportive that I thought
20 it was volatile. And what I want to just
21 highlight tonight very quickly is it's not a

1 probl em provi ded we' re very careful wi th
2 what' s done at Thi rd and Broadway. So as
3 part of the Kendal l Square work, we do
4 cri ti cal sums trying to i denti fy -- it' s a
5 crude traffi c engi neeri ng tool that we use to
6 try to use to i denti fy wi th the devel opment
7 bui ld out. Are there i ntersecti ons whi ch are
8 parti cul arly sensi ti ve and for whi ch we mi ght
9 want to be very careful? And the onl y
10 i ntersecti on that has been i denti fi ed for
11 Kendal l, Central, and the transi ti on area, i s
12 Thi rd and Broadway. So I wanted to j ust
13 qui ckly talk a l i ttle bi t about thi s i ssue
14 and sort of l eave you wi th a broad sense of
15 where I' m comi ng from.

16 So i f you l ook at the very fi rst
17 graphi c, that chart that shows the uses on
18 Mai n Street, the sort of take-away message
19 here i s that the auto use share of Mai n
20 Street acti vi ti es for cars i s very small .
21 The bul k of the acti vi ti es that are happeni ng

1 on Main Street today is the MBTA users, the
2 pedestrians that are walking up and down on
3 the sidewalk, and the pedestrians that are
4 crossing the street. And that very much
5 defines the character of Main Street today.

6 So now we go back to the beginning.

7 IRAM FAROOQ: No, I'll catch up
8 wherever you are.

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So one of the
10 images that's been shared with the Board
11 though this process is the work that the East
12 Cambridge Community did with CBT looking at a
13 rendering of a future use of Main Street that
14 I think Board members were very happy with.
15 This is the rendering now that's showing up
16 here in which it -- different people may have
17 different things they like about this, but it
18 shows Main Street with a very prominent role
19 giving representing Kendall Square with Main
20 Street is a very dominant factor. However
21 when I look at this picture, it scares the

1 living day lights out of me. And it does it
2 for a couple of reasons. So we took this
3 picture and tried to say okay, what does that
4 really mean in boring old transportation
5 details? And this is boring old
6 transportation details. But essentially if
7 you're trying to have Broadway continue
8 through from the bridge on Broadway and
9 you're trying to make a straight connection
10 into Main Street because you want that
11 identification of Main Street as part of
12 Kendall Square, and you're also trying to get
13 the connection between Third Street down into
14 Main Street, and you're making all of the
15 vehicle moves happen. It's a lot of street
16 and a lot of moves. And when do those moves,
17 you end up with these three S's which are
18 signals to try to manage that to make all of
19 that piece work, and it starts to be a very
20 auto dependent piece of transportation. And
21 when you have a very short block between

1 signals like this, it also is very hard for
2 us because you have to run things really well
3 because otherwise if you don't make it work,
4 it messes up the intersection behind. So
5 this loses the median. It provides a lot of
6 paving. So she's making me keep going. This
7 is very good.

8 IRAM FAROOQ: (I naudi ble).

9 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Nope, nope. Keep
10 going.

11 IRAM FAROOQ: Sorry.

12 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So this is now
13 taking the CBT rendering and trying to say
14 how do you take the black and yellow drawing,
15 I was just talking about and you put it on a
16 rendering? So you end up with these three
17 signals that are in close proximity with the
18 park isolated in the middle of it. You lose
19 the planted median that's coming off the
20 bridge as you enter into the area. The size
21 of the Point Park gets really substantially

1 reduced. So you lose almost a third of the
2 space that you had at Point Park. And then
3 the -- when you're making the move between
4 going straight on Main or being able to go
5 down Broadway, you end up with a lot of
6 pavement in that sort of area just as -- just
7 before the park.

8 Keep going.

9 And I should just say that Main is
10 about half the traffic volume today as
11 Broadway. And the westbound move on Main is
12 about 20 percent of the Main Street volume.
13 So. . . .

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, because only
15 busses can do it.

16 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Right. But the
17 character of Main Street, if you like
18 anything about Main Street today, and I
19 happen to like things about Main Street
20 today, part of it is there's not a lot of
21 vehicle volume on it.

1 Okay. So now this -- we've been
2 working on the Main Street design which
3 Public Works has been lead on. And what
4 we're trying to do in that design in this
5 intersection is to in the top -- they walked
6 off with it, that was their little thing. In
7 the top corner we're squaring off the
8 intersection so the busses don't have that
9 sweeping turn in, and adding that crosswalk
10 connection that goes really from the
11 intersection of Broadway and Third to the
12 head house that's on Main Street where you
13 have a -- and you have the new front of
14 Google or Microsoft or whoever it was.

15 You're adding the bike lanes in this
16 case to a bike move that continues between
17 Main, but you're adding just a southbound
18 vehicle and bus move from Third Street into
19 Main Street which is something that we're
20 advocating because we're trying to provide a
21 transit connection that we don't currently

1 have to get good service into Kendall Station
2 and hopefully some day in the future we'll
3 have urban Rindge service that goes from
4 Sullivan and beyond to Main and beyond.

5 And then you've got the ability to have
6 a bigger Point Park where you could have a
7 really nice new signature entry into Kendall
8 Square which is a substantial nice thing
9 right there that anchors this. And then the
10 piece of Main Street that is going through
11 that's red in this drawing, and the little
12 piece of the connection, are streets that
13 need to have a very strong, strong pedestrian
14 orientation. And so you're backing the park
15 and this piece of Main Street up with the
16 clock tower building, and maybe some day MIT
17 will do something nice at Eastgate that will
18 also enhance what you've got there. And so
19 rather than having a heavy traffic move that
20 separates this, you've got a much more low
21 volume, pedestrian-friendly street. And so

1 then that ties in with the design that we
2 have for Main Street that takes the median
3 out, takes the signal out at the head house,
4 creates a really strong pedestrian crossing
5 between the bus and properties plaza, and
6 whatever work that MIT will be doing on the
7 other side. And the widened sidewalks allow
8 you to have a lot of activity on that street
9 to make that a really nice street.

10 And then just these, these slides come
11 with Advil, but essentially we looked at a
12 lot of different traffic operations for the
13 intersection of Third and Broadway, and
14 everything we did when we started adding more
15 and more traffic movements in the one we're
16 recommending, which is the upper right, we
17 get to a level of service. And these are
18 better than what the implementation of the
19 CBT kind of designed with the roads around
20 the park we do. So because in critical sums
21 this is such an important intersection, we

1 want to be careful about making sure it
2 continues to work for the future.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I'd like to
4 respond because I think I've been completely
5 misunderstood.

6 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Okay.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I don't, you know, if
8 you say this is the way cars have to be
9 handled to make it work, I'm fine with that.

10 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Okay.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: What I'm not fine
12 with is the notion that there's some like --
13 that there's a superhighway that comes in and
14 terminates -- the Longfellow Bridge, people
15 run at 50 miles an hour and they don't slow
16 down until they hit that traffic light. That
17 bothers me a lot. That means they're giving
18 away this space as to a highway.

19 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So I think --

20 HUGH RUSSELL: And that's point A.

21 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes, okay.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: And point B is I
2 don't think the character of Main Street that
3 you're suggesting is significant enough from
4 an urban point of view. There's no there
5 there. I mean, I think it's great -- I mean,
6 I don't disagree with the character, but to
7 say that's the middle of it where, you know,
8 it's, it's like the pedestrian mall in the
9 middle of Kalamazoo. You know? It's not,
10 it's not a square, it's a pedestrian street.
11 And I think we need, and this is what I think
12 was the core of the CBT thing was, we need a
13 place to say this is the center of Kendall
14 Square from an architectural and an urban
15 design point of view. And I mean, if you
16 look at Harvard Square as an example, it's
17 very clear what the center of Harvard Square
18 is. The cars, you know, they're really
19 highly constrained at Harvard Square. And it
20 doesn't affect the urban character of it
21 being a center. And I'm worried that if you

1 just put a nice leafy green park at the end
2 of the superhighway, you're not creating the
3 right urban experience.

4 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: So let me say
5 something about the Longfellow Bridge. The
6 Longfellow Bridge design which is hopefully
7 being advertised shortly, will be under
8 construction for the next four years. So for
9 the next four years it's not going to be a
10 highway. But the design has a single lane
11 from Boston to Cambridge. So there's a
12 reduction.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: What do you mean?

14 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It goes from two
15 lanes to one lane from Boston to Cambridge.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are they doing what
17 they're doing on the other bridges by putting
18 a bike lane?

19 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: The additional
20 space is a bike lane, but a bike area bigger.
21 So it's a, it's a pretty substantial change.

1 In addition, the construction -- during the
2 four years of construction, it's going to be
3 one lane from Boston to Cambridge and zero
4 lanes -- no. One lane from Cambridge to
5 Boston and zero lanes coming into the city.
6 So it's a -- it's going to be a single lane
7 operation for quite a long time during the
8 construction of the bridge.

9 When the construction is done, the
10 bridge is then finished, it will be two lanes
11 from Cambridge to Boston and one lane coming
12 in and with wide, some wide -- sidewalk
13 widening and some bicycle lanes. And the
14 area from the base of the bridge to Third and
15 Broadway will undergo a lot of different
16 detour scenarios because they have to build
17 -- they really have to build three chunks of
18 bridge. They have to build the to Boston
19 lane. They have to rebuild the section the
20 Red Line is on, and they have to rebuild the
21 section that's coming the other way. And

1 during all that of phasing they're flipping
2 travel lanes and the Red Line and that's why
3 it's only ending up a one lane because the
4 commitment is keep the Red Line running the
5 whole time, make sure we don't lose the
6 transit service. Make the -- the drivers are
7 the ones that have to go around.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are they
9 repositioning the Red Line tracks? Are they
10 still going to be right in the middle of the
11 bridge?

12 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: They're going to
13 be back to being in the middle, but during
14 construction they'll be flipped in order for
15 the middle to be rebuilt.

16 So when they're done, in order to get
17 all of the detours and the things to work,
18 they're going to have dug up a section of
19 Main Street from the portal of the Red Line
20 to Third and Broadway for detours. And so
21 we're working with the Highway Department

1 about what that would look like in the
2 future. So I think there's some wonderful
3 opportunities, if there's only one lane on
4 the bridge, to continue that kind of a
5 different look and feel of that highway down
6 further to Third and Broadway and then at
7 some point we're going to want to pick up the
8 right turn going north on Third.

9 So I think what you think of today as
10 the bridge just coming through and dumping
11 vehicles into this area is going to be quite
12 different in the future. So I think there's
13 a real -- it's hard because there's a Main
14 Street design that's ready to go forward.
15 There's a bridge that's going to be in
16 construction for four years so your time
17 frames are really different on these things.
18 But I think there's a real opportunity here
19 to not have something where you have this
20 highway that's dumping you at a park and then
21 you're trying to figure out how do you know

1 you're in Kendall Square? How do you know
2 what the place is and that you've gotten
3 there and this is where it is? Because I
4 think we share the goal you're talking about,
5 you know, I want to retreat and say I'm just
6 the traffic person here and you can figure
7 out how to make it a place. But I think
8 we're trying to use all of these things plus
9 the changes that the bridge represents as --
10 and the opportunities that it represents to
11 really be recreating that to really make this
12 a much better place than what it is in the
13 past.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: Right now coming off
15 the bridge if you want to go down Main
16 Street, you go to one of the next two
17 intersections and cut over, and that's been
18 working that way for a long time. And it
19 doesn't seem to be anything that needs to be
20 fixed about that.

21 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. And I, I

1 think it's helpful to hear you talk about
2 what it is about the CBT plan that is
3 appealing to you and what you hope it would
4 accomplish. Because we probably don't have
5 as much of a difference in the goals, but
6 it's figuring out how to get there is much
7 harder.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: I can say, though,
9 that what you just described to me is a
10 significant enough transportation change in
11 the future that that needs to be incorporated
12 into what we're doing in this, and it's not
13 just a side little thing, that hey, this is
14 happening and we gotta -- that's significant,
15 I think, and how you, you know.

16 IRAM FAROOQ: And that has all been
17 factored into the analysis that we did. So
18 when we did critical sums analyses, we
19 resumed all of the future intersection
20 alignments. Just on the urban design and
21 public space piece, I think again, just like,

1 Sue, I just want to echo that it's really
2 useful to hear you articulate the components
3 that you like most. Because Stuart and
4 others are embarking on this open space
5 analysis and the surveys are out. So that's
6 going to be really useful input for that
7 process as it proceeds. And as you can see,
8 these three diagrams were all done by each of
9 the different consultants, and everybody has
10 a perspective that starts from Point Park.
11 So one is MIT CBT and Goody Clancy. And they
12 all are envisioning it as an active public
13 space, a lot of paving in all of those
14 analyses. And so I think it's consistent
15 that there will be, that it is anticipated to
16 be one of the very important (inaudible) and
17 we'll probably have two.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: Can I -- how?

19 IRAM FAROOQ: How?

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: How?

21 IRAM FAROOQ: How will we get people

1 there?

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: How we get there?

3 Yes, that to me is the critical question. I
4 mean, and I agree with you, all three of
5 those things, but I think we're -- the kind
6 of -- and maybe you all discussed this when I
7 wasn't here last time, but I think that, if
8 you want to make Point Park a place, what
9 does that mean? I mean, obviously what Sue
10 has just described in terms of transportation
11 and streets around it, is very important.
12 Hugh just said that, you know -- but I mean I
13 guess that's the core thing. When all is
14 said and done, what is it that we're going to
15 be recommending that we do to make that
16 happen? And one of the things that we can do
17 is look and see how the traffic pattern
18 changes. The other to do is the size of the,
19 you know, what kind of -- how pedestrian do
20 we want it? How cars do we want it? And the
21 size. And obviously Sue's -- not necessarily

1 Sue's, but those are the kinds of options
2 that you need to look at. And granted, you
3 can say that this one is -- its pros is that
4 it creates a bigger park, but the cons is
5 that it makes level of service at less
6 intersections. And I guess that's what I'm
7 -- that's what I'm struggling with this whole
8 project is the how. I think we're seeing
9 lots of visions as to --

10 IRAM FAROOQ: Actually, fortunately
11 the intersection that has the large footprint
12 for the park also -- and maybe we shouldn't
13 call it park or maybe we should call it plaza
14 or something.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Or square. Which
16 is, I like that terminology.

17 IRAM FAROOQ: Square's good.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's not a square.

19 IRAM FAROOQ: Inasmuch as Harvard
20 Square is a square.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yeah, yeah.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Squares in Cambridge
2 are not square.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: They're not
4 triangles.

5 IRAM FAROOQ: One solution that is
6 not (inaudible) is the one that works. So in
7 that case the two goals are actually in
8 alignment. I think there will be an urban
9 design piece to this as well in terms of what
10 the buildings are around the square. And
11 that -- also, the Board needs to think about
12 and I'm going to let Roger speak.

13 ROGER BOOTHE: Let me just say
14 something because Hugh raised the Harvard
15 Square example, and Hugh and I have spent
16 since 1986 dealing with the Harvard Square
17 Overlay District. If you remember back when
18 we did the guidelines, I think we're at a
19 point kind of where we are here, Quincy
20 Square was a dead intersection where busses
21 laid over. We had a whole process of dealing

1 with Quincy Square. We all think of
2 certainly the T as being the heart of Harvard
3 Square, but, you know, it has gone through a
4 lot of transformations as well at the T
5 station. And then Winthrop Square was
6 forgotten. And now since we went through
7 that process and redesigned Winthrop Square,
8 it's fabulous.

9 Look at Charles Square which was a
10 train yard, and now it's vibrant and lively
11 with all those things. And so I'm just
12 saying I think we're at the point where we're
13 trying to get the vision and out here in the
14 spiral -- we're kind of far out, and we're
15 getting -- it's going to be a while before we
16 get down to, you know, exactly resolving the
17 kind of issues that Sue is saying. We all
18 want it to be soon, but the truth is these
19 things take time.

20 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, but I think we
21 have a Harvard Square example which we can

1 I learn from.

2 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

3 WILLIAM TIBBS: You know, and when I
4 ask the question how, we have a good example
5 from 1986 to 2012 --

6 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- what did we do in
8 terms of our Zoning, in terms of our
9 initiatives, in terms of our overlays --

10 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

11 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- which caused
12 those great things to happen. And can we do
13 that and can we compress it?

14 ROGER BOOTHE: Right.

15 WILLIAM TIBBS: I mean within
16 reason, within reason given the development
17 potential that's here, which is very
18 different than the kind of development that
19 potentially we had.

20 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: And also we had the

1 T that was making major changes in Harvard
2 Square that we can piggy back on. And we
3 have a bridge construction which is making
4 some changes at which -- that's what I'm
5 saying. What are the catalysts -- when I say
6 how, that's what I'm just asking. What are
7 our tools that we're using, understanding
8 it's going to take time to do that, but
9 whatever the tools and let's learn from that
10 experience that you've just, that you've just
11 mentioned.

12 ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I don't want to
13 go on too long, but I do feel like Point Park
14 is so important. It will never be the center
15 of Kendall Square, but it's multiple centers
16 and that's the kind of bracelet idea, that we
17 have a whole bunch of things, kind of like
18 Harvard Square. While the heart is there at
19 the T station, every one of those other
20 spaces is essential to the things surrounding
21 it. And I think we're at a point where we're

1 going to start taking what is then counted
2 nothing spaces and really making them
3 fabulous, and it is going to take a lot of
4 process, lots of hours. You know, a whole
5 committee that definitely looks at Point Park
6 and so forth.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I ask a
8 question? What Boston Properties is now
9 doing to so-called Point Park, productive or
10 that completely irrelevant to how we see this
11 going forward?

12 ROGER BOOTHE: I think it's, frankly
13 it's sort of irrelevant.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: And, therefore,
15 why are they doing that?

16 ROGER BOOTHE: Well, they're not
17 doing that much to Point Park right now.
18 It's the truth. We want to take a step back
19 and look at the necklace, and this is
20 something that, you know, our committee has
21 really gotten excited about, the thought of

1 this necklace. This is something where I was
2 totally thinking the CBT plan and Cambridge
3 congruent plan, and really think out of the
4 box and realize what we have out there is
5 pretty much all mediocre and inadequate in
6 terms of open space, but there's tremendous
7 potential, and it's going to take lots of
8 time.

9 To Bill's point, I think we can learn
10 that Harvard Square is one example. And
11 we've learned a lot about a lot of these
12 things, and I think we're going to be
13 spending sometime as part of that whole
14 process that will flow out of the big picture
15 that you all are looking at at this point.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I want to
17 make two points about why this is not a Point
18 Park. This is an important place, the most
19 important place in the district. It's the
20 place where MIT, Microsoft, Department of
21 Transportation, Innovation Center all face

1 each other. The big, big players. Microsoft
2 stands in for a bunch of big players, but --

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: And the Sloan
4 School.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, you know, and
7 MIT with their Sloan School, their black tar
8 building. But these players are all facing
9 each other.

10 The second thing that's really
11 important to me is that Third Street is
12 really important because of what's out Third
13 Street. The Cambridge Research Park is out
14 Third Street. The Alexandria properties are
15 out Third Street, you know. The shopping
16 Galleria is out Third Street. East Cambridge
17 residential neighborhood, they're part of it,
18 is out Third Street. And, you know, the --
19 and so that, that wave is as important.

20 And perhaps a fourth thing is, you
21 know, it's the entrance to the city when you

1 do come across that bridge however few people
2 will come. I mean, I'm not surprised that
3 it's one lane because I drive that a lot and
4 there's never -- there's never traffic coming
5 that way. But so it's not a huge traffic
6 flow coming across the bridge that's coming
7 that way but it is symbolic to Cambridge.

8 ROGER BOOTHE: We'll have more and
9 more bicycles when we get to Alewife.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And we also
11 in these traffic plans really go beyond what
12 we're doing with bicycles. I mean, should
13 bicycles be able to make that left on to Main
14 Street? A lot of them would certainly like
15 to, but if that takes a phase, it will blow
16 everything.

17 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: No, we've talked
18 about it. We've talked about it. I mean,
19 fortunately you can run the bicycles on a two
20 legged left which you can't really do with
21 cars because you don't have anywhere to put

1 them. So, yes, I think that the level of
2 flexibility for the bikes can be better than
3 what it is for.

4 PAMELA WINTERS: Sue, let me ask you
5 a question. And so if I wanted to get from
6 Mass. General to Cambridge, how would I do
7 that?

8 HUGH RUSSELL: For the next four
9 years?

10 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, the next four
11 years.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: Take the T.

13 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: You get admitted
14 and then get out in four years. No.

15 The detour will be to O'Brien Highway.
16 So you would, you would get on Storrow Drive
17 and go up to Leverett Circle. Or you would
18 get out and go down Storrow Drive to Mass.
19 Ave.

20 PAMELA WINTERS: Oh, so could you
21 also go down Charles Street, go down Berkeley

1 (sic) Street, and then go out Storrow Drive
2 that way?

3 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Yes. I mean,
4 pretty much all the Boston connections are
5 being maintained. And this is -- it's more
6 draconian than it seems when they were doing
7 the work on O'Brien Highway when they were
8 doing one direction and everybody thought it
9 was a disaster. But when it's totally
10 closed, people know there's no chance of
11 getting through and so they go --

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Find other ways.

13 SUSAN CLIPPINGER: In some ways when
14 you do the more draconian thing, it's almost
15 easier.

16 WILLIAM TIBBS: As opposed to what
17 they're doing in the Harvard Bridge right
18 now.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I would like to
20 ask for sort of a request from the staff.
21 Lay out for us what you think you're going to

1 be doing over the next month or two because
2 we're not going to be taking this up. And
3 sort of a bulleted list with what you think
4 you've heard from us. What you're going to
5 do. What the process is doing. Because I
6 think none of us are very clear about that.
7 Bill made that point. So I think I'm still
8 awake you might want to --

9 IRAM FAROOQ: You want us to do it
10 now?

11 HUGH RUSSELL: No.

12 BRIAN MURPHY: I think, Iram, you
13 should probably jump in, and Roger as well.
14 The one thing that's going on now in terms of
15 as we talk about the open space in the area,
16 we will be making, I think, significant
17 progress on putting out what the public
18 process will be around the open space because
19 there are a number of important open space
20 projects that will be going forward in this
21 area. The Alexandria Park just to name one

1 of them, for example, but that would be a
2 very significant addition to the necklace and
3 what we do about that. And so I hope in the
4 next month I hope we can sort of announce
5 what that will be and how that will look
6 going forward. I know we'll have still have
7 conversations with MIT. I know MIT is going
8 through its process and try to get a sense
9 from them of when they'll be ready to go.
10 And now they're in the wait mode and soon
11 they'll be in a hurry-up mode if I had to
12 predict where things are going to go. But I
13 think they still have to go through their
14 internal process.

15 I think we will continue to work I
16 think on language in terms of what we want to
17 come forward. I'm not -- are there any
18 particular subjects --

19 IRAM FAROOQ: Design guidelines.

20 BRIAN MURPHY: Design guidelines,
21 yes.

1 IRAM FAROOQ: I think that one of
2 the things that we really would like to talk
3 to all of you about is the big picture issues
4 that actually -- well, not big picture in
5 conceptual, but big picture in terms of
6 things that apply to the whole area in
7 Kendall Square. Things like we talked about
8 a Kendall Square fund that we contribute to
9 various positive things that are needed in
10 the area. We've talked about the public
11 space piece, but we've also -- I'm trying to
12 think whatever. Well, maybe even just a
13 discussion of how, how height -- how we feel
14 about height in the area. Which we haven't,
15 you know, we've sort of had -- you told us
16 what you think. But we're really trying to
17 compare what happens if you try to
18 accommodate the same amount of density in a
19 lower height limit and what that might look
20 and feel like. So we'd like to bring you
21 that information, the design guidelines,

1 because those will all dovetail to influence
2 what the place will feel like. So that's
3 kind of what we'd like to do and bring to you
4 in October 30th which I think is the next
5 time we're slated to be here for this.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess I do want to
8 say that you said that you asked that they
9 tell us just kind of what you're going to be
10 doing, but I'd like to see kind of a plan of
11 what we're trying to accomplish within -- by
12 the time that MIT comes in hurry up. Because
13 what's going to happen is at some point we're
14 going to have to act on something, and I just
15 want to know -- I guess we've got to corral
16 this in some sort of way and what's your
17 ideas as to how that's going to happen that
18 we're going to -- you know, Roger, you just
19 talked about other committees. Is this going
20 on for another six months? Is it going on --
21 I just don't have a good sense of the process

1 here. We're talking about a lot of stuff,
2 but what's the process? And this time, by
3 the end of the year or this time next year
4 where will we be, kind of and what's our
5 goal?

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We're
7 adjourned.

8 (Whereupon, at 10:55 p.m., the
9 Planning Board Adjourned.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE I NSTRUCTI ONS

2
3 The original of the Errata Sheet has
4 been delivered to Community Development
5 Department.

6 When the Errata Sheet has been
7 completed and signed, a copy thereof should
8 be delivered to each party of record and the
9 ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development
10 Department, to whom the original transcript
11 was delivered.

12
13 I NSTRUCTI ONS

14 After reading this volume of the
15 transcript deposition, indicate any
16 corrections or changes and the reasons
17 therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you
18 and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations
19 on the transcript volume itself.

20 REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE
21 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 1st day of October 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.