

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, October 30, 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
- Ahmed Nur, Member

Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for
Community Development

Community Development Staff:
Susan Glazer
Liza Paden
Roger Booth
Stuart Dash
Jeff Roberts
Taha Jennings

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

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

I N D E X

<u>CASE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
GENERAL BUSINESS	
Board of Zoning Appeal Cases - Telecommunication antenna special permits Sanofi Sign Variance Request	
Update, Brian Murphy	
Adoption of Meeting Transcript (s)	
PUBLIC HEARINGS Continued	
PB#272, 165 CambridgePark Drive	
PB#274, 51 Cedar Street Section 5.53 Rich Brawn, Applicant	
GENERAL BUSINESS	
Bike Parking Zoning discussion	
PB#231A-159 First Street, Residential building design review	

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This
3 is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board,
4 and first item on our agenda is a review of
5 telecom antennas. And I guess they're
6 working diligently to try to hook up the
7 electronics.

8 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Good
9 evening, Mr. Chairman, for the record Ricardo
10 Sousa on behalf of the Applicant T-Mobile.
11 In the event that we can't get the slides up,
12 I do have hard copies of all the various
13 simulations and plans. If you'd like to
14 proceed I can do that.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: So, let's do that.

16 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So we have
17 four tonight to be heard, two of them are
18 new. They are 10 Canal Park and 8-10 Arrow
19 Street. And then two others are revisits
20 where we've gone back and improved the
21 design. That would be 678 Mass. Ave. and 80

1 Sherman Street. What I'd like to do with
2 your permission, Mr. Chairman and members of
3 the Board, is go to 10 Canal Park.

4 And so you have photo simulations in
5 front of you for 10 Canal Park. It's the one
6 right underneath all the way at the bottom.

7 And so this is a continuing effort by
8 T-Mobile to upgrade its wireless antenna
9 installations. And in this case we have six
10 current panel antennas that are located on
11 the facade of the penthouse of the building,
12 and we are simply replacing those with six
13 new air antennas for T-Mobile and we're also
14 removing the pipe mounts so that we get
15 closer to the facade of the penthouse and
16 we're replacing those pipe mounts with low
17 profile brackets. So in this case there's
18 really a de minimus effect. We're
19 essentially placing the new antennas in the
20 exact same location as the old antennas. So
21 those photo simulations show fairly well.

1 I'm sorry, Mr. Winter, I don't have an extra
2 copy.

3 STEVEN WINTER: I'm looking over
4 here which is just fine.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I've already
6 been convinced. If somebody wants to look at
7 this.

8 I think the advantage here is that the
9 existing mounting already meets a lot of our
10 standards. It's on a setback penthouse.

11 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, it's
12 very difficult to even see this installation
13 when you're in that area because the building
14 is so far set in from Monsignor O'Brien
15 Highway, for example. And it's shielded on
16 one side by the Hotel Marlowe and, you know,
17 it's very difficult to see.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: So are we all agreed
19 that that's okay?

20 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. It actually
21 looks like it's set back a little bit even

1 more than the proposed conditions, looks like
2 it's even further -- a little narrower; is
3 that correct?

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: With
5 removing the pipe mounts actually does
6 streamline the design a little bit. It gets
7 you closer to the wall. It does.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Great.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, No. 2.

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And I'd
11 like to hand out some of these.

12 LIZA PADEN: Excuse me, is that no
13 comments or no objections?

14 HUGH RUSSELL: No objection.

15 LIZA PADEN: Okay, thank you.

16 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Members of
17 the Board, this is 8 to 10 Arrow Street. So
18 this is another existing T-Mobile
19 installation. We have currently three panel
20 antennas that are located on the smokestack
21 of this building, and we're simply taking out

1 those existing three panel antennas and
2 replacing them with three new ones. And also
3 improving the mounting mechanisms by removing
4 the pipe mounts and replacing them with low
5 profile brackets as well. So I think this is
6 also a real de minimus effect on the
7 installation. And, you know, the benefit of
8 these antennas, especially with a site like
9 this where you're utilizing a smokestack, is
10 that you don't have the remote radioheads
11 underneath the antennas or behind them. The
12 remote radioheads in the T-Mobile antennas
13 are literally built into the antenna and so
14 it's one unit and that is a benefit.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: And the others,
16 the previous -- where are the remote heads
17 for the Canal Street?

18 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So those
19 are -- for the other carriers?

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: On the first one
21 that we saw.

1 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So on the
2 first installation same type of antenna.
3 They're in the one unit. They're within the
4 antenna. But my comparison was two other
5 carriers. So a Sprint or an AT&T typically
6 has a -- the antenna, a jumper, and then the
7 remote radi head. So these are really nice
8 antennas.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: What are you going
10 to say when you represent those other
11 carriers?

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We're going
13 to try as best we can to hide those remote
14 radi heads. And I think we've done a pretty
15 good job, you know. But I have to say
16 truthfully Sprint is not on this building or
17 on this smokestack. It would be hard to hide
18 that remote radi head for another carrier.
19 Where if you're on a rooftop, you can hide it
20 behind a parapet wall, down below on the
21 penthouse. There are ways to hide them. And

1 I think we've done that on the other
2 installations.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: I will say that a
4 faux chimney is one thing, but a chimney with
5 antenna on it does, is quite prominent. Is
6 quite easy to see and doesn't disappear as
7 well as something that is by the cornus line.

8 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, but --

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: In this
11 case -- sorry, Mr. Chairman. In this case
12 it's an existing installation. So we're
13 trying to utilize that existing installation
14 and doing the best to when we improve it to
15 do it in a way that, you know, doesn't
16 detract from it.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, you're not
18 making it worse, I'll agree with that. Could
19 this --

20 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: Would the engineer

1 say that to put it on the corner line of the
2 building, because it is lower, would thereby
3 be less effective if not effective at all?

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It would
5 surely be less effective. Whether or not it
6 would kill the site altogether, I'm not sure.
7 I'm not sure if that analysis was done. With
8 that being said, the improved height gives us
9 a much better propagation and once again
10 reduces the number of sites that we have to
11 build in that area because of that additional
12 height.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: I go by this site on
14 a daily basis and I had no idea that those
15 antennas were there.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Because you didn't
17 look.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. That's
19 precisely my point, is that if you people
20 don't look closely at chimneys, the eyes just
21 go passed them.

1 THOMAS ANNINGER: I look at chimneys
2 all the time.

3 AHMED NUR: I'm with Thomas on this
4 where the chimneys have these fine dimensions
5 and they're so high up, the smokestacks, that
6 when you start attaching these things on
7 them, it -- they're already having a problem
8 with them. Oh, sorry, thank you. You're
9 already having a problem with these
10 smokestacks on our street in Harvard Square
11 I'm assuming this is, you know, that we
12 attach this attachment and give an industrial
13 look to it. That is not easy to swallow.
14 You know, existing I understand, but we don't
15 want to keep on -- especially -- I'll say
16 this, I wasn't on the Planning Board, I
17 wouldn't -- but now I am and I'm wondering if
18 -- I'm really having a hard time looking at
19 this.

20 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I
21 understand your point. I do. You know, with

1 that being said, it is an existing
2 installation and we are now, I think,
3 improving it by taking out the pipe mounts
4 which is something that was used on a fairly
5 regular basis when carriers were still being
6 built. So as part of the modernization,
7 we're actually improving the installation by
8 attaching right to the smokestack itself
9 rather than having a lot of space, and then a
10 pipe and then space and then an antenna.

11 AHMED NUR: Right. I wonder why do
12 people come down here to get permission if
13 all it is is an improvement of an existing?
14 Shouldn't they have the right of way to do
15 that?

16 LIZA PADEN: You want to answer
17 that?

18 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I can.

19 Mr. Nur, we did try. We went through
20 -- we feel that this T-Mobile upgrade is such
21 that it's a like-for-like exchange of

1 antennas. So we did work with both Ranjit
2 Singanayagam, the Building Commissioner, and
3 also the Town Solicitor to try to get a
4 reading or a ruling that we would not have to
5 go through the Special Permit process or the
6 Planning Board process, and they determined
7 that it's in place for a specific reason,
8 there's no specific exemption for this type
9 of change, and, therefore, we had to go
10 through this process.

11 AHMED NUR: And exactly to my point,
12 and that's why you're here is for us to look
13 here and now, not what happened before. And
14 I think I'm with Thomas. I'll rest my case,
15 but I think I'm with Thomas that in its very
16 limited square footage, stick so high up
17 above the buildings to have these
18 attachments, it just goes up. I just
19 wondered, I mean, I've said this over and
20 over again. Is there anything we can put
21 around them that make it look like an

1 architectural, you know, spandrel that goes
2 all the way around? I mean, there are
3 meshes -- there are things that would let the
4 electromagnetic field go through and still
5 make this an antenna, but at the same time
6 architecturally looking, you know,
7 acceptable. I just wondered.

8 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. We've
9 done that in other situations where you're on
10 a roof, but not around a smokestack. I think
11 from a structural perspective, it would be
12 very difficult to do that. But we have
13 absolutely done faux chimneys on a rooftop
14 that I think do improve, or I should say hide
15 the antenna altogether.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well --

17 HUGH RUSSELL: This is actually a
18 historic building, and so then I think if
19 they did that, they would have to go to the
20 Historic Commission.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: If what?

1 HUGH RUSSELL: If they were to alter
2 the character of a historic building, they
3 have to go to the Historic Commission.

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, all of
5 these applications goes through a process.
6 The Massachusetts Historic Preservation
7 process.

8 AHMED NUR: And, Mr. Chairman, you
9 were here before and I'm not trying to finger
10 point at you but why didn't they go to the
11 Historical Society to put those on to begin
12 with?

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Because the Historic
14 Commission got jurisdiction over Harvard
15 Square five years ago in the general sense.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess what I
17 would say is that, that there are limits to
18 the argument that you're just replacing
19 something, No. 1. Or that you're improving
20 on the replacement, because those
21 improvements are I would say very subtle.

1 They're minor. What you showed us on Canal
2 Street is almost --

3 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It is de
4 mi ni mus.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: It really is de
6 mi ni mus. And, therefore, that in a case like
7 this is less persuasive for me when, when
8 towers, the few we have, I wish we frankly
9 had more, are prominent. So I don't think
10 it's unreasonable to ask the question what
11 would it look like if you brought them down
12 to the edge of the building in terms not only
13 of aesthetics, but in terms of the coverage?
14 When we get an opportunity to improve
15 something, I think for us to just to
16 perpetuate something that we're not entirely
17 happy with is a lost opportunity.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Well, I'm
19 entirely happy with it as it is. I think
20 this is a chimney that is not -- although it
21 is taller and you can find a place to take a

1 picture of it, does not contribute and is not
2 really an architectural feature. This is an
3 industrial building that has a chimney.
4 They're using it, and I think they should be
5 allowed to continue to use it for this
6 purpose. I think we have to pick our battles
7 and go after the things that are significant.
8 And I do not think this is significant in my
9 opinion.

10 PAMELA WINTERS: I concur with that.

11 AHMED NUR: I believe with all due
12 respect, I have picked my battles and I like
13 Canal Street because it is an industrial
14 area. And this is an important area. And at
15 this small service I wondered, but anyhow,
16 I -- yes, I'm not going to change my
17 position.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, this is
19 probably a close enough call that I see no
20 reason to throw my body in front of this
21 tractor. I'm prepared to yield to the

1 Chairman on this one. But I do think the
2 point needs to be made that simply replacing
3 what's existing with your very de minimus
4 improvements should not ought to be the end
5 of the discussion.

6 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I
7 understand, Mr. Anninger. Understand.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: So I guess we should
9 report to the Zoning Board that this has
10 brought some questions up, but we do not as a
11 Board object formally, but that it's, you
12 know, there was a discussion which was
13 brought forward and we did not reach
14 consensus on how to deal with that.

15 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, perhaps
16 we could say that -- ask staff to take the
17 gist of Mr. Anninger's discussion, which is
18 let's not stop trying to find new and
19 innovative ways to make these invisible, and
20 that that's really the point that we wanted
21 to send along.

1 And if there's any way, Tom, that you
2 can continue to provide that, either to staff
3 or in a memo or something, to get us all
4 thinking about new and interesting ways to
5 cover these up, I think that's okay, too.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, what I would
7 change from what Hugh just summarized, I
8 think we did reach a consensus, but not
9 necessarily a happy one. Issues were raised,
10 but I think we're prepared to accept this to
11 go forward, but I think vigilance on this
12 kind of a situation is one that I would like
13 us to keep on the forefront of our mind.

14 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

15 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Understood.
16 Thank you.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, moving on.

18 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Members of
19 the Board, if I could turn your attention to
20 80 Sherman Street. So a set of photo
21 simulations like this.

1 And so this is a petition that you have
2 heard, I believe it was two weeks ago. My
3 partner Brian Grossman was here and talked
4 about we are looking to increase or upgrade
5 this installation by taking out the old
6 antennas and putting in the new ones. The
7 problem with the current faux chimney is that
8 it's not large enough to accommodate the
9 newer antennas. The newer antennas, because
10 they are RH's are actually in fact built into
11 the antenna, need a clearance to any other
12 object, including the faux chimney itself.
13 And so in order to accommodate three new air
14 antennas we need to increase the size of the
15 chimney.

16 Yes, Mr. Winter.

17 STEVEN WINTER: Is this the heat
18 dissipation issue?

19 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, it is.

20 STEVEN WINTER: Okay, thank you.

21 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Exactly

1 right. And there needs to be a --

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: Is this Sherman?

3 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: This is 80
4 Sherman. And so if we could talk about 80
5 Sherman first? And so when we first came to
6 you, we enlarged the size of the existing
7 chimney considerably and to your
8 dissatisfaction. It would turn from its
9 current dimensions to four-by-four, pretty
10 large. No longer a faux chimney, but more of
11 a faux penthouse. And so we went back to the
12 drawing board. And in order to get that kind
13 of clearance, we need to take one of the
14 antennas, not all three of them, but one of
15 the antennas out of the faux chimney and
16 essentially facade mount it as if it was a
17 real chimney but with a facade mounted
18 antenna. And that's what's shown here. You
19 see the first --

20 AHMED NUR: The L?

21 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, that's

1 exactly right.

2 And so the back of the building will
3 have an actual real antenna on the outside as
4 a way to keep the chimney smaller and still
5 allow us to upgrade the installation. And so
6 it won't be visible on Sherman Street, but it
7 will be visible on that back parking lot,
8 which we thought was the better location to
9 put the antenna. So we think this is a big
10 improvement from what we were proposing
11 originally. It fits within your guidelines
12 as well.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: When you said L,
14 what did you mean?

15 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So it's
16 really the last photo.

17 AHMED NUR: The third last.

18 PAMELA WINTERS: The third to the
19 last.

20 AHMED NUR: Third last. Right over
21 here.

1 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. And
2 also the absolute last, 10 of 10 also shows
3 it, that one antenna on the back.

4 AHMED NUR: Right.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Photo 3B, photo 4B.

6 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Okay, good.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think this is a
8 better version.

9 AHMED NUR: So much better.

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We think
11 so, too. Yes.

12 STEVEN WINTER: I concur.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: Yeah.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: Allow me to point
15 out which is the obvious, sometimes if we ask
16 the question, we get a good answer. There's
17 no reason to ask it from time to time.

18 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, in fact
20 if we're moving this forward, I think we
21 should move it forward with an

1 acknowledgement that the proponent worked
2 very hard to come up with an innovative
3 solution. And I'm charmed by the idea of
4 something faux offering something real to
5 something that also is trying to be faux.

6 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.
7 That's an enigma wrapped in an. . . .

8 AHMED NUR: No, I mean that last
9 page, I mean just looks like that antenna
10 seems to be part of the architecture. It
11 looks like a little of the reveal.

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUS: Right.

13 AHMED NUR: You know? A reveal in
14 the middle. Centered perfectly and so far
15 away.

16 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Well the
17 team will be happy to hear that.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so we're going
19 to support this.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

21 PAMELA WINTERS: I also want to say

1 I loved the fact that you changed the color
2 of the chimney, and it really suits, you
3 know, it just blends in with the --

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: The back
5 penthouses on the other building.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. Exactly.

7 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That was
8 the goal.

9 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, great.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, and now we've
11 got --

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: The last
13 one. Really one of the toughest ones that we
14 struggled with here. This is 678 Mass.
15 Avenue. This is a unique installation for
16 T-Mobile because it has four sectors.

17 I'm sorry, right in front of you, 678
18 Mass. Avenue.

19 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

20 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So this is
21 unique in the sense that it has four sectors.

1 Two of the sectors are facade mounted on the
2 back of the building on the brick facade.
3 Those were fairly straight forward. When we
4 first proposed them, they were not
5 objectionable to the Board. The two
6 complicating sectors are the ones that are on
7 River Street -- at the corner of River Street
8 and Mass. Ave. So there are essentially
9 four, and there are proposed four antennas
10 there. And the comment from this Board was
11 that it's chaotic, find a way to fix it. And
12 so we were able to take two of those antennas
13 and move them to the middle penthouse. So
14 they will be facade mounted on the middle
15 penthouse. But we're still faced with two
16 other antennas that have to cover Mass. Ave.
17 And so what we did do is move them further
18 back. However, the question is do we add
19 radomes and essentially make them into flue
20 pipes or do we keep them as they are in their
21 current condition, which is the way we've

1 shown them on the photo sims. Because in
2 order to accommodate that clearance that we
3 were talking about, you would need a 28-inch
4 radome around each antenna. So we feel that
5 would be much -- it would add more mass, that
6 would be unnecessary. I hate to say it, but
7 there are a couple of instances where there
8 are two carriers who have essentially naked
9 antennas across the street on top of the
10 Starbucks, and then across the street also,
11 much higher on the Leader building. Now,
12 that's not an example we want to follow, but
13 with respect to two antennas we feel that it
14 would be more beneficial not to put radomes
15 around them because they would just be too
16 large. But if it's the pleasure of the
17 Board, we would do so. But at least two of
18 the antennas are cleaned up by being facade
19 mounted, and I can show you on the photo
20 sims. I apologize, I did have the slide show
21 set up.

1 AHMED NUR: One of them perfect
2 lines up with the vertical column.

3 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It does.

4 AHMED NUR: Perfectly.

5 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And we
6 tried to do that as well. We tried to line
7 it up with architectural feature that's on a
8 very ornate facade.

9 AHMED NUR: You couldn't get these
10 two other ones up on the other dimension of
11 that wall?

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We
13 couldn't. You mean up against the penthouse
14 itself?

15 AHMED NUR: Up against the
16 penthouse.

17 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, there
18 are just too many -- there are antennas there
19 already. And just, there wasn't enough
20 space.

21 AHMED NUR: You couldn't get a

1 28-inch.

2 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. There
3 isn't enough space. Above and beyond that we
4 would be so far away from our objective. It
5 would be essentially too much roof blockage.
6 Our signal would be blocked by that roof
7 going from that penthouse into Mass. Ave.

8 AHMED NUR: And one of them is
9 taller than the other. And it looks like one
10 of them is on a (inaudible) on top of --
11 hanging in the air. Is there a reason why?

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: They're
13 actually, I think that's just a visual
14 effect, because I have a plan that shows that
15 they're the exact same height.

16 AHMED NUR: Really?

17 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.

18 PAMELA WINTERS: Really? It does
19 look like it's floating.

20 AHMED NUR: Because when you bring
21 it here closer --

1 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So I
2 believe.

3 PAMELA WINTERS: It does look like
4 it's floating.

5 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So as you
6 can see the proposal is the same height. You
7 mean these two?

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

9 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.

10 AHMED NUR: Maybe it's closer.

11 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It's
12 closer, exactly.

13 AHMED NUR: Oh, okay.

14 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: But they
15 are the exact same height. So if you were on
16 Mass. Ave., looking at the Mass. Ave. facade,
17 they would be the same height. So they're
18 going to be proposed here. If you recall,
19 and I apologize for only -- I can explain it
20 here. This is where the antennas were. Much
21 closer to the corner. We're moving them

1 further back this way and back this way. So
2 they're going to be the same height along
3 these two columns.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: And there were
5 four instead of two last time?

6 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: There were
7 four, correct. So we're reducing the number
8 on that corner.

9 H. THEODORE COHEN: Is this the
10 building we were told that you couldn't move
11 things on to the penthouse.

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. When
13 we first asked the landlord, he said no. So
14 we came back to this Board, reported that.
15 And essentially as a team we met and said,
16 you know, what are we going to do here? We
17 have very few options. We tried a penthouse.
18 We tried chimneys. We tried a smaller
19 penthouse with four antennas matched around.
20 And the site acquisition agent went out and
21 talked to the landlord again and the landlord

1 finally said yes. Sometimes persistence --

2 PAMELA WINTERS: We thought he
3 would.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: There's just one
5 final alteration, and that is I would like
6 the color of these things that are sticking
7 up to match the spandrel color so that it's a
8 little darker.

9 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Okay, sure.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Not a lot darker, but
11 I think that helps to have them different
12 colors. I'm sure you don't care, right?

13 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Not at all.
14 We'll paint them any color. In fact, I had
15 black also in my slide show presentation.

16 PAMELA WINTERS: That was bad.

17 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Bad? Okay,
18 fair enough.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Why is that, Hugh?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: I think that it
21 should be, they're little -- by matching the

1 terra-cotta that's on the main color of the
2 building, they are more noticeable. If you
3 change the color, then they'll be less
4 noticeable and the color I would suggest is
5 that spandrel panel color which is not
6 inconsistent, it's just a little darker.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: I understand that.
8 I thought the same frankly for the chimney.
9 I didn't understand why a chimney should not
10 be brick color in the previous one on
11 Sherman.

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: We'll make
13 it either color. We were trying to -- to be
14 entirely honest, there were some -- there's a
15 penthouse on the building right next-door
16 that is a beige color, and we felt we wanted
17 to match that.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Fine. I think
19 this is another opportunity that we took and
20 I'm glad we did it.

21 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, it's

1 an improvement.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think it's an
3 improvement.

4 LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so you would
6 indicate that we are recommending approval of
7 this and give the rich history of how hard
8 people worked to make it happen.

9 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the
12 Board, very much.

13 AHMED NUR: At some point you'll
14 know what we want.

15 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I'm getting
16 there. Much like my wife, I'm not exactly
17 sure, but I'm getting closer.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Who is going to
19 collect all the submissions?

20 LIZA PADEN: I will.

21 The next BZA case, since Bill isn't

1 here yet for the public hearing is the Sanofi
2 Sign Variance, they're going to request a
3 sign variance. And I did send you an
4 electronic version of the application. They
5 will be going to the Board of Zoning Appeal
6 for a Variance because of the height of the
7 signs that they're proposing on this
8 building. The size of the signs are within
9 the limits for wall sign. The internal
10 illumination dimensions have been met. So
11 the only restriction is the location on the
12 building. Unfortunately I don't think we
13 have the PowerPoint. It's not working.

14 CHEE-CHONG TAI: That's fine.

15 Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, my
16 name is Chee-Chong Tai with R. E. Dinneen
17 Architects. We represent Sanofi Sign.

18 So what I'd like to do with this
19 process is actually start with what we
20 thought to do is to put conforming signs on
21 the building and hence the layout that we

1 have presented to you. You'll notice that
2 the first page that we have here is the
3 conforming sign that is facing Memorial
4 Drive. That is the sign that is under 20
5 feet and below the second floor level. And
6 the signage following that is the size of the
7 sign that is on Memorial Drive -- that would
8 be on Memorial Drive. And then there's also
9 an image of the signage that is conforming on
10 Memorial Drive itself. Subsequently then on
11 parking lot B that is on the parking lot side
12 of (inaudible). And that is the approach we
13 were looking at initially to say, all right,
14 let's put a sign that's conforming to the
15 zoning requirement at the regulation height
16 and what would that look like? So now I'd
17 like you then to go to the existing street
18 views of the building as it stands actually
19 today. I actually took one out and took some
20 photos with it. This is the building from
21 the view of bridge that I've taken. You

1 notice that the top of the building is in
2 mechanical level itself. And then the next
3 image is the Memorial Drive itself. As you
4 can see, the reality of the building what you
5 see is actually the second floor of the
6 building. So, you know, we realize that at
7 that point that putting a conforming sign on
8 Memorial Drive under 20 feet level is not
9 just going to be visible.

10 The next image is the image of 640 view
11 from, I termed as the street but it's also
12 the parking lot side, a portion side. Okay?

13 Now we come to what we determine is
14 Sanofi that, you know, has more prominence
15 and more visibility is the proposed signage
16 that we're looking at. The first image is
17 Memorial Drive. As you can see, the signage
18 is a little small. It's actually on the
19 penthouse wall which is somewhat set back
20 from the leading edge of the actual building
21 itself. The next page shows a more close up

1 view from Memorial -- sorry, from the view of
2 bridge. That's sort of taking a closer look
3 at it. Okay? A closer shot. And that's the
4 area we're proposing the signage to be.

5 And the next rendering that we have is
6 actually the signage that's on the view from
7 the parking lot side; namely, the Waverly
8 Street side. And, again, the signage is at
9 this corner of the building. The top of that
10 corner of the building. Again, it's also a
11 mechanical formulation. And the image that
12 we have here is of that sign from the parking
13 lot.

14 The sign does conform as far as the
15 total square foot for an internally lit sign.
16 However, because proportionally what we're
17 going to have to end up doing is although the
18 area itself, total area conforms to the 60,
19 the logo itself of Sanofi, and fortunately
20 proportionally to this we had to increase it
21 up to three feet. Sorry, to -- yeah, three

1 and a half feet. And that is purely because
2 of the proportion. And the requirement is
3 that we have to stay under 30 inches and
4 create a vertical and horizontal. At this
5 point we met the requirement on these
6 individual signs, the letters itself. And so
7 we are looking for essentially the mounting
8 height from the grade -- from grade level all
9 the way up. And also partly for the signage
10 height itself for the logo. So both signs
11 are going to be similar to these dimensions
12 that we have.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

14 Now, Roger told me that he's reviewed
15 this and discussed it with Charles Sullivan
16 and he was prepared to give us a little
17 report on that.

18 ROGER BOOTHE: Thank you, Hugh.
19 Charlie and I spent quite a bit of time on
20 the rooftop mechanicals for this building
21 because it was a concern of the neighbors,

1 and MIT did the basic building and the
2 mechanicals, and I feel that the penthouse is
3 very carefully designed and works quite well
4 with the building. So the question is
5 whether the sign is a problem up there. And
6 I think on the Memorial Drive side, it seems
7 to be fine. Hugh and I talked about whether
8 it should be centered in the bay rather than
9 kind of crossing over there. Charlie is fine
10 with that.

11 On the parking lot side, I don't think
12 we see a reason for it to be up high on that.
13 And I guess I would suggest that maybe it
14 should be more closely associated with the
15 entryway. I'm not quite sure why it's not.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I would concur
17 with those.

18 STEVEN WINTER: I have a question,
19 Mr. Chair.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

21 STEVEN WINTER: And my question is,

1 and I would like to perhaps address the two
2 of you on this. Is the Waverly Street
3 side -- could we consider that a way finding
4 sign for people who are approaching the
5 building from the street, from afar who might
6 be able to see this as a way finding?

7 ROGER BOOTHE: I don't think we
8 would see it that way, particularly given the
9 sensitivities in the neighborhood. They were
10 very, very concerned about the addition of
11 the building. And as you know, signage is
12 quite a sensitive matter. I think it -- from
13 the parking lot side, it can be down at a
14 conforming height and work perfectly fine.
15 On the river side, clearly you can't see it
16 because of the bridge that rises up there,
17 and I think it's a classic sort of Variance
18 justification actually on the river side.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: On the parking lot
20 side, Roger, I don't know quite what's
21 conforming, but....

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: This is
2 conforming.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Is that what you
4 have in mind? I would have thought it could
5 have gone in one of these floors.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, none of those
7 are conforming either.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: I understand. And
9 would we be willing to consider something a
10 little higher than conforming but not the
11 penthouse? Not the rooftop?

12 ROGER BOOTHE: Charlie doesn't feel
13 as strongly about signage on the addition
14 because it's not part of the historic part of
15 the building. I failed to mention that MIT
16 did a beautiful job renovating this very
17 complex building and historical facade. So I
18 think it would be more a matter of sticking
19 to some of the Board's standards about why
20 would you want a sign to not be conforming.
21 I think the conforming sign would work

1 perfectly well for people coming to the
2 parking lot wanting to find the entry.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right.

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: I concur with
5 that. I think a parking lot sign makes
6 perfect sense where it is right above the
7 entryway, and it's an empty parking lot and
8 people can see it. I don't see why they
9 don't need it up high. I agree that on the
10 Memorial Drive side I don't have any problem
11 with it being up high given the location of
12 the bridge and what Memorial Drive does
13 there. The question I have is this will be
14 internally illuminated?

15 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Yes, it is. Yes,
16 it is. It's internally illuminated LEDs, but
17 it's not as bright if that's the case, you
18 know, if that's the thought right now. And
19 Sanofi does have another sign down on Albany
20 Street which, which is also a similar sign
21 that we're putting up. Although it's

1 smaller, but it's almost internally lit,
2 those signs and they are very....

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: And the internal
4 illumination is allowed for this type of
5 sign?

6 CHEE-CHONG TAI: It is allowed with
7 restrictions, and those are the restrictions
8 it has to meet, you know, below 60 square
9 feet in the area and height with the
10 horizontal or vertical of 30 inches. That's
11 the requirement.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: So are you going to
13 need relief to get your logo to be the right
14 size? Because I don't think we would have
15 any objection to that.

16 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Proportion,
17 correct.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. That it makes
19 graphic sense to do it that way, and it's
20 not --

21 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Okay.

1 AHMED NUR: Is it flush with the
2 facade or is it projected out a certain
3 inches.

4 CHEE-CHONG TAI: It's projected
5 about three inches off of the leading edge of
6 the wall.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: So there's a
8 technicality that this logo -- there's a
9 30-inch restriction on the height of the sign
10 and so the logo's slightly bigger than that.
11 And it makes sense graphically to do it that
12 way.

13 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Proportionally
14 that's what we're looking for.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And that -- it's a
16 very --

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: So this is
18 slightly non-conforming?

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Correct.

20 CHEE-CHONG TAI: You know, every
21 piece of that sign is individually, it's an

1 i n d i v i d u a l .

2 AHMED NUR: Spaci ng.

3 CHEE-CHONG TAI : Ri ght. I t has no
4 common background to i t other than the
5 bui l di ng, so they' re al l i n d i v i d u a l pi eces.

6 WILLIAM TIBBS: And that' s three
7 teardrops.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: That' s a teardrop.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: I was goi ng to say
10 that' s i n c l u d e d i n the l o g o, there' s no
11 c i r c l e, w h i t e c i r c l e there?

12 CHEE-CHONG TAI : No.

13 AHMED NUR: And i t' s al l l i t at
14 ni ght?

15 CHEE-CHONG TAI : Yes, yes, i t i s.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you l i v e w i t h
17 that sol uti on?

18 CHEE-CHONG TAI : I' l l need to go
19 back and consul t w i t h the Sanofi on thi s as
20 far as the parki ng l o t si g n l o c a t i o n- w i s e,
21 yeah. I t' s somethi ng that we have to al so

1 consult with the landlord as well. Just, you
2 know, for location-wise. Obviously this is a
3 multi-tenant building, so at some point in
4 time the conforming sign that they have, will
5 happen all in that band of the building, and
6 that's something that we are trying to get
7 present to the building so Sanofi being the
8 building's a prominent tenant.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: And you understood
10 the issue about the horizontal alignment?
11 Right now the sign is sort of two-thirds on
12 one side of column and then a third down.

13 CHEE-CHONG TAI: I understood that,
14 yeah.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And we'd like
16 it to not be to be mounted at all on the
17 column.

18 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Yeah.

19 AHMED NUR: I have a quick question
20 for Roger, though. The last sentence was
21 this was a multi-tenant building. So are we

1 taking into consideration that these guys
2 maxed out on the amount of square footage per
3 sign is it per building or per tenant?

4 HUGH RUSSELL: So there's a sign
5 allowance for the building that's one square
6 foot for each linear feet of street frontage,
7 and they have a great deal of street
8 frontage. So the signage on the building has
9 much less than the permitted total signage.
10 But there's also limitation on the sign --
11 size of each sign, and they're going to max
12 out on the sign of that sign.

13 AHMED NUR: Yes, I just wanted to
14 make sure.

15 LIZA PADEN: No, actually they're
16 under 60 square feet.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: They are?

18 LIZA PADEN: Yes.

19 So there's no sign that meets 60 square
20 feet. There's no limit on the number of wall
21 signs, so that's not an issue. The size of

1 each individual wall sign is limited to 60
2 square feet and they're not maxing out on
3 that number either. They're not going over
4 that.

5 AHMED NUR: Okay.

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: So might we be
7 faced with other tenants coming before us
8 wanting similarly sized and located signs?

9 LIZA PADEN: I don't know how, I
10 don't know the amount that Sanofi's taking.

11 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Yeah, Sanofi's not
12 taking entire building. There is another
13 tenant in the building potentially another
14 tenant.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: So the answer to that
16 is yes, and then we might have to address
17 that.

18 AHMED NUR: This very soon could
19 look like a strip of signs. Strip mall
20 signs.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: I doubt it.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: We have to take
2 it --

3 HUGH RUSSELL: I doubt that we would
4 support that.

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: I think it is not
6 unreasonable, though, to ask the landlord to
7 -- what their strategy is for the signs
8 regardless of your specific signs.

9 CHEE-CHONG TAI: They do have a
10 restriction in their lease as to -- they
11 understand the Zoning requirements and all of
12 that. So they proportionately assigning sign
13 locations and number of signs they could have
14 for the building in that respect. And I
15 agree, I mean that's the one thing is
16 potentially if you have multiple tenants,
17 either two or three, and putting it in
18 conforming elevation tends to end up like a
19 strip and that's, you know, that's a reason
20 for trying to get it up -- not as high, but
21 in a more prominent position of the building.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: Roger, I was
3 wondering whether you and Charlie Sullivan
4 had considered the possibility of the sign
5 going in sort of the white rectangular areas
6 above the parapet like where the address is?

7 ROGER BOOTHE: We had not discussed
8 that. I'm pretty sure Charlie would not like
9 that, because he wanted to keep things off
10 the historical part of the facade. That
11 would certainly be my inclination.

12 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair. As long
13 as you're here, Roger, this is the old Ford
14 motor plant; is that correct?

15 ROGER BOOTHE: The old Ford assembly
16 building.

17 STEVEN WINTER: That's the
18 historical part that we're really interested
19 in. I would like the proponent to be thanked
20 for being as thoughtful and willing to go
21 through this process with us. That was

1 actually one of the first motor car plants in
2 the country --

3 ROGER BOOTHE: That's right.

4 STEVEN WINTER: -- where it was a
5 vertical assembly line as opposed to a linear
6 assembly line. So it's a really interesting
7 place.

8 ROGER BOOTHE: MIT did a wonderful
9 job. A lot of the mechanical equipment is in
10 the basement of the building. It's an
11 expensive building.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think they had
13 lamps that they brought down.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: There was actually a
15 section, some of which remains that they --
16 and they were, I guess, conveyor belts
17 possibly in that area. It turned out to be
18 not a terrific way to build automobiles.
19 But...

20 DAVID PERRY: They had a test track
21 on the roof, too.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Really?

2 Okay.

3 LIZA PADEN: All done?

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And we -- is
5 that it for the Zoning Appeal?

6 LIZA PADEN: That's it for the BZA
7 cases.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

9 CHEE-CHONG TAI: Thank you.

10 LIZA PADEN: I'll move to bring the
11 next applicant in here.

12 ROGER BOOTHE: We've brought in a
13 new projector since the one in the room isn't
14 working. And we'll get that set up because I
15 believe the next proponent needs to use it.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Brian, you're willing
17 to give us your update while that goes on?

18 BRIAN MURPHY: Of course.

19 The next meeting will not be until
20 November 20th because of Election Day next
21 Tuesday. On that we've got the Prospect

1 Street entrance hearing as well as 54R Cedar
2 Street.

3 Under General Business there will be
4 additional discussion of Kendall Square as
5 well as a brief update from MIT in terms of
6 where they with their process internally what
7 they expect to be doing going forward.
8 And then we have -- we're still trying to
9 schedule things, but the other Planning Board
10 meetings are December 4th and December 18th.
11 As well as January, and I believe for January
12 Liza we're on the 8th and 22nd; is that
13 correct?

14 LIZA PADEN: Yes, 8th and 22nd.

15 BRIAN MURPHY: 8th and 22nd. And
16 then February 5th will be Town Gown reports.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So I'd like to ask my
18 colleagues if that's three months out there,
19 what if we get additional things, would we be
20 willing to consider an additional meeting in
21 that three-month period in order to get the

1 busi ness done?

2 PAMELA WINTERS: Well , I woul d
3 rather than stayi ng unti l mi dnight l i ke we
4 di d the l ast ti me. I thought we weren' t at
5 our best. So I woul d. I woul d.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Bi l l , woul d you be
8 wi l l i ng?

9 BRIAN MURPHY: So woul d that be i n
10 January, Mr. Chai r?

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Well , I thi nk i t' s up
12 to your managi ng the agenda.

13 BRIAN MURPHY: Thank you.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: So the next i tem i s a
15 publ i c heari ng, Pl anni ng Board case #272, 165
16 Cambri dgePark Dri ve. Thi s i s a project that
17 we revi ewed earl i er and we made comments,
18 Traffi c and Parki ng Transportati on Department
19 has made comments, and the Peti ti oner' s back
20 to show us thei r response to those comments.
21 And after the presentati on the questi ons by

1 the Board and we will be asking anybody who
2 wishes to comment on the changes. We don't
3 want to reopen the book, but we'd like to
4 know what the people think about the changes.

5 Can you proceed, Jim, without the
6 electronics?

7 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, I
8 believe.

9 Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of
10 the Board. For the record, James Rafferty,
11 130 Bishop Allen Drive, Cambridge. I used to
12 say Adams and Rafferty, but I have to think
13 about what we do about that because Mr. Adams
14 passed away last week. I don't know if you
15 saw that.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: It could still be
17 Adams and Rafferty.

18 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We'll talk
19 about that.

20 As the Chair noted, this was a matter
21 that was before the Board I think maybe about

1 six or eight weeks ago. It's a project at
2 165 CambridgePark Drive opposite the other
3 multi-family project is 160 CambridgePark
4 Drive. And the commentary from the Board was
5 helpful in a number of areas, and I'm sure
6 you've noticed from the middle that you
7 received last week that most of the comments
8 were taken quite to heart. I would
9 categorize them in two areas:

10 There are new visuals that attempt to
11 provide a better understanding of what was
12 there, what we produced, what we showed to
13 you last time, and in some cases landscapers
14 removed just so you can see the full
15 architecture and then the landscapers put
16 back in.

17 And then there are a series of other
18 design changes which were again responsive to
19 issues raised by the Board. And probably the
20 chief design changes are occurring along
21 where there was proposed to have parking

1 along the side, a side drive that was
2 abutting the portal into the reservation and
3 there's been a whole new design approach
4 taking to that. And there's also been an
5 attempt to address both design-wise and
6 presentation-wise the issues about the ground
7 floor plan of the CambridgePark Drive. Both
8 in context and in providing better images of
9 what's proposed, but more importantly to try
10 to meet as many of the criteria and
11 guidelines, the urban design guidelines for
12 the Alewife Overlay District and in
13 particular this district, the Triangle
14 District.

15 This building, as you know, probably
16 contributes to the most significant design
17 guideline, which is seeking for architectural
18 diversity within the emerging districts. And
19 certainly this building represents a somewhat
20 different approach than the building across
21 the street to the -- its outlook. And that's

1 very site-directed approach. This site has
2 the benefit of abutting the reservation. And
3 what the design approach here taking by
4 Mr. Hodges and his team at DiMella Shaffer
5 was really an attempt to embrace that and
6 celebrate that. The permeability
7 requirements here are exceeded significantly.
8 The open space requirements are exceeded, and
9 it's largely around open space and creating
10 an at grade courtyard rather than simply
11 having the building up on plinth which is
12 needed in some locations, but in this case
13 the building really, because of the
14 courtyard, the courtyard has the affect of
15 separating the building into two buildings as
16 it were, and creating essentially two parking
17 garages. And there's been a lot of focus and
18 attention placed on the entry to these
19 parking garages. We were asked early on in
20 the project whether or not those entries
21 could be located on the side. That's service

1 roads. And we've looked at that, but frankly
2 it complicated a number of operational issues
3 in the building. It also served the purpose
4 of having those -- that access road becoming
5 more intensely used road. The objective here
6 is to try to minimize the level of activity,
7 have that, have characteristics and features
8 different than a road. In many ways it's a
9 pedestrian path. We have since our last
10 appearance met again with the Traffic
11 Department, and Mr. Hodges will walk you
12 through that. That road has been reduced in
13 width. It's largely, its dimensions are
14 largely being driven by fire access, but in
15 many ways we're going to be able to achieve,
16 particularly as the road goes across the back
17 of the courtyard, some characteristics of
18 that road that make it feel more like a
19 pedestrian path and less like a road. I know
20 that Mr. Hodges will show you all of the
21 design changes, but I think what we were able

1 to do here in response to the Board's
2 question is to relocate parking spaces in a
3 way that no longer has a line of parked cars
4 abutting the pedestrian access into the
5 reservation, but the consequence and the
6 tradeoff for that is the parking supply's
7 actually further reduced. The project as
8 originally before the Board had a, I believe
9 at that the one we originally submitted, we
10 have 244 parking spaces. That number has
11 been reduced somewhat. And I refer to you
12 Ms. Clippinger's memo, we're proposing a 0.87
13 parking ratio.

14 We performed a parking supply study at
15 the building at 30 CambridgePark Drive at
16 Ms. Clippinger's suggestion to determine
17 overnight utilization. So traffic engineers
18 were actually out there at 3:30 in the
19 morning. Apparently if you're staying out,
20 it's presumed you'll be home by 3:30. I've
21 learned this on these studies. We had

1 Mr. Ham, I don't think it was Mr. Ham
2 directly, but somebody who works for him, was
3 out there at 30:30 in the morning counting
4 cars to figure out what the overnight
5 utilization was for the parking spaces. And
6 in that building it was something in the
7 range of 0.72. And I know the Board
8 constantly hears arguments and discussions
9 about what the adequacy of the parking
10 supply, what is this emerging residential
11 population, what does it really mean about
12 who's living in these buildings, and how many
13 spaces are being used. So the data at 30
14 CambridgePark Drive suggests around 0.72. I
15 think that's what allowed Ms. Clippinger to
16 support our reduced requested 0.87. P.

17 So, cars really are sacrificed here.
18 And as you know in the development world,
19 sometimes that's not a great thing because
20 people can pay to release spaces, they can
21 sell spaces, but the sacrifice in cars here

1 has been made to allow for the site
2 characteristics to really dominate the
3 residential amenities here, and that's the
4 on-grade courtyard and the manner in which
5 there's a visual connection from
6 CambridgePark Drive. Admittedly the project,
7 and this building doesn't lend itself to the
8 type of design that is acknowledged as
9 favored under some design guidelines, and
10 that is to have doors and entries on the
11 street. But if you look at the way this
12 building is designed, that is simply -- and
13 Mr. Hodges can go through the pros and cons
14 of that, but the way the building's designed,
15 that simply is not an option. There has been
16 as you'll see in Mr. Hodge's presentation,
17 the introduction of additional entries, a
18 real enhancement of the open courtyard. And
19 the open courtyard in the front is going to
20 provide a level of activity. I don't want to
21 be accused of stealing thunder here, but the

1 level of activity in the open courtyard which
2 again came about as a result of staff input,
3 when we began this many months ago, that was
4 intended to provide some auto circulation.
5 That was going to be a drop-off area with
6 vehicles, and we were encouraged and strongly
7 so, to move away from that and to create
8 separate garage entries. So what you'll see
9 tonight is a slight enhancement of that. The
10 concepts have remained the same, but we've
11 really been to in both presentation and
12 additional detail be able to give you some
13 real context about what's there. So the
14 activity at the ground level of this building
15 I would suggest is going to be happening in
16 that courtyard in a way that perhaps other
17 buildings don't enjoy the same type of
18 activity. So, it's not perhaps the exact
19 type of street level activity that the
20 guidelines call out for, but the guidelines
21 do promote visual access into the

1 reservati on. They do promote archi tectural
2 di versi ty, and we're hopi ng i n thi s case that
3 we wi ll be abl e to convi nce you that thi s
4 approach to thi s bui ldi ng i s consi stent
5 overall unless the Speci al Permi t that's
6 bei ng sought i s warranted. So havi ng sai d
7 that, Mr. Hodges -- I shoul d have menti oned
8 that my cli ent i s Hi nes Devel opment. Wi th us
9 thi s eveni ng i s Davi d Perry and Mi chael
10 Franci s of Hi nes. And we have our engi neers
11 present. We have our Landscap e archi tects
12 present, and we have our archi tects present.
13 So we thought we'd begi n wi th an
14 archi tectural presentati on and then provi de
15 any addi ti onal i nformati on that you may need.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

17 ED HODGES: I'm Ed Hodges, the
18 pri nci pal and CEO of Di Mel l a Shaffer. And as
19 archi tects, you know, we often appreci ate the
20 opportuni ty to i mprove our proj ects, and I
21 thi nk through your i nput as Ji m menti oned

1 we' ve been able to make this project better
2 from the proposal that we put before you
3 about a month ago.

4 So as an overview, I don't want to
5 spend a lot of time on this because we talked
6 about it last time, but the Board has been
7 trying to promote residential development.
8 You've been successful in that. There are
9 three other projects underway at 70 Fawcett
10 Street, 160 CambridgePark Drive, and the
11 Faces site on Route 2. In addition to the
12 Archstone project which is already occupied,
13 our site is in the middle. We think it's
14 unique as Jim mentioned us backing up to the
15 reservation, and we have opportunities in
16 this project for those connections, visual
17 and physical, to do on our site that some of
18 the other sites don't have -- are not
19 possible on those sites. And so we've chosen
20 to emphasize those aspects of this project.

21 Moving in a little closer, there's the

1 flood mitigation that's gone on which
2 actually has opened up the reservation
3 visually and created some really nice
4 features. So it further increased our desire
5 to actually open our building to the
6 reservation and create a connection through
7 these courtyards and fingers that reach out
8 towards the bike path.

9 Another one of the guidelines is to
10 increase permeability and open space. As you
11 can see here, the site is 95 percent
12 impermeable currently. The guidelines call
13 it for it to be 25 percent permeable and
14 we're actually going to achieve 34 percent
15 permeable.

16 The current conditions on the site, the
17 Pfizer building that's on the end of the
18 street, the views through the middle of our
19 site if you remember last time that these
20 magnificent weeping willows which we're
21 choosing to focus some of the project on, and

1 then a view looking east down CambridgePark
2 Drive. And then looking directly at the
3 site. And then this is the pedestrian access
4 that is being created to the reservation
5 along the edge of our property. So I think
6 you can see from these views that the
7 building is going to certainly increase the
8 pedestrian experience. There's three loading
9 dock doors there now when it's complete.

10 And as I mentioned, the reservation's
11 been opened up. This is from a couple of
12 weeks ago. It's now been planted, the water
13 in here, we don't know how high the water was
14 in here yesterday. But the boardwalk -- and
15 so this is going to be a really nice amenity
16 for the residents. And also that the
17 residents will be constituents for the
18 reservation by virtue of living on it and
19 using it daily.

20 So we talked about the pedestrian
21 experience and how do we enhance that. And

1 we wanted to go back and look at
2 CambridgePark Drive and what is along the
3 street. And what we are doing in the upper
4 right here is the first building after the
5 access road from the parking garage as you
6 turn to go down CambridgePark Drive. And we
7 have the sidewalk, the planting zone with
8 trees and some landscape, and you see in the
9 foreground the drop off here and then the
10 same kind of treatment of low planting trees
11 and then the building is set back about 15
12 feet from the street. You get a little
13 further down, the street opens up quite a
14 bit.

15 The building is a ways away from the
16 sidewalk. The trees are actually in the
17 sidewalk.

18 Continuing to the next block, we have
19 the office building which has this sort of
20 overhang which diminishes the experience
21 coming out towards the street. This is about

1 a 15-foot setback. Again, the trees are
2 right in the sidewalk so that inhibits the
3 pedestrian flow. And then along our site is
4 the sidewalk, the face of this building is
5 set about 15 feet back. The planting. And
6 then here's a section of what we're
7 proposing, which is the building will be set
8 back at that 15-foot line. So you see the
9 size the height of a person, it's about three
10 times their height. The building is back off
11 the street with ground cover stepping up to
12 planting and street trees.

13 We wanted to understand what the access
14 path is going to be like since the view along
15 here into the project was important. They're
16 going to put a single timber guardrail on the
17 left side. They're going to put a six-foot
18 black chain link fence on the right side.
19 They're going to leave these existing trees
20 and clean out a little bit underneath them
21 and plant a meadow mix of grasses along in

1 here.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: I'm sorry, who is
3 they?

4 ED HODGES: The city and the MDC.
5 They're doing the floodplain.

6 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: This is
7 the public portal in the area to the left of
8 our site which is the public access into the
9 reservation.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

11 ED HODGES: So this shows the site
12 plan 165 steps back here to create a
13 courtyard. We felt important to hold the
14 street there so that it didn't open up, and
15 then where this building steps back out, we
16 inflected our building to create that
17 entrance court that Jim talked about that the
18 public amenity and then step back out to the
19 street. And then the loading dock is moved
20 off the street so it's not visible from
21 CambridgePark Drive. And there's a one lane

1 road that we've -- that Jim mentioned
2 downgrade. I'll show you some pictures of
3 that that comes around the building for the
4 fire department access.

5 Here's probably where the biggest
6 changes were made. There was concern about
7 we had open parking along this side of the
8 building. One of the things we did that
9 those bikes used to be concentrated over
10 here, we took a lot of those bikes and moved
11 them over here, and we were able to add a row
12 of parking in here. This made a lot of
13 sense. We have one bike per unit, so we have
14 244 bikes. We actually have more bikes than
15 cars. So we have some which are accessible
16 on to Cambridge Park Drive here. We have
17 another group of them which go directly out
18 to the reservation on the bike path. And we
19 have some other storage areas that might be
20 for people that ride their bike less
21 frequently, but it takes care of all the

1 bikes. And that gives us pedestrian
2 activity, and we're not looking at cars along
3 the path now. We worked with the
4 Transportation Department to have three Zip
5 Cars which are outside the garage and
6 accessible to the public and it reduced
7 this -- we'll show you views of this, it's
8 more residential in scale.

9 I'm working on another project in
10 Boston and we've got their complete street
11 guidelines and they talked about -- and
12 retail space that's sort of you should have
13 doors about every 75 feet because people walk
14 -- in about 15 seconds they walk about 75
15 feet. So we kind of looked at our site. You
16 come on to the site, about 55 feet in we've
17 enhanced this lobby which we introduced
18 another elevator for move-ins and this is the
19 tallest part of the buildings. And so there
20 are about 100 apartments on this end of the
21 building that would most likely use this

1 entrance if they're going to the T station.
2 So we have enhanced this and made it more
3 like a building lobby with some furniture and
4 art that comes out. If you move 75 feet, you
5 get to this point and your eyes are more
6 drawn to the entrance you've come just by one
7 of the parking entrances to make a decision
8 whether you come to the building or you keep
9 walking. You go another 75 feet, you get
10 here to the entrance where the view is
11 through the building to the reservation. And
12 this is very unique in this building type to
13 have this at-grade courtyard with a two-story
14 entrance that really emphasize that, which
15 we'll show you a view of that.

16 And then as you move on down, you get
17 into this zone another 75 feet. So there are
18 activities along that zone in terms of that
19 interval in terms of the pedestrian
20 interaction.

21 And then the next level up, this shows

1 the two-story lobby. These are the 20 units
2 per floor for five floors that uses, that
3 could use this elevator to go down if they're
4 going down to the T. The other ones use this
5 bank and come out or come out to the
6 courtyard. And there's an amenity deck for
7 the residents on this side of the building.

8 So this shows a view of the street, and
9 when we were here before, we talked about
10 this is maybe translucent glass because this
11 is where the bikes were. We heard what was
12 said. We looked at this and we've come up
13 with a fritted striped pattern that has
14 narrow clear pieces in it that are in the
15 lower half of the window below the transom
16 rail. And, you know, in our team we talked
17 about do you want to see the chaos of the
18 bikes? If somebody has a \$1500 bike, want
19 somebody looking in and knowing that their
20 bike is in there. So this is trying to reach
21 that duality that you see in, you see the

1 color of the bikes, but you're not really
2 telling exactly what's in there. We're
3 showing an accent color on the back wall.
4 And because we have residential units above
5 parking, we need to have a ceiling in there.
6 And our idea is to have a drywall ceiling in
7 that first bay back to the bike wall and
8 light that with down light so that it has a
9 very pedestrian residential feel to it at
10 night when you're walking along there.

11 And then as Jim mentioned to make sure
12 that we're clean and that you're seeing
13 everything, we picked the landscape out so
14 you can see the building comes to the ground.
15 There's a base, you know, lower part of the
16 window will be covered by the vegetation
17 here. There's balconies. We've grouped
18 those so that there's a balcony and then a
19 two-story reading, so it's not sort of 1, 2,
20 3. And then this line sets back at the
21 fourth floor and then goes up. And we talked

1 about how the building bends back out to end
2 the street as you're coming down the street.
3 And this actually tails into the angle of the
4 Pfizer building. So urbanistically this
5 building kind of completes the street, draws
6 your eye to the street and then comes to the
7 end.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you go back
9 one? I'm just comparing it to your former
10 slide. Now in your former elevation you also
11 have a more of a solid entry sign that used
12 to have windows along that wall where the 165
13 is?

14 ED HODGES: Yes. I'll address that
15 in just a second. We're going to take a walk
16 all the way around the building.

17 So then from across the street this
18 talks about that entrance, the canopy there.
19 You know, you'll be able to see in. We're
20 thinking some art, some chairs on the wall,
21 but that's where these people will come down

1 and come out. You can see how you get a
2 little bit of transparency there and sort of
3 the yellow color on the back wall. And maybe
4 we even change that color down the length of
5 this to give it a little variety.

6 And then again without the landscaping.

7 So this is more of a close up of that
8 view. You can see the translucency in the
9 clear here in terms of the reading. And the
10 ceiling would be up here. And you would see
11 the down light. So, you know, if it was a
12 residential unit, someone would have their
13 blinds down at night because you're not going
14 to look directly in the window. But your
15 feel is not that that's parking but that is a
16 nicely lit space. And our client has been
17 supportive of doing these things which are
18 certainly above what would typically be done
19 in a garage type spaces.

20 And then again without the landscaping.

21 And as you move along to the next part

1 of the building, in terms of the overall
2 architecture we tried to develop a strategy
3 that dealt with the whole ground floor in
4 terms of a theme throughout the building, and
5 we decided that one of the things that we
6 wanted to develop is this building is about
7 connecting to the reservation, green design,
8 and energy. And that if we use wood where
9 the people were as kind of a thematic thing,
10 that that would be a good idea, to sort of
11 make that connection to the reservation. And
12 we have wood panels and we have wood battens,
13 and we use those two things with the panels
14 where a lot of people activities occur and
15 the battens where there's landscape or
16 planting or screening. And so to address
17 that point we pulled this wood out of the
18 lobby and use it as a potential place to make
19 for the signage. And so that kind of pulls
20 you like a funnel into the lobby and that
21 goes through the lobby. And you'll see that

1 comes back out on the courtyard. And then
2 these panels periodically allow us to
3 introduce the garage doors in a way that
4 you're not focusing on the garage door
5 because there's panels that happen all
6 throughout the design, you know, up in here
7 and everywhere. And so it all kind of blends
8 in and that doesn't call attention to itself.
9 And as you come by the corner of the building
10 here, your eye is drawn down here and so the
11 garage is 30 feet back from the street off to
12 your right and not really in your view.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: And you've broken the
14 doors into several --

15 ED HODGES: We've broken the doors
16 into two. So there's that view without the
17 landscape.

18 And then moving --

19 HUGH RUSSELL: It's significantly
20 bigger with the landscape.

21 ED HODGES: Yeah. I'm glad to hear

1 you say that, Hugh.

2 It really and definitely enriches it.

3 So then you reach this point with this, you

4 know, there's two stories open inside the

5 building, but the opening is actually four

6 stories so it's to the scale of the thing,

7 building on the street. This wood you see

8 pulling you in here. We've put a panel by

9 the door which we're thinking will have --

10 potentially have a map of the reservation and

11 let people know what's on the other side. As

12 I mentioned, this ground level courtyard of

13 connecting to the reservation and not having

14 space up on the second floor, but actually

15 addressing the courtyard at grade has been

16 one of the driving forces of the design.

17 And, you know, the fact that someone comes

18 down the street and they see through -- the

19 sun comes from behind us so it lights those

20 big willows in the back, you know, really

21 let's you know that something is going on

1 behind the building. And there are no fences
2 or gates that prevent anyone from walking
3 around and sort of participating in that.
4 But this hints at that from the Cambridge
5 Street side. Again, there's eyes on the
6 street, you know, with balconies. And to
7 build --

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: Are you encouraging
9 the general public to walk through there?

10 ED HODGES: No. Not necessarily
11 through the lobby, but they can go around the
12 building. There's no fence in the back
13 between the property.

14 And so then, Bill, you see how this,
15 you know, pulls you through into the lobby.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: Are those bicycles
17 underneath 165?

18 ED HODGES: Yes.

19 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Visitor
20 bikes.

21 MICHAEL FRANCIS: There's 10 racks

1 there, so 20 bikes.

2 ED HODGES: Then again without the
3 landscaping.

4 So then coming down to the other end of
5 the building, the treatment in the ground
6 floor would be the same as I talked about
7 down at the bike storage. This happens to
8 have parking behind it, but we would treat
9 the ceiling the same way going back the first
10 10, 12 feet. And here we've -- this is the
11 other garage entry. We've broken the doors
12 apart. We've treated them with the same
13 fritted bands, so that they become in the
14 system. And so in this building you don't
15 even notice that the garage entries are
16 treated the same. They're treated like the
17 architecture that they're part of, and
18 therefore, they're less disruptive visually
19 in terms of the project. And then we come,
20 this is the Zip Cars which are available to
21 the public. This is the public access. The

1 six-foot chain link fence is not shown in
2 here, but we're planting on our side and
3 planting trees on our side. And then we pick
4 up with the batten expression on the bikes
5 beyond that point.

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Before you move
7 on, is there a reason why you don't have
8 those nice wooden garage doors at the Zip
9 Cars?

10 ED HODGES: We discussed that and we
11 thought that them being open -- I guess Zip
12 Car had some issues with having to swipe
13 through a door to get to the cars is less
14 desirable. We're not opposed to that as a
15 solution but it's in negotiation with the
16 vendor. And we, you know, we did this image
17 and we felt like this was not offensive
18 because it's not, you know, 20 cars. It's
19 just a few cars.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: And it's there for
21 anybody to use it's there.

1 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right.

2 And to see them visually Zip -- they wanted
3 people to visually be able to access them and
4 see them. But we could explore it.

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: I personally
6 think the doors look great. And since that's
7 going to be a public access way, it would be
8 nice I think if there were doors there rather
9 than just staring at cars. And I've used
10 plenty of Zip Cars where you have to go into
11 a parking garage or you have to go someplace
12 to get it so I don't think it should be a
13 real issue for them.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: If I'm not
15 mistaken you seem to have paneled the inside
16 with the wood?

17 ED HODGES: Yes.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: So that actually
19 makes for a nice interior. Open.

20 ED HODGES: Yes.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: You open on to

1 wood which is following the pattern.

2 ED HODGES: Yeah. So the doors, you
3 know, this is where the people thing happens.
4 This is where people thing happens so staying
5 with that theme.

6 PAMELA WINTERS: And you said that
7 Zip Car had an issue with the people getting
8 into a --

9 ED HODGES: He's right, they do it
10 some places, but some preliminary discussions
11 they've had they said, you know, they prefer
12 they be open and accessible and not -- if the
13 garage door doesn't open, then the person
14 can't get the car, and you know. . . .

15 And then continuing on --

16 STEVEN WINTER: There's a public
17 safety issue also with garage doors on that.
18 So there's a lot of issues to be concerned
19 with.

20 ED HODGES: So moving around.
21 Here's the public access path. Here's the

1 single timber guardrail coming in. Here's
2 the wood fins that come around. This is the
3 bike parking. This is the door that comes
4 out that accesses the bike path. This is the
5 amenity deck of the project. And then you
6 see the building in the background, how it
7 steps down and the fingers come out through
8 the reservation. The planting mix is sort of
9 wetland shrubs. Rob can probably describe
10 this better than me, but it has all kinds of
11 stuff in there that will grow as planted and
12 trees periodically. So we're trying to just
13 illustrate that.

14 But to show you we have nothing to
15 hide, this is what it would like if it was
16 all manicured lawn up to the building.

17 The thing that we really like about
18 this treatment is that you're moving
19 perpendicularly to the building. And because
20 the front of the building needs to be so
21 closed in terms of the ventilation for the

1 garage, we get a hi degree of ventilation but
2 your visual site lines into the garage are
3 constantly blocked.

4 So then coming around to the back, this
5 is a real photograph of the vegetation from
6 here up that's on the site now. You remember
7 the willows that I pointed out earlier.
8 There's at grade access here. No wall. This
9 is that courtyard on the back side of the
10 building embraces those willows with this
11 very nice opening into the reservation. It
12 gets a piece of sky. And so this really
13 speaks to, you know, what this project is
14 about. And all of the ones of these that are
15 up on the plant when you come in the back of
16 the lobby is dark, this building is going to
17 have such a different feel and a connection
18 to nature and the green design, and it's
19 going to attract those kind of residents that
20 want to live with the reservation, the
21 balconies, and those kinds of things.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Do you think you'll
2 be forced to put a fence in the back?

3 ED HODGES: I would hope not,
4 but....

5 WILLIAM TIBBS: I guess I'm thinking
6 more of a practicality of just having people
7 walk by and strolling into the thing. I just
8 want to get your --

9 ED HODGES: I mean that's --

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: If that's a reality
11 that you think that might happen I'd like to
12 see how you're going to do that. I
13 understand the nobleness of keeping it open,
14 but from a practicality sense is that really
15 going to --

16 ED HODGES: Yeah, I mean, you know,
17 there are ways that you can communicate
18 private without actually putting a gate that
19 would make people a little uncomfortable.
20 They're going to be watched. There's a lot
21 of eyes on the courtyard. But I think it's

1 partly an operational thing. But the client
2 has indicated at this time that they wouldn't
3 start off by fencing this off from the
4 reservation. That actually to encourage the
5 communications -- am I speaking correctly?
6 Yes.

7 And then I've mentioned earlier last
8 time we were here this was an 18-foot road
9 around the back. We've been working with
10 Transportation and the fire department and
11 we've understood that a 12-foot path with
12 reinforced turf on either side has been
13 approved on the Faces site. So we've
14 diminished the width of the road here. And
15 so you get a sense of how the battens
16 actually, you know, you don't see into the
17 garage as you move linearly as you move along
18 the bike path or move along this path along
19 the building. This is the larger of the
20 upper courtyards and how that connection is
21 here. And then the at-grade courtyard there.

1 And then the vegetation that's on the MBTA
2 parcel along the right-hand side.

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: Where is the
4 property line?

5 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good
6 point, yes.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: It's to the right
8 side.

9 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: To the
10 right. Right there.

11 H. THEODORE COHEN: The right?
12 Okay.

13 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: So what's
14 not shown there is the proposed chain link,
15 black chain link fence that --

16 ED HODGES: That's not here.

17 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, you're
18 behind the building?

19 ED HODGES: Yes.

20 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, I see.

21 ED HODGES: So it's five feet off of

1 here, right, Lee?

2 LEE BRAUN: Yep.

3 ED HODGES: And so then sort of
4 directly behind the building at the willows
5 again we've taken a picture from the site
6 including the lower vegetation that's in that
7 parcel. So the improvements will stop at
8 this edge of the bike path, and then there's
9 a 35-foot zone that the MBTA owns. And then
10 the Hines property starts from there. And so
11 this is into our at-grade courtyard here.

12 And you see the three fingers coming out to
13 the buildings with balconies out to the end.

14 So then this is the naked architecture,
15 if you will, and the picture of the
16 vegetation kind of all put together that's in
17 that MBTA parcel. So you can see this is
18 inviting in to that visual connection,
19 connecting to the reservation right at grade.

20 So just I'll go quickly through this, a
21 little bit of detail. We're using a new

1 fiber cement siding called Artisan which has
2 a really deep shadow line which emphasizes
3 the horizontal here. It's a real
4 five-eighths inches thick. We've grouped the
5 windows into horizontal bands to emphasize
6 your view into the landscape because most of
7 the units you have views out to the
8 landscape. They drop down at the living room
9 grade. We have these accent panels in the
10 composition and then the battens and wood
11 panels at the base and then the entry piece.

12 The front white parts are a main screen
13 of fiber cement with the joints. You see the
14 doors I talked about here. The grouping of
15 the balcony and the one-story and two-story
16 to make sure that that does not sort of a
17 repetitive scaling. The secondary scaling at
18 the fourth floor and then the setback of the
19 upper floor.

20 And then the end of the wings that have
21 balconies on them that have the same fiber

1 cement rain screen. The garage is a ground
2 face block with composite wood vertical
3 battens on it.

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you go back
5 to the previous slide?

6 What is that rectangle at the top of
7 that?

8 ED HODGES: This is a screen around
9 the condensers on the roof.

10 So what you're seeing is if this wall
11 of the building is here, those units are out
12 here. So they're...

13 So just quickly the landscape plan,
14 this is a 50-by-100-foot courtyard that's at
15 grade, and they're indicating some kind of
16 treatment here, sort of the diminishes the
17 feeling of this even as we've redesigned it
18 as a road in sort of connection to the
19 reservation. You see the property line right
20 there, sort of five feet off of the road, and
21 then the MBTA parcel and then the MDC land.

1 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you describe
2 the circulation pattern for like people who
3 live here? Like, are they walking through --
4 if they were in that courtyard and wanted to
5 go to the reservation, would they just walk
6 across the lawn there? And what's this
7 little path over on the other side from the
8 public access?

9 ED HODGES: Here?

10 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. What is that?

11 ED HODGES: This goes into the bike
12 storage down below.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: So that will be for
14 people who have their bikes there to go out
15 onto the bike path.

16 ED HODGES: Yeah. They go directly
17 onto the bike path. When they come home,
18 they can go in here.

19 WILLIAM TIBBS: So you don't see,
20 quote, unquote public on this access road
21 that's wrapping around the building as you

1 see it?

2 ED HODGES: Well, I fully imagine
3 that someone will use this path to the
4 reservation, and residents may actually use
5 this path to cut through. There's a concrete
6 timber rail that goes about from here to here
7 that makes it a little hard to go directly
8 out that's not on our property, but you can
9 go, you can cut diagonally on the corner.
10 But, again, we have not taken the liberty to
11 showing paths across someone else's property
12 but it doesn't mean that people won't take
13 it.

14 WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I just wanted to
15 get a sense of the pedestrian flow of people
16 who live there versus the people who don't
17 live there and what they could and couldn't
18 be doing and how the design relates to this.

19 ED HODGES: Yeah.

20 So the elevators are here, so someone
21 can come down into the lobby and down into

1 the courtyard and then into the reservation,
2 kind of however adventurous they want to be,
3 you know, through any of these places. But
4 our property ends here and so we can make,
5 you know, that connection. But to make a
6 connection across here, we're not opposed to
7 it, but it's not something that we wanted to
8 show.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: I'm not suggesting
10 that you do. I just wanted to understand it.

11 ED HODGES: Yeah.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: The runners in the
13 building will probably create some favorite
14 pathways just as there are these little
15 one-foot wide running paths all throughout
16 the MBC or DCR properties.

17 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I have a
18 question, please.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

20 STEVEN WINTER: On this slide, slide
21 36 could you show me the trajectory of the

1 delivery vehicles, how they will enter and
2 exit to the loading dock?

3 ED HODGES: For move-ins the truck
4 would come in here and back up here and then
5 load into the elevator. The trash would also
6 be picked up here, and then those trucks
7 would drive around the one way and then out.

8 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

9 ED HODGES: I imagine UPS and Fed-Ex
10 will pull up here and the guy will come in
11 and get back into his truck.

12 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

13 ED HODGES: I don't expect them to
14 fully use the landing dock.

15 STEVEN WINTER: So there will be
16 some element of traffic moving around there
17 that would be commercial or industrial
18 traffic.

19 Do we expect or anticipate that the
20 people who live there would for any reason
21 use that as a way to get somewhere quicker?

1 I'm just trying to figure out what kind of
2 traffic will be on that pathway.

3 ED HODGES: It's been our goal to --
4 I would say it was our goal to not even have
5 that if the fire department wasn't demanding
6 it. Because from the start I mentioned our
7 goal is to essentially try to place our
8 building in the reservation, you know, make
9 that as much of an amenity as we could. So
10 the, you know, what we've done, you know,
11 through, you know, the suggestion of the
12 board by eliminating all this parking is that
13 it's only from here out to here that the Zip
14 Cars would come. And by having the main
15 entrances here on the CambridgePark Drive, we
16 don't expect that that's going to benefit
17 anyone to drive around the building. So we
18 don't see it. We really see it as
19 infrequent, you know, the trash truck, you
20 know, twice a week and the move-ins as they
21 happen. It might be frequently in the

1 beginning but over time pretty infrequent.

2 So, this -- I'll go quickly through
3 this. Halverson, as you know has done a lot
4 of really wonderful landscapes in Cambridge
5 and they're our landscape architects, and
6 these are some of the preliminary thoughts in
7 terms of the development of the sort of front
8 entrance courtyard space.

9 Into the at grade courtyard which then
10 actually nicely steps back with balconies
11 overlooking it so it actually gets 20 feet
12 wider up above in terms of sort of natural
13 stone walls in there and tall grasses and
14 paved areas up close to the building.

15 And then the really large elevated
16 courtyard, which is 100-by-145 feet so it's
17 quite a significant space. It has some
18 topography in it in terms of sort of up and
19 down and creation of small gathering spaces,
20 so a lot of different residents from the
21 upper floors can come down, and then the

1 units that are actually at that level have
2 sort of protected courtyards.

3 And then to end just kind of a dust
4 shot that shows, you know, there's activity
5 up in the building, how it draws your eye,
6 how it ends the street and picks up into the
7 Pfizer building. And we're pleased to
8 present it to you, and I think we've
9 hopefully addressed your concerns and moved
10 you around the building in a way to show you
11 that we've taken it seriously.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

13 We've been asking questions as we go
14 along, are there any other questions?

15 Does anyone from the public wish to
16 speak at this time?

17 (No response).

18 HUGH RUSSELL: I don't see anybody.
19 Okay.

20 So, I came loaded for bear here with,
21 you know, all kinds of tabs and regulations

1 and I've been completely won over by this
2 presentation because I think they really have
3 considered the intent and the spirit of what
4 these regulations are and tried to address
5 it. This is a very high quality building.
6 And the additional consideration on changing
7 the parking on the left side and the
8 additional consideration about exactly how
9 the street's going to work convinced me that
10 this is really going to be fine. It's going
11 to be beyond fine. It's really going to be
12 very nice. So I think to explain their
13 tradeoffs here and they're going for the most
14 important things which are the connection to
15 the open space in back and the courtyards and
16 trying to do things a little differently than
17 our formulas, but I think it succeeds.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: I thought they did a
19 good job the first time around. I was
20 particularly not over -- I didn't like the
21 elevation of the cars along the public

1 pathway and I think they've really improved
2 it in general. So I think I kind of liked it
3 the first time and like it even better now.
4 I particularly like the pseudo visual opening
5 of the bicycle area up here with the
6 translucent strips as opposed to the whole
7 translucent panel. So I think the things
8 that they've done from my perspective has
9 really improved and made it better.

10 HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

11 AHMED NUR: I too concur. The
12 architectural, even though I have to say the
13 back of the building, page 32, when it's put
14 from this perspective, I'm not sure, for one
15 it looks like it's a different -- is it
16 different skin from this perspective of the
17 building?

18 ED HODGES: It's the same scan in
19 different colors. So the -- we call the
20 boomerang so the bent bar is one color, and
21 then the fingers that reach out to the

1 reservati on are a compl ementary col or.

2 AHMED NUR: Okay.

3 Well , I must say that I do like that
4 front lobby area. That's extremel y -- very
5 wel comi ng.

6 And then the other questi on that I had
7 is I guess you had a condenser on the lower
8 roof as my col league asked?

9 ED HODGES: Yep.

10 AHMED NUR: Okay. What's the noi se
11 on that? I suppose because there are some
12 windows right above it. If you can go back
13 to that drawi ng.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: They're actual ly 240
15 condensers; ri ght?

16 ED HODGES: In total , yes. Not on
17 that roof.

18 AHMED NUR: On the lower roof.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: So there's one
20 condenser for every apartment, that l ittle
21 three-foot square boxes.

1 AHMED NUR: Oh, they're three-foot
2 square boxes? Okay. It's not like a rooftop
3 unit?

4 HUGH RUSSELL: No. I mean, they
5 need to consider the cumulative effect of 20
6 or 30 at one spot, but it -- you can get
7 very, very quiet units.

8 ED HODGES: So the idea is that
9 they're going to be moved out to the end of
10 those wings so they are not up close to the
11 windows.

12 AHMED NUR: I see.

13 ED HODGES: And be treated as a
14 potentially like sort of a wood lattice fence
15 with screens on them. So, you know -- but
16 your view out of your apartment, you want to
17 look sort of diagonally at the reservation,
18 so the building -- that's why the building
19 bends. And I think in the original package
20 there was a roof plan, if anybody has that,
21 that shows how they're kind of pushed away.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: How noisy are those?
3 Because I know the building across from you
4 has a zillion of them on their roof, too. So
5 I wonder if we're going to get a buzz of
6 condensers from these two complexes.

7 ED HODGES: Well, we have an
8 acoustic engineer on board and we're
9 screening them with the walls so the noise is
10 not moving laterally. And most of them are
11 vertical, you know, they pull in the sides
12 and blow air straight up.

13 AHMED NUR: The only other comment
14 that I wanted to make is the car share
15 garage, you know, there are other -- that's
16 okay. I mean, I was just going to say that
17 there are other companies that are car share
18 garage other than Zip Car. I don't really
19 care either way if it's opened or closed, but
20 if I were to rent the Zip Car as a company
21 for car shares for a company that are not

1 just tenant for the building, that's for the
2 public. Somebody could be taking the T for
3 there and somebody could be walking in there
4 and a closed door that you don't know how to
5 operate or get out, and the liability of
6 damaging a car and a door, you know, in the
7 case of something goes wrong is to me an
8 insurance liability, and I can understand why
9 they don't want to close doors only -- and
10 all kinds of public safety as Steve said,
11 it's, you know, dark and they're behind
12 closed doors and the door is jammed or it's
13 wintertime, it could be an issue. So I don't
14 have a problem with the door being open that
15 way.

16 I wonder if there was anything in our
17 Zoning, because I know we passed -- we put
18 them into Zoning whether that car share
19 should be an internal or external and
20 accessibility and safety.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think we've

1 got specific regulations about that.

2 LIZA PADEN: No.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: No.

4 I have one little suggestion which is
5 the opening looks like it's about 10 feet
6 high or something like that to the doors,
7 it's fairly tall. Maybe you should consider
8 putting a ceiling that slopes a little bit
9 towards the inside because then that plain
10 would pick up some light rather than from
11 the, that would be coming in horizontally.

12 ED HODGES: Yes.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: That could be sloped
14 or stepped or something. It might be, I
15 mean, it's going to be artificially lit at
16 night I'm sure.

17 ED HODGES: We can do that.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Tom?

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think this is
20 now ripe for a decision. The only comment I
21 would make is that I think it's a beautiful

1 bui l di ng and under the headi ng of di versi ty
2 we have Fawcett Street, Route 2, and across
3 the street all done by the same archi tect i f
4 I'm not mi staken, and they're si mi lar.
5 They're di fferent and they went out of their
6 way to be di fferent, but thi s i s truly
7 di fferent, and that I thi nk we shoul d
8 celebrate. I thi nk that's very si gni fi cant.
9 I even thi nk i t's so handsome i n the way i t
10 faces Cambri dgePark Drive that I thi nk i t
11 wi ll i nspi re others to do something that wi ll
12 look di fferent and perhaps si mi lar to thi s
13 whi ch woul d be a good thi ng. So I thi nk
14 you've done a terri fi c job. And I hope that
15 we can move on by cl osi ng the heari ng and
16 l etti ng you, Hugh, hel p us wal k through what
17 I thi nk i s a fai rly compl ex Ordi nance so that
18 we can get to cl osure before ni ne o' cl ock.
19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So all those
20 i n favor of cl osi ng the heari ng and
21 proceedi ng wi th the deci si on.

1 (Raising hands).

2 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in
3 affirmative.

4 So, I'm looking at the application and
5 I see there are five items that we need to
6 act on:

7 There's the Article 19 project review.
8 And those are the things that we've actually
9 been looking at and discussing. They are --
10 each of the criteria are addressed in the
11 narrative that was given to us originally.
12 There is probably some enhancement to that
13 narrative that needs to be based -- updated
14 to the current, some of the current things
15 that have been done, and -- but I think as we
16 usually do, we read the narrative, we can
17 accept what's in the narrative as correctly
18 stating the facts about the project. Then
19 the yard requirements, and I've forgotten,
20 there's some setback issues?

21 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

1 The front setback by Special Permit I
2 think we can go to 15 feet, so we're seeking
3 the Special Permit to do that.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Otherwise it would be
5 a formula setback?

6 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's
7 right. And it's only portions of the
8 building where we really need to --

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So in general
10 it's about using the formula setbacks for a
11 building that of this size would create
12 things we don't wish to see basically.
13 Greater setbacks that really don't enhance
14 the project.

15 ED HODGES: Yes.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

17 And then there's a parking gross floor
18 area waiver and that's because the parking is
19 at the ground floor level; right?

20 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's
21 right. And then in the Alewife Overlay

1 District it doesn't get -- it can be excluded
2 from the GFA calculation upon the issuance of
3 the S from the Board.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

5 You're actually below the permitted
6 total GFA, but you still need this relief?

7 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: True. But
8 I think -- yes. We're about 30,000 shy. I'm
9 going to guess the garage all in is excess of
10 that.

11 ED HODGES: Yeah.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, it's
13 considerably excess of that.

14 Floodplain overlay, that's another
15 thing that exists in the floodplain.

16 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: And we have not
18 discussed the floodplain and there wasn't
19 information I think in our packet, but you're
20 putting -- how are you achieving compliance
21 with the floodplain regulations? Is it

1 partially because so much of the site doesn't
2 have any storage because of the existing
3 buildings?

4 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, maybe
5 we can give you one minute to cover the
6 record. And identify yourself. Just go up
7 to the microphone and quickly answer them.

8 SCOTT HORSLEY: For the record, my
9 name is Scott Horsley with the Horsley
10 Witten, Inc., we're the civil engineers on
11 the project.

12 If we can go to slide 36, first of all,
13 we're decreasing the amount of impervious
14 surface on the project. You can see from
15 that original slide, it's 95 percent
16 impervious. We're creating the green spaces.

17 So very quickly, we're increasing the
18 amount of compensatory storage on the site at
19 both of the elevation requirements. We've
20 provided that table of information in the
21 application to you and it was also submitted

1 and approved by the Conservation Commission
2 prior to the notice of intent.

3 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Page 17 of
4 the original application.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: So you're not doing
6 any fancy under building storage --

7 SCOTT HORSLEY: Well, I was going to
8 just quickly run through that because a
9 couple times tonight this was referred to as
10 a green project, and that's true in many
11 respects, but we are as your Ordinance
12 requires, we're employing a variety of low
13 impact development features. And I'll just
14 quickly mention them using this slide.

15 First of all, the ring road, the
16 emergency road circling the building, is to
17 be constructed of permeable pavement. And as
18 you saw from the presentation, also a
19 vegetated strip on either side to encourage
20 infiltration of storm water. A good part of
21 that emergency road sort of back right

1 section, if you will, underneath that there
2 is a series of structures called rain store
3 units, that will store the roof runoff from
4 the upper areas and then feed that into the
5 storm water system in a way that will
6 decrease the peak flow. It's actually
7 decreased them lower than existing
8 connections.

9 Further, we have the two vegetated
10 courtyards, one at ground level and one
11 elevated. Both of which provide some
12 significant flood storage functions
13 infiltration some of that storm water. That
14 will transport some of that water and
15 overflow into the same system.

16 And then finally upfront this
17 entranceway that shows some very nice
18 pictures of, is also intended to be a binary
19 retention. Some of the storm water will be
20 collected into vegetated areas. So I think
21 together all of those will provide not only

1 the flood storage which the Ordinance
2 requires, but also some nice water quality
3 treatment and some nice low impact
4 development features.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: And basically our
6 Special Permit that we grant is basically in
7 recognition that this been reviewed by the
8 city engineer.

9 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And the
10 Conservation Commission.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: And the Conservation
12 Commission.

13 BRIAN MURPHY: And, Mr. Chair, I did
14 receive earlier this evening a letter from
15 Owen O'Riordan attesting to that fact and
16 stating similar conclusions as the engineer
17 referenced.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

19 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And,
20 Mr. Chair, I think we'd include in the
21 record, we submitted a copy of the order of

1 conditions that was issued by the Con. Comm.
2 which addresses the same criteria in the
3 floodplain Special Permit on storm water
4 management.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. It's a
6 peculiar feature of our Ordinance that we
7 permit stuff that is really actually on the
8 jurisdiction of others, but....

9 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: But there
10 are sometimes when -- I mean, it just happens
11 to be that you've got overlapping
12 jurisdiction here, but there are occasions
13 where need to have a floodplain and there
14 isn't a Con. Comm. role, but it is true in
15 this case that the heavy detail has this
16 analysis has gone on at public hearings
17 before the Conservation Commission and their
18 decision is part of our application.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: And then the last is
20 a reduction in required parking from 1.0 to
21 now currently 0.87. And that is supported by

1 Sue Clippinger, and we have a letter from her
2 dated today. And she has a few conditions
3 that would be part of our decision that about
4 to take of bicycle racks that are to be used.
5 And an earlier letter had asked that the
6 parking garage entrances be moved. In the
7 current letter says that she's now in
8 concurrence with the plan based on our review
9 and discussion of it.

10 I have to say that was one of my big
11 things, too, but then I sort of suddenly
12 realized there are two access points to the
13 garage. Are they going to be where the doors
14 are or are they going to be where the access
15 road is? It doesn't actually make any
16 difference. Same number of cars are going to
17 cross the sidewalk in one place or another.
18 And the way it's being done now it's very
19 visible, it's very safe, and it's very
20 pretty. So that seems like it stopped being
21 an issue for me when I finally got to that

1 realization.

2 So, that's the relief being sought and
3 so I think as I say, the findings are found
4 in the application sort of chapter and verse
5 we've discussed them when we did the project
6 earlier.

7 Somebody can make a motion to grant the
8 Special Permits and we can proceed.

9 WILLIAM TIBBS: So moved.

10 AHMED NUR: I just had a quick
11 question with regard to the last item which
12 was the relief in the wetland.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the floodplain
14 overlay?

15 AHMED NUR: Right.

16 You said you reduced the hardscape.
17 What percent did you decrease it from?

18 HUGH RUSSELL: 95 percent hard to
19 something like 70 percent hard.

20 PAMELA WINTERS: 20 percent
21 difference I think.

1 AHMED NUR: What material are you
2 using to do that? Is it stone or are you
3 just using permeable the new asphalt that are
4 kind of lighter?

5 SCOTT HORSLEY: The figure that I
6 was referring to is 20,000 square foot
7 reduction in the impervious area, and the
8 primary areas at the at-grade courtyard, the
9 elevated courtyard, and then along the
10 emergency way, you saw the rendering earlier
11 that shows vegetated areas along the sides of
12 that emergency --

13 AHMED NUR: But not the roof?

14 SCOTT HORSLEY: Well, not the roof
15 at the top of the building but the elevated
16 courtyard is included in that but not the
17 roof at the sixth floor, no.

18 BRIAN MURPHY: And knowing the
19 elevation, water table's being high there,
20 how -- are you putting a lot of stone under
21 something?

1 the groundwater?

2 SCOTT HORSLEY: No. Releases it
3 into the storm drain system.

4 AHMED NUR: Oh, okay.

5 SCOTT HORSLEY: So we're limiting --
6 we're on purpose limiting the amount of
7 infiltration because of the high water table.

8 AHMED NUR: Are you using any of
9 that grey water for other usage or no?

10 SCOTT HORSLEY: Not other than
11 irrigating the two courtyards.

12 AHMED NUR: Okay, thank you.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

14 AHMED NUR: And, William, you're all
15 set with your sign? You had a question about
16 the --

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. He did explain
18 it.

19 AHMED NUR: Okay.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: So, there's a motion.

21 Is there a second to that motion?

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Is there more
3 discussion on the motion?

4 (No Response.)

5 HUGH RUSSELL: All those voting in
6 favor to grant the five Special Permits?

7 (Raising hands).

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. All members
9 voting in favor.

10 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you
11 very much.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
13 This is was an exemplary project.

14 ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And now we will take
16 a 10-minute break, short break, and take up
17 the next item on the agenda.

18 (A short recess was taken.)

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we're all
20 here and ready to pick up. Maybe we can
21 close the door. Just to remind you, Hugh,

1 our Chair has recused himself from the Cedar
2 Street matter.

3 Could somebody lower this podium so
4 that I can see the people that I'm looking
5 at? We may have to raise it again, but I'm
6 not sure.

7 We're picking up where we left off.
8 Let me just get my notes. This is a matter
9 of 51 Cedar Street. The hearing is still
10 open. What I would like to do is to ask
11 Mr. Hope if he has any comments and then we
12 will have some comments perhaps from people
13 who want to make comments while the hearing
14 is still open, and then I think we can move
15 to deliberation and I'm hoping to do that in
16 certainly no more than half an hour, perhaps
17 less.

18 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes, sir.

19 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

20 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Good evening.

21 For the record, attorney Sean Hope, 130

1 Bishop Allen Drive in Cambridge. I'm here
2 tonight with the project architect Peter
3 Quinn. This is a continued case at 51 Cedar
4 Street, and this is a proposal to add a
5 single-family house to the middle rear of the
6 structure pursuant to a 5.53 Special Permit.
7 Two weeks ago we were before the Planning
8 Board and we presented our proposal. In
9 those two weeks this gave us an opportunity
10 to actually -- for Peter, the owner, and
11 myself and re-look at the plans and we came
12 up with some minor tweaks. I would just like
13 to emphasize to the Board that, you know, it
14 did give us a chance to again reach out to
15 the abutters. We made the decision not just
16 to change something to change. I think
17 during the discussion period there was a lot
18 of guidance given by the Planning Board in
19 terms of what they saw. I know we want to
20 get to the actual presentation. One of the
21 things we asked Peter to do was to actually

1 have an image of the as-of-right part of the
2 5.53 Special Permit, once to look at
3 identifiable benefits and as well as whether
4 two structures would maybe reduce or more
5 importantly not significantly increase the
6 impact on the abutters. So when Peter brings
7 that up, and I think this is actually the
8 as-of-right scheme -- this is one of the many
9 schemes, but I think it visually just shows
10 what the connected townhouses potentially
11 might look like. So Peter will walk you
12 through that. But I just wanted to point out
13 a few in terms of for the record:

14 One of the advantages to two structures
15 would be that the massing is broken up.
16 Really depending on how you orient the
17 buildings, they're still going to be a very
18 long wall plain of building. And depending
19 on which abutters you are, that could be
20 maybe more beneficial or less beneficial but
21 either way the experience from the sides that

1 you have a long building and I think the
2 proposal, the as-of-right scheme it's greater
3 than 80 feet going into the rear yard. Part
4 of that is because of the non-conforming
5 front yard. So you have to move the house or
6 cut off the front porch to make it conforming
7 and then you have the attached rear
8 structures.

9 Another criteria that I think is
10 important to bring up is that the two
11 structures is preferable for actually the
12 occupants of the building in terms of light
13 and air. As your typical connected row
14 house, often times the middle unit or the end
15 unit has less light and air because you don't
16 have windows on the side. So that providing
17 two separate units -- Peter, put it back to
18 the other? So providing two units would
19 allow for increased light and air for this
20 rear single-family as opposed to having a
21 unit sandwiched in between a front and an end

1 uni t as well .

2 I 'd also just want to briefly talk
3 about the urban design guidelines. There was
4 some feedback about shadows. I think
5 Mr. Anninger pointed out that specifically it
6 says to mitigate shadows, not eliminate
7 shadows.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Mi ni mi ze.

9 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Mi ni mi ze,
10 exactly. Excuse me, mi ni mi ze shadows. And I
11 think we did that by moving the house three
12 feet to the rear. But we also did look at
13 different types of roof types and we looked
14 at what the appreciable decrease in shadow,
15 and it was very -- it was not significant in
16 terms of actually maybe creating something
17 that's not consistent with the character of
18 the neighborhood. So we did look at that as
19 well .

20 Out of the Article 19 design
21 guidelines, and just briefly, they look at

1 storm water mitigation. They look at trash.
2 They look at window sight lines. There are
3 10 different characteristics that are part of
4 those design guidelines. I would say that we
5 meet or achieve almost all of those. So just
6 to the point that what you see here today was
7 really, it was really based on those design
8 guidelines, and they're only guidelines but
9 they are important. And so I think that
10 shadow was really focussed on the last time,
11 but that's only one of ten. And then so to
12 the extent that we could achieve those.

13 And another thing I think you'll hear
14 from some of the public comments that, you
15 know, there are some neighbors that wanted us
16 to move the house further back. One wanted
17 to protect the tree canopies, and tree
18 protection is very important as part of the
19 design guidelines as well. So, as you move,
20 you satisfy maybe one neighbor and you may
21 exacerbate another situation on the other.

1 So I just want to let the Board know that we
2 also -- we did look at this. We tried to
3 orient the roofs different ways and tried to
4 change the experience, but I guess in the
5 interest of time I'll turn it over to Peter
6 and he can walk you through the changes.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Sir, can I ask you
8 a question? I think I'm in the process here
9 of perhaps changing my mind from what it was
10 the last time. Could you show what was, what
11 could be built as of right?

12 WILLIAM TIBBS: Right.

13 PAMELA WINTERS: That's it right
14 there.

15 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: This is an
16 as-of-right scheme. And so the garage or
17 that third house could be swapped around or
18 the third house could be moved and you could
19 actually have a non-covered garage. But I
20 think you can just tell the depth of which
21 that continuous structure actually goes back

1 into the lot. And there's also, and I think
2 Peter can explain this, but also this
3 proposal as of right, also has shadow
4 implications. They may move to a different
5 location to a different abutter, but it's
6 still a challenge because you still have that
7 massing there. But I do think the experience
8 for the occupants of these proposed
9 buildings, if you're in that middle unit, you
10 really have less privacy but also light and
11 air because you're limited by windows. You
12 can do things like skylights and do other
13 things that have skylights and air, but it's
14 very different than having your traditional
15 single-family. But I do want to let Peter --
16 turn this over.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes. I'm going to
18 ask you a question, too, Mr. Hope. You went
19 through in your submission what you called
20 the guidelines of Article 19. Am I not right
21 that Article 19 sometimes applies as a

1 requirement but that's not the case here.

2 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes. So part
3 of the Special Permit criteria has these
4 guidelines as a guide, but in terms of
5 requirement as meaning if you don't meet one
6 of these guidelines there's not, it doesn't
7 trigger --

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Sometimes, right.

9 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: -- additional
10 relief.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see, thank you.
12 Why don't we move on.

13 PETER QUINN: Thank you. Good
14 evening. Peter Quinn, Peter Quinn Architects
15 for the record.

16 Before we get to the by-right scheme I
17 just wanted to fill you in on some other
18 drawings that we produced. We did do a
19 shadow study in which we tried a couple of
20 different ridge and roof arrangements. And
21 again, looked at the shadow implications as

1 we would be for December. I hope this is
2 readable here. But this is the way that it's
3 presently configured with the ridge running
4 this way. And you can see at noon that the
5 yard is shadowed as we've shown in previous
6 shadow -- shadow studies. We turned the
7 ridge the other way, it has a small affect.
8 And if we actually did a flat roof, even with
9 a flat roof, that's almost 10 feet lower than
10 -- it's about nine feet lower than what the
11 ridge would be on this. There really is no
12 appreciable difference in the shadow believe
13 it or not.

14 If you look at three o'clock in the
15 afternoon, again, you have very similar
16 shadows depending without regard to which
17 ridge or roof style you use.

18 So we concluded from that that we
19 probably had as good a solution as we're
20 gonna have on these roofs not thinking that
21 there really was, you know, a difference, for

1 instance, with the flat roof here eventually
2 that shadow will move on that house and we'll
3 be back where we were with this one. So I've
4 -- we also made some adjustments to
5 windowsill height at the request of one of
6 the neighbors. And finally, that we did some
7 advanced anticipation of our site engineering
8 plan should we get approved by this Board, of
9 putting in dry wells and making sure that
10 there's no soil stockpiled on the roots of
11 this tree.

12 So I'll go to the by-right now. So
13 this is a scheme, it's actually very similar
14 to the scheme I presented at 49 Cedar over
15 two years ago to show how this could be built
16 out by right. And the way the law reads I
17 think the way Sean was explaining it, that if
18 you have an existing structure which is
19 conforming, your only limit to what you can
20 add is one that must be attached. And
21 secondly, that it built up to your limit of

1 FAR, floor area ratio. So I just simply took
2 the footprint of what we were proposing as a
3 freestanding building and attached it to
4 these other structures so that it becomes a
5 single structure with the same amount of
6 square footage as we have here in total. As
7 you know, the area required for a parking
8 garage does not count as part of your floor
9 area ratio. So, you know, this would be a
10 single-story structure connecting a modified
11 front structure. This would be modified so
12 that you could have two townhouse structures
13 that complies with the letter of the law as a
14 townhouse development. And then finally an
15 attached townhouse structure in the rear for
16 a total, the same amount of square footage.
17 I think we probably end up maybe not quite so
18 far back in the backyard if you just compared
19 these two. This one is a little further
20 back. Again, that's part of our adjustment
21 process with neighbors. But this by-right

1 that we have here, you know -- I know having
2 talked to Rich as late as today, he'd rather
3 not develop this, not only because it's less
4 desirable for light and air for these units
5 that are in the middle, or have to abut each
6 other, but also he's got a nearly completed
7 renovation on the interior that he spent
8 quite a few years on. So, you know, having
9 to do the entire interior to make this work
10 or to tear this down would be something he
11 would rather not do. He would rather build
12 on what he's been able to do.

13 Just for the record, would have to take
14 off kind of a front porch that's been
15 enclosed which puts us exactly at the front
16 setback that what we would need in order to
17 comply with the by-law.

18 I'll take any questions. Thank you.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,
20 Mr. Chair. To be noted on the construction
21 drawings, no stockpiling of soil over tree

1 rots. Was that a request also from the
2 abutters?

3 PETER QUINN: It was. And I would
4 -- eventually it will end up on a landscape
5 drawing, but --

6 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

7 PETER QUINN: -- somebody was
8 thinking ahead and there was no contest on
9 that.

10 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

11 And approximate location for proposed
12 drain and dry well. Is that a request also?

13 PETER QUINN: Yes, it was.

14 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

15 And could you help me understand
16 wherever it says removed, just tell me how
17 that happened and what -- how that's going to
18 help? For instance --

19 PETER QUINN: In here.

20 STEVEN WINTER: -- next stair
21 addition removed.

1 PETER QUINN: This is getting back
2 to what the existing house looks like right
3 now. And I, if you wanted me to go into it
4 in detail, I'm happy to pull up some photos,
5 but it's just short as I heard from the
6 Chairman. There's a small addition about one
7 and a half story on the site here basically
8 falling apart. There's a large deck that's
9 mounted on the side of the building with
10 braces right in this location right now also
11 about to fall off. And then on the side of
12 the building there's a small one-story, you
13 know, separate structure that functions as an
14 entry into the basement. So all three of
15 those would come off and then rebuild. So,
16 you know, that we would rebuild right here
17 but a landscape in the other areas.

18 WILLIAM TIBBS: Just for clarity,
19 those things that you're saying are roots are
20 not changes to the drawings you did the last
21 time? Only the things in red clouds.

1 PETER QUINN: Only in red, yes.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could I?

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Go ahead.

4 WILLIAM TIBBS: Could you explain
5 the change in the elevation? The windows I
6 difference. I just wanted to know.

7 PETER QUINN: Yeah.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: What was the purpose
9 of that I guess?

10 PETER QUINN: Right, so the purpose
11 is that so that one can't look directly out
12 at the neighbor.

13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, really? Okay.

14 PETER QUINN: And this would affect
15 really both neighbors in the rear. So those
16 windows are located approximately right here.

17 WILLIAM TIBBS: I see.

18 PETER QUINN: So by putting the sill
19 at four-foot, eight it's just a little bit
20 above eye level for most people.

21 WILLIAM TIBBS: Thank you.

1 AHMED NUR: I think that was the
2 original by the way. That's not in the
3 ridge.

4 PETER QUINN: I think I needed to
5 clarify. I had the wrong number down. So,
6 yeah, thank you.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay. I think
8 that does it.

9 I want to make sure that we have the
10 continuation of the hearing for anybody who
11 wants to speak. The point of speaking today
12 is to comment on what further we have learned
13 from the proponent and whatever comments you
14 have that you did not make last time. Let me
15 just say to you that we have received letters
16 from at least three or four people, maybe 10,
17 and a couple of others. I'm going to ask you
18 this time because we've already had a chance
19 to speak last time, that this time you speak
20 for two minutes, and I have one person here
21 who has signed up. Is there a Nancy Pagan

1 (phonetic). Would you like to speak?

2 NANCY PAGAN: Yes.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Please come
4 forward.

5 AHMED NUR: Come up to the
6 microphone. State your name and address.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: I don't have a
8 clock, Tom. But I think where there's only
9 two people speaking, I don't think it's an
10 issue.

11 NANCY PAGAN: My name is Nancy Pagan
12 and we live at 53R Cedar Street. We weren't
13 at the first hearing the last time. We
14 weren't aware of it. We didn't know it was
15 happening, so that's why we're here tonight.
16 We live right next-door to the development
17 that's, you know, where you see unit 3 is
18 looking over our backyard there, that green
19 sort of like those -- there's our backyard.
20 So we had prior to 51 being developed, we had
21 two yards that were open, and we had a nice

1 Landscape. And so 51 was developed and we
2 got two new houses overlooking our yard.
3 Very looming, and that's okay. And then now
4 we're discovering that right next-door we're
5 going to have another house even closer to us
6 right over our backyard looking down on us.
7 So the two were bad enough, but this one is
8 really close. A little bit too close for
9 comfort for us, and it's just really
10 distressing because we have a very nice old
11 house and bought it because of the yard. And
12 so now I don't know if there's any way around
13 this, but I'm very concerned about living
14 with that.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you show me
16 where you are again?

17 NANCY PAGAN: Yeah, right around --

18 PAMELA WINTERS: Are you in the
19 brick house?

20 NANCY PAGAN: Uh-huh. Yeah, the red
21 brick house.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, it's charming.

2 NANCY PAGAN: It's very charming.

3 You know, so there you have it. We have this
4 open space and now it's going to be

5 compromised. So I would love for it to be

6 not that configuration, you know, have it

7 more towards the front. You know, that works

8 better for us in terms of, you know, being

9 able to maintain that sense of openness.

10 That's the reason why we bought the house

11 frankly, was that backyard and the open

12 space. And the other houses were developed.

13 So it's just a little, for us, difficult to

14 live with.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

16 Is there anybody else who would like to
17 speak?

18 AMY TAN: Thanks for letting me
19 speak again today.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Speak up.

21 AMY TAN: Just for the record Amy

1 Tan, owner of 49 Cedar Street, unit 2.

2 I think the biggest issue that the
3 proponent is trying to bring forth is that
4 this second dwelling, as you know, is in the
5 premise of light openness, open space and
6 that's really what the proposition was for 49
7 Cedar Street, was to create three dwellings
8 with private open space and private open
9 yards so that residents can enjoy. And at
10 this point it really does affect us. I mean,
11 the shadow study does show that during high
12 noontime to three p.m. it completely
13 obliterates rates my backyard. I've got, you
14 know, landscape evergreens and that need four
15 to five hours of light. But just not really,
16 you know, affecting my unit per se, but
17 really affects I think unit 1 as well. As
18 you can see, this is -- this is unit 1's
19 private use of the deck. So really it's
20 blocking off noontime for me, blocking off
21 three p.m., you know, light between this noon

1 to three p.m. also affecting unit No. 1. So
2 this is not just affecting one space, but
3 really multiple effects. And, again, you
4 know, I think the shadow really does come to
5 play from an east to west side. So really
6 little affect for the other abutters. But,
7 again, in the spirit of preserving open
8 space, I think this really does the
9 opposite of what we try to accomplish for 49
10 Cedar Street.

11 Thanks.

12 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

13 Is there anybody else who would like to
14 speak?

15 (No Response.)

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right. I
17 think we can move on to our deliberation and
18 I think we can probably close the hearing at
19 this point.

20 All those in favor of closing the
21 hearing, please raise your hand.

1 (All Members of the Board
2 raising their hands.)

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: That is settled.
4 We had taken a bit of a sense of the Board
5 last time. And I think, Ahmed, you had some
6 questions that you had to be resolved in your
7 own mind. Whether you want to speak to those
8 now or not, this would be a good time.

9 AHMED NUR: Yes, I do. And I do
10 appreciate it, Mr. Chairman, after having the
11 time to think about we were overloaded the
12 last meeting and I didn't want to hear what I
13 think I was hearing and I wanted to go out
14 there and visit the neighborhood when I was
15 rested I suppose to look at the houses, the
16 abutters, the back, so on and so forth. And
17 it helped quite a bit to go back there and
18 I'm ready for deliberation. I don't have any
19 other questions.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

21 Pam.

1 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, I know I was
2 very much against this last time.

3 Of course my preference would be just
4 to have keep the two-story dwelling in the
5 front and not build anything in the backyard.
6 I've been in a similar situation myself, so I
7 really sympathize with the neighbors I have
8 to say.

9 You know, there's a term in landscaping
10 called borrowed landscape, and without that
11 house in the back, you know, if you put in a
12 really nice garden back there, it would
13 really benefit all of the people living
14 around there. That was my thought.

15 So, the Green Ribbon Committee which
16 was -- happened about ten years ago really
17 mentioned that this area of Cambridge in
18 particular, North Cambridge was one of the
19 most needy in terms of open space and park
20 space. And that was another reason why I was
21 objecting to it. I was putting my thoughts

1 together during the week.

2 I also like to look at each individual
3 proposal. I know a lot of my colleagues and
4 I have the utmost respect for them and
5 probably over my 13 years on the Board I have
6 only disagreed with them a handful of times.
7 But I really like to look at each individual
8 proposal on its own merits and I know that
9 they were saying well, okay, if the two -- if
10 the people on the other side, on the right
11 side were able a couple years ago to put up
12 those two houses, then this developer should
13 also be able to -- be allowed to put up
14 another house. But I do like to, you know,
15 see the consequences of the building and see
16 what's -- how that's going to impact the
17 neighborhood as a whole.

18 And let's see, what else here? One of
19 the most important things when we were doing
20 the rezoning for the residents of Cambridge
21 was to maintain open space in the city. And,

1 you know, my feeling is you get a street like
2 Holworthy Street which is up by Mount Auburn,
3 and -- Mount Auburn Cemetery, and that has
4 very deep backyards. And you start filling
5 in, okay if one person fills in one, you
6 know, why can't another person fill in
7 another? So those were a lot of reasons that
8 I came up with, but in seeing what the
9 developer can do as of right, you know, it's
10 tough -- you know, again, I would love to
11 just see the cars parked in back. I don't
12 have a problem with that. But I would love
13 to see a nice garden in the back that
14 everybody could enjoy and it wouldn't be as
15 crowded and, you know, that would be my
16 preference. And -- but, seeing what can be
17 done as of right, I don't think we have much
18 of an alternative here. So that's my feeling
19 about it and I just want to say I just really
20 respect the rest of my colleagues' decision
21 on this, too. I know I was a little

1 emotional last week, but anyway.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right, thank
3 you, Pam.

4 PAMELA WINTERS: Sure.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you for
6 explaining where you stand.

7 PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Anybody else want
9 to make a comment?

10 H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure.

11 You know, it's a difficult Ordinance
12 and it's a difficult situation. The
13 Ordinance does allow certain things as of
14 right, and I was one of the people who wanted
15 to see from the developer what could be done
16 as of right and whether this was a
17 preferable scenario to then the as of right,
18 and I think it is. I've been by the
19 neighborhood and by the property many times,
20 including again today. I think the
21 neighborhood has a lot of houses that are

1 very close together. A lot of them have
2 houses that are in the rear of their houses.
3 You know, two of the speaker today live in
4 houses that are behind of their houses. And
5 that it's difficult I think for all of us to
6 accept that open space here and in a lot of
7 other places is not ours. I mean, it belongs
8 to someone else. And, you know, as much as
9 we enjoy having someone else's open space, it
10 really doesn't belong to us. And so if the
11 owner of that property has a right to do
12 something with their property, they have that
13 right. And so there is something they can do
14 as of right which I don't think is a great
15 option. It's already a large, long building,
16 just making it even longer and putting
17 parking in the middle and blocking out the
18 windows. And two of the units I don't think
19 is a preferable situation. And so I think
20 the Special Permit option is a preferable
21 situation with the one separated house in the

1 back. I know there have been concerns about
2 parking and, you know lights, headlights, but
3 there is a large fence there and I don't
4 think that's going to be a real issue. I've
5 looked at the shadow studies carefully and,
6 you know, while yes, there will be some
7 shadows, I think the increase is fairly
8 minimal. I mean the trees create shadows.
9 The existing houses create shadows. If what
10 was allowed as of right was built, that would
11 create shadows. And so I think weighing all
12 the equities of what we can't do under the
13 Special Permit and all the requirements of
14 the Special Permit, I think this is a
15 preferable solution and an option and, you
16 know, I would be in support of granting the
17 Special Permit.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Steve.

19 STEVEN WINTER: Thank you, Mr.

20 Chair. My position has not changed since the
21 last time we discussed this. And I remain

1 convinced that in 553.2, the 553.2(a) and
2 (b) -- (a) and then (b)3, 5, and 6, that all
3 of these conditions are met and I think I
4 agreed with them last time so I want say it
5 again. I believe that we've met all of these
6 conditions.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Bill.

8 WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to say
9 that I -- I just want to say that I agree. I
10 definitely agree with Ted. He made the
11 points that I wanted to make. It's extremely
12 helpful almost every time one of these comes
13 to us, we ask the question of what can be
14 done as of right, I think the way the
15 Ordinance is written, it kind of implies that
16 you want to see one alternative versus the
17 other so we can determine whether the Special
18 Permit separation is reasonable. So I just
19 want to say to staff that when other people
20 come with these kinds of things, if you can
21 just remind them that it's much more helpful

1 to us if they go through that exercise so
2 that we don't have to do it a second time.
3 It makes it -- I think it gets to the core of
4 whether or not these work or not.

5 PAMELA WINTERS: Can I just say one
6 last -- were you through?

7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

8 PAMELA WINTERS: Can I say just one
9 last thing just to the couple?

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: Sure.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: I understand where
12 you're coming from, but I don't think that
13 this design is going to impact your property
14 much less than what they could do as of
15 right. So I think you need to kind keep that
16 in mind. So, thank you.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: And I still
18 believe what I said last time, and I have
19 gone back also, and I don't think this is an
20 easy one. I think this is hard for all of us
21 because I think we understand in these very

1 tight situations how change of this sort is
2 threatening and uncomfortable. My sense is
3 that we have the 49 Cedar Street example,
4 which I think actually has been an extremely
5 successful example of how to take a long
6 narrow lot and make it better than it was
7 before. My view, and I know not everybody
8 will agree with this, is that these very long
9 narrow lots have a lot of open space in the
10 back that is not just underutilized but often
11 become unmaintained large lots in back that
12 perhaps be considered open space in one
13 sense, but they are hardly improved lot space
14 because they are too big and because they end
15 up being like sandlots that are forgotten.
16 Many lots like that are in -- these long lots
17 have really been almost abandoned lots. And
18 now that 49 has been improved, I think the
19 gardens and the maintenance of them have made
20 what open space is left actually much better
21 than it was before. And I think that will be

1 the same for 51.

2 I also think that it was helpful to see
3 what can be done as of right. It is
4 surprising, actually, when you think about it
5 just what can be done as of right, but that
6 is the way the Ordinance reads, and that
7 could hardly be a better solution. I think
8 that's perfectly clear. So I think we're
9 ready to move on.

10 We have a difficult Ordinance here.
11 This 5.53 gives us a choice of (a) and (b).
12 And last time I skipped over (a) because we
13 really didn't have before us a single
14 structure as of right to compare it to. We
15 now do, and I think it is perfectly clear to
16 me that the proposed development of two
17 structures will reduce the impact of what it
18 would be if it were just not one structure.
19 So I think we could probably rely just on A,
20 but I'm tempted to take on this one, somewhat
21 of a belt and suspenders approach, and just

1 look through the conditions of B as well to
2 satisfy us and others because I'm convinced
3 as you said, Steve, that we can meet those
4 conditions.

5 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, B is --
6 if it makes us creating a more defensible
7 decision, then I'm all for that.

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. And
9 I think you've said that you're satisfied
10 that it met the requirements. I think we
11 talked them through. I'll run through them
12 quickly, and maybe Ted and others can bolster
13 whatever I say or omit, but I believe that it
14 does provide nevertheless for a rear yard
15 setback. What is it, 35 feet?

16 ATTORNEY SEAN HOPE: Yes.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: Which is -- what
18 is the minimum required and it is
19 substantial. It is adequate for that really
20 large tree, that really wonderful tree. So I
21 think you've taken care of that. In a way I

1 will say that it almost would have been
2 better if you didn't move it back those three
3 feet that you did, but I understand the
4 balancing that you went through and I don't
5 think we want to revisit that.

6 I think you stayed as best you could
7 for the existing two-family in the front half
8 of the lot together with the parking
9 facilities. I'm not quite sure where the
10 half line is. Is it where in the middle of
11 the parking lot?

12 PETER QUINN: The 75 foot is right
13 there.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

15 PETER QUINN: Halfway is right about
16 there.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think when this
18 is done provided enhanced living environment
19 for the residents on the lot. It looks for
20 incentives to retain existing structures on
21 the lot, particularly anything considered

1 hi storical or preferably preserved. You're
2 certainly doing that with the front building.
3 And I think that's all to the good.

4 Parking is being handled sensitively
5 with -- as I see from the landscaping, an
6 attempt to visually keep that out of sight
7 from at least the north. I'm not quite sure
8 what to say about the south. That's a fence
9 there. That's a building there.

10 NANCY PAGAN: That's our house.

11 PETER QUINN: The mill windows on
12 it.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. And
14 so I think the visual impact of the parking
15 from the public streets and the adjacent lots
16 has been addressed as best as it can.

17 And just to mention this, I think you
18 have made a good attempt at minimizing the
19 shadow impact to the extent you can, but I
20 accept and think it's reasonable that you
21 cannot eliminate them entirely. And I

1 understand that that's not always what others
2 want to hear, but I think this, in the end
3 when all this is said and done, I expect this
4 to be an enhancement of Cedar Street and I
5 hope you will feel some of you will feel that
6 way, too.

7 We have received at least one letter
8 from a neighbor saying that they thought this
9 was a good and promising improvement to the
10 neighborhood this evening from somebody at I
11 think it's 49.

12 PAMELA WINTERS: Jennifer
13 (phonetic).

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's not an
15 unanimous problem. Given all that, I think
16 having heard everybody --

17 STEVEN WINTER: I think if we're --
18 if we wanted to add 2b.6, I believe that also
19 is applicable here and I'll just ask my
20 colleagues, I don't think you mentioned it,
21 but if it is applicable, I'd like to include

1 it, which is the increased opportunities to
2 reduce the height and the bulk -- in this
3 case bulk -- as new construction is deeper
4 into a lot or closer to structures on
5 abutting lots.

6 We're reducing the bulk.

7 Does that make sense to you, Ted?

8 H. THEODORE COHEN: It does. I
9 mean, I think A is sufficient in itself, and
10 I think B are, you know, just matters were to
11 consider and I don't think necessarily to
12 find all of them, but I think basically in
13 this circumstance almost all of them have
14 been complied or improved.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we've also
16 gone over the criteria that's required for a
17 Special Permit and I see no reason to add to
18 what has been submitted to us so I think we
19 can incorporate that into the record.

20 I think I'm prepared to ask for a
21 motion to approve what has been requested.

1 AHMED NUR: So moved.

2 WILLIAM TIBBS: I second.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: Ted, do you want
4 to help me here?

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, it's
6 already been moved and it's been seconded.

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Any discussion?

8 (No Response.)

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: All those in favor
10 please raise your hand.

11 (Raising hands).

12 PAMELA WINTERS: I'm abstaining.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: I believe we have
14 three, four, five votes in favor, one
15 abstention. The Special Permit is granted.

16 (A short recess was taken.)

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So, if the Board's
18 agreeable I'd like to, I think the bike
19 parking zoning could take quite some time and
20 I don't think we have time for that tonight.
21 I'd like to move on to the 159 First Street

1 While they're setting up, Roger, could
2 you explain to us what we're doing right now?

3 LIZA PADEN: Okay, I'll take a whack
4 at it.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

6 LIZA PADEN: Special Permit No. 231A
7 is a three-part Special Permit; one part is
8 the office development that is currently
9 under construction by Skanska.

10 One part is a multi-family residential
11 development at 159 First Street which that
12 portion of the permit has been purchased by
13 Urban Spaces with a partner.

14 And the third part is eight townhouses
15 on the Charles Street block.

16 What is before you tonight is a change
17 in the entrances to the ground floor first
18 floor units. And Roger and I wanted you to
19 have a chance to look at them directly,
20 because during discussion at the public
21 hearing for this and other ground floor

1 residences, the Board has asked for direct
2 entries, stoops on the street to enliven the
3 streetscape. Because of issues with the
4 architectural variance board there has to be
5 another solution, which Roger and I wanted
6 them to bring this to you so that you can see
7 this and make a reading if this is in keeping
8 with the original decision.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So just add
10 to that the access board believes that if you
11 do a direct access from a street in an
12 apartment, it needs to be accessible to
13 someone in a wheel chair. And it's not
14 written in their regulations, but it is an
15 interpretation that they have offered when
16 asked, so that was something that wasn't
17 known I think when we were at the Ordinance.
18 So the Ordinance encourages stoops but they
19 actually can't be done. Although, there have
20 been strategies, for example, Sierra, for
21 example, which has stoops, there's also an

1 accessible roof that comes up to the terrace
2 that all the stoops are on the terrace and
3 there's a way to get to them in a wheel ed
4 vehic le. And in my own practice, I just
5 completed a bui lding in which the first floor
6 slopes 20 inches from one end to the other
7 because it has to follow the slope of the
8 exi sting si dewalk. It's actual ly the steps,
9 but the core of steps. And it's very
10 chal lengi ng to meet these rules on any real
11 si te. So that's, it's not a fri volous
12 change.

13 STUART DASH: The Board has seen two
14 projects not yet bui lt that have been
15 approved where they basi cally put a ramp up
16 that intersected wi th each of the stoops that
17 went along the way.

18 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chai r, I wanted
19 to note first of all, that my house bei ng 100
20 years old has that slope all by itse lf. It's
21 develo ped it over the last 100 years. But my

1 feeling is that the full ADA accessibility is
2 the mandatory threshold criteria for us. And
3 I just wanted to see if you concur with that,
4 that nothing less than that is appropriate.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, if we're
6 getting technical, ADA doesn't apply to
7 apartment buildings. Federal fair housing
8 applies to apartment buildings. And also the
9 Massachusetts Architectural various board
10 regulations, so you have a federal regulation
11 which can be complied with in one of I think
12 now 10 compliance pathways that are slightly
13 different in their regulations, and you have
14 a state which doesn't always agree a hundred
15 percent, which causes certain difficulties.
16 They have different ideas, for example, on
17 how you approach your refrigerator. And so
18 if you're really complying, you have to make
19 both methods of approach work. So, yes, I
20 mean they are -- I'm not arguing that we
21 shouldn't follow the law and I'm just

1 explaining that it's -- because it's not part
2 of the written regulations on the various
3 board, the issue wasn't -- when they issued
4 the regulations in 1996, this wasn't clear.
5 But it has been made clear by the Board in
6 response to questions in cases. And this is
7 what they want to do. And I think their
8 logic is that -- I mean many apartments like
9 buildings I've done, there's a corridor
10 access that's fully accessible. But I think
11 their issue is if there's a front door, they
12 want the place to be visitable by people
13 without having to go to, you know, the route
14 for someone who needs a wheel ed vehicle to
15 get someplace, should be the same route that
16 somebody who doesn't need a wheel ed vehicle
17 should be. And that's the kind of principle
18 behind it.

19 So now you're here and you're going to
20 explain how you've worked this out.

21 PAUL OGNI BEME: Thank you. I'm Paul

1 Obnibeme from Urban Spaces. I just wanted to
2 introduce the concept and have our project
3 manager Jeff explain it in detail.

4 When we initially came before the
5 Board, we had designed stoops which maybe we
6 can show. Can't show. The original drawing
7 had traditional staired stoops. And in the
8 discussion it had become apparent that we
9 needed to revise that potentially and comply,
10 as you're indicating, with wheeled access
11 right from the front doors. So what we did
12 here is essentially tried to replicate the
13 look of a stoop by creating these terraced
14 planters on either side of the doorway, but
15 provide access right off the street level off
16 grade in a traditional way straight on in.
17 This is the only access point into the unit.
18 So we felt that we didn't have another
19 alternative. And maybe Jeff Hirsch can get a
20 little more color on this please.

21 JEFF HIRSCH: Yeah, sure.

1 We wanted to keep the memory of the
2 stoops alive, and obviously if we want to
3 comply with the Fair Housing Act being, you
4 know, we wanted to keep in the spirit of MAE
5 board and the ADA, we can't have the stoops
6 here and utilize that as we did before. We
7 looked at other options of could we do a
8 methodology of a ramp and then an almost
9 sidewalk that connected all the of them
10 together. By the time we did that, we had
11 this monolithic concrete mess there that
12 really didn't work with the solution that we
13 have here. And we felt that this kept the
14 memory of the stoops alive here. That the
15 idea of being able to, you know, walk up to
16 something or have the stepping up effect to
17 the building and be able to landscape it as
18 it's shown here, would allow us to still keep
19 this area free and clear for ADA access. I
20 thought it was a relatively simple solution
21 that provided the memory of what we used to

1 have and still solve the problem and didn't
2 cause a monolithic, you know, over abundance
3 of concrete and railings that we just were
4 gonna make it look like a --

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: When you say
6 memory of what you used to have, you mean
7 memory of a plan that now you've abandoned?

8 JEFF HIRSCH: The memory of the
9 stoops that used to be in this area here, the
10 memory of the stairs and the stoops as you
11 would walk up to it we've now transferred
12 from this area here now to this area here.

13 THOMAS ANNINGER: Right.

14 JEFF HIRSCH: So we've essentially
15 flip flopped what was before here just a
16 little landscaped area at grade with the
17 stoops going up to it.

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay. I see what
19 you mean by the word memory.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: What's the paving
21 material inside the that old recess?

1 JEFF HIRSCH: We haven't identified
2 the actual paving materials, but we have a
3 similar paving stone that travels through
4 courtyard passageway into the main courtyard
5 in the back. So I think we're gonna keep the
6 same courtyard paving system that we have
7 through here. And I know they show some sort
8 of gate system here and that's not in there,
9 but unfortunately they, I think the renderer
10 just left it in.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess because I'm
12 thinking it would be valuable to distinguish
13 between the material on the sidewalk and the
14 material of the semi private area.

15 JEFF HIRSCH: Yes, I think -- and
16 that's what is -- it's not well shown here,
17 but you can see the difference in the
18 coloration and the rendering technique up
19 here and what's -- well, you can't see in
20 there. But on the floor plans it is.

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: How many

1 situations are there like this?

2 JEFF HIRSCH: I believe we have six
3 of them, and they all have individual
4 entrances off the street. And they don't
5 have a back entrance or another common
6 entrance that they can use.

7 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I have a
8 question, please.

9 You know, I know a lot of folks who
10 live in ground floor or basement units, and
11 they seek the privacy that they require.
12 Have we found an unintended outcome that
13 perhaps some of the greenery will shield
14 those -- provide a little privacy along with
15 the appropriate blinds and infrastructure on
16 the windows?

17 JEFF HIRSCH: Well, we're hoping for
18 that. And that's why we said at this level
19 of three feet. The original drawings had a
20 much little window, and we felt because of
21 the street access here and the proximity to

1 it, we needed more, more privacy inside
2 there, and therefore, a little bit more
3 shielding. In fact, and the hope is that,
4 you know, with the property management system
5 in place, that we will keep these, you know,
6 properly under control and provide what we're
7 intending to.

8 STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

9 AHMED NUR: If any with the spacing
10 between the shrubs and the glass.

11 JEFF HIRSCH: I'm sorry.

12 AHMED NUR: The plants and the
13 glass, the curtain wall, is there any space
14 or is it just going right up?

15 JEFF HIRSCH: No, it's going right
16 uphill. And it will -- obviously there will
17 be some sort of flashing detail to take care
18 of how that integrates. Yeah.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: As I look at the plan
20 here, there are six units, three of which
21 that are accessed through the courtyard and

1 three that front on the street?

2 JEFF HIRSCH: No. That's an
3 obsolete plan. Those were changed to be
4 front to back units.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: Can you take a
7 step back so that we can see the whole
8 elevation and how this fits in?

9 JEFF HIRSCH: I don't think we have
10 that, do we?

11 PAMELA WINTERS: That would be nice
12 to see.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: Potentially you're
14 going to alternate doors and windows it looks
15 like. Because you can see the corner of the
16 neck door, right?

17 JEFF HIRSCH: Correct. I mean, what
18 you're seeing, this language here would be
19 translated.

20 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but at the
21 very right end of the thing there's the edge

1 of the door frame it looks like right there.
2 So you'll alternate the four doors on one
3 side and two doors on the other.

4 JEFF HIRSCH: Yes.

5 AHMED NUR: I was just going to say
6 that I really haven't seen that around here,
7 but I do like it a lot. And if you travel
8 abroad, you'll see speaking of community
9 connectivity and neighborhood, and you know,
10 we always talk about retail on the first
11 floor, but to really have residential that
12 close up to the sidewalk is very special.
13 I'm liking it.

14 While they're waiting --

15 HUGH RUSSELL: Are there any other
16 -- there seems to me we're in agreement that
17 you solve this problem in a reasonable way
18 that gives some privacy, gives that sort of
19 texture of volumes that the stoops give you.
20 And it's sort of really very clever.

21 Is there anything else that you wanted

1 us to consider?

2 ROGER BOOTHE: We've been having
3 some discussions about materials, but I don't
4 think we're quite there yet. They're
5 requesting changes in some materials and
6 we're trying to work that out.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

8 AHMED NUR: What's the lighting
9 like? I see a light overhead or on the jam
10 of the door. Yes, right there. I could just
11 see that --

12 JEFF HIRSCH: I think we're still
13 working on the exact placement of those.

14 AHMED NUR: Okay.

15 JEFF HIRSCH: As to whether it's
16 actually interior in here. I think at one
17 time we had the circular sconce up here and
18 we switched it to two side sconces and they
19 sort of moved into the interior. I think
20 we're still debating amongst ourselves as to
21 what the best location is.

1 AHMED NUR: Okay.

2 THOMAS ANNINGER: May I ask, Roger,
3 you're bringing this to us because you have
4 reservations?

5 ROGER BOOTHE: No. I just felt that
6 it was something different from what you'd
7 approved. And, you know, it's something, as
8 you described, it's very tricky to work out.
9 And first of all, we wanted you to see the
10 solution, make sure you felt comfortable with
11 it and also just kind of share the thought
12 process because we do have a lot of
13 guidelines that say we do want to have
14 entries on the sidewalks and it's proving
15 very difficult. I think it's a reasonable.
16 I have some trepidation about it. I'm glad
17 to hear Ahmed point out that in other
18 cultures it's not abnormal. It's not
19 something particularly normal in our culture
20 to have someone directly right into a unit
21 like this, but I think weighing off not being

1 able to have the doorways versus issues about
2 being a little unusual for us, it's still
3 better to have a doorway I think. We wanted
4 the Board to make sure you felt the same way.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. We need to
6 take any formal action or can our discussion
7 serve as an approval?

8 ROGER BOOTHE: I think as always
9 just a vote to say that you're okay with this
10 would be good for the record.

11 PAMELA WINTERS: And you will
12 continue to work with them in terms of the
13 materials as you were saying?

14 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, if we could work
15 out the materials so I feel like it's
16 consistent with the what the Board showed, I
17 wouldn't necessarily bring them back.

18 H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm just curious
19 what does this do to the interior?

20 JEFF HIRSCH: It raises the
21 windowsill which is about the only change.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I mean
2 before you had somebody going up four steps
3 to the doorway.

4 JEFF HIRSCH: Before we had the
5 entire floor system raised up several feet
6 for this.

7 H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

8 JEFF HIRSCH: And the interior, it
9 actually increases the head height a little
10 bit inside the unit so it's now a larger.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see. So
12 everything is lower.

13 H. THEODORE COHEN: The floor is
14 now --

15 JEFF HIRSCH: The floor has been
16 lowered down. Before there was interstitial
17 space. And there were questions about what
18 are we doing in there? How do we make the
19 best out of it?

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's not a bad
21 thing.

1 JEFF HIRSCH: I think all in all,
2 it's making a lot of sense to do this. I
3 know in usually in the New England area our
4 contextual language doesn't typically have
5 this type of entrance. We are used to seeing
6 stoops if you walk down the, you know, in the
7 Back Bay or, you know, Beacon Hill, you see
8 that all over and that's sort of the language
9 that we're accustomed to.

10 ROGER BOOTHE: Stuart just mentioned
11 a thought, and it's just a thought, that you
12 know, we would want to make sure that this
13 was safe for flooding considering what we've
14 just been through. And I don't know if you
15 thought about drainage issues and, you know,
16 if you get --

17 JEFF HIRSCH: It does actually ramp
18 up here.

19 ROGER BOOTHE: You have a little bit
20 of a ramp?

21 JEFF HIRSCH: Yes.

1 ROGER BOOTHE: And any sort of a
2 drain do you think it's necessary, do you
3 think?

4 JEFF HIRSCH: I think it's necessary
5 to have drains in this area.

6 AHMED NUR: And snow maybe you want
7 to have a heat raise on the bottom of the
8 glass there just to kind of melt the snow so
9 you don't have accumulative snow blocking the
10 entrance and that sort of thing.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: Or a catch basin.

12 AHMED NUR: My thoughts are in the
13 summertime, pulling bicycles in there and
14 getting little dogs in there. I think it
15 will be really warm and welcoming to see
16 pedestrians, you know, seeing residents going
17 in there and the like. More residential.

18 STUART DASH: I think what Roger's
19 referring to, we're about to engage in a
20 study of adaptation for potential sea level
21 rise, and this area is something that the

1 area you see on maps that you look at. So I
2 think we'll talk to Owen and Jeff back in
3 their office to make sure they're comfortable
4 with this as well.

5 AHMED NUR: And maybe just a canopy
6 overhead.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: I think part of what
8 you need to do is something like this is
9 keeping it within the scale of the apartment
10 as opposed to the scale of the building. And
11 so if you put the canopy over that, it looks
12 more like the front door of the building and
13 it's a little strange because the building
14 has five front doors now.

15 BRIAN MURPHY: Yes. Like a window
16 canopy, but yes.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: So, okay. So could
18 we have a motion that would say that we've
19 reviewed this design and found that it's
20 consistent with our ideas?

21 STEVEN WINTER: So moved.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: Second?

2 PAMELA WINTERS: Second.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

4 All those in favor?

5 PAMELA WINTERS: Bill had to leave.

6 (Raising hands).

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you very much.

8 All members voting in favor.

9 We are adjourned.

10 (Whereupon, at 10:05 p.m., the

11 Planning Board Adjourned.)

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 the 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 the Community
10 Development Department, to whom the original
11 transcript was delivered.

12
13 I NSTRUCTI ONS

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

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BRISTOL, SS.

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 3rd day of December 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.