

PLANNING BOARD
for the
CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 2015 at 7:00 p.m.

-held at-

Second Floor Meeting Room
34 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

BOARD MEMBERS:

H. Theodore Cohen, Chair
Steven Cohen
Louis Bacci, Jr.
Hugh Russell
Tom Sieniewicz

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT STAFF:

Liza Paden
Jeff Roberts
Iram Farooq
Suzannah Bigolin
Stuart Dash

REPORTERS, INC.

CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD

617.786.7783

www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA TOPICS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
 <u>General Business</u>	
Update from Community Development	4
Adoption of Meeting Transcript(s)	9
 <u>Public Hearings</u>	
(Continued) Planning Board Petition to amend Section 13.10 in the Planned Unit Development at Kendall Square (PUD-KS) Overlay District. The majority of the PUD-KS District is occupied by the Volpe Transportation Systems Research Center operated by the U.S. Department of Transportation. Planning Board deliberation.	10
PB#300, 16-18 Eliot Street, Special Permit to waive the parking requirements (Section 20.54.4) and relief from yard requirements for residential use (Section 20.54.5) to add approximately 11,935 square feet of residential Gross Floor Area, with 15 dwelling units, in a three-story addition above an existing two-story retail building at 16-18 Eliot Street. 16-18 Eliot Street, LLC, is the applicant.	109

I N D E X (CONT'D)**AGENDA TOPICS****PAGE****General Business**

PB#243, 100 Binney Street
Final Design Approval

116

Board of Zoning Appeal Cases
BZA-007137-215-284 Broadway, Use
variance to convert a ground floor
auto repair to a microbrewery and
Special Permit to reduce the parking
requirement by three spaces

240

P R O C E E D I N G S

TED COHEN: All right. Good evening everyone. Welcome to the Planning Board's July 14th meeting. And Happy Bastille Day everyone.

And we'll start with our update from the Acting Assistant City Manager.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good evening. So today's meeting is going to focus on a continuation of the Volpe hearing from a couple weeks ago when we had a joint hearing with the City Council of the Planning Board and the City Council. And then there is a hearing on 18 Eliot Street which is largely a parking waiver issue because that particular building falls within the Harvard Square Overlay District.

There are a couple of other general

business cases. 100 Binney Street, which, as you might have read in the paper, half of it was -- roughly half of it was leased by Bristol-Meyers Squibb. This is an Alexandria building. So now there's a tenant potentially in place. The building project is real.

And then there's a BZA case for 284 Broadway that will be under discussion next meeting.

Your next couple of meetings are January 21st and January 28th.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER:

July 28th?

IRAM FAROOQ: July 21st and 28th.

The 21st will be a hearing on 57 JFK Street. This is the Staples building. You heard this before, so this is a continued hearing.

And the other item that's going to be

new is a hearing on the Incentive Zoning Petition which I -- Jeff is not here right now because he's at the Incentive Petition hearing that is currently ongoing at the Ordinance Committee in the Sullivan Chamber.

I know some of the folks here in the audience were -- are also coming from that hearing.

On the 28th, there's a hearing on 2551 Mass Ave under the North Mass Ave Overlay District provisions, and this is a building that's on Mass Ave, close to Alewife Parkway area.

And then there is under General Business, a phasing schedule change -- it's a minor amendment -- for North Point.

So there's some small changes in phasing, but the most significant one of them being that there's an interest in bringing

forward the retail cluster near the T station which we think is actually a real positive move given that the district is now starting to take shape.

August 4th meeting -- I'm going to stop there -- August 4th meeting should be interesting. There's no hearings on that meeting as part of that meeting, but there will be two items of discussion, one is the Affordable Housing Trust members will be here for a joint discussion on just affordable housing questions. And they have been real keen to meet with the Planning Board given all the discussion that has been ongoing in terms of rezoning and how affordable housing requirements fit into that.

The Incentive Zoning Ordinance that is before you, there's a study ongoing right now to look at potential modifications to

inclusionary zoning ordinance.

So there are a lot of housing-related issues that are either before the Board right now, or will be coming forward over the coming six to 12 months.

And so, this is a good opportunity to have that joint discussion.

And then the second item will be a discussion on the recommendations of the Net Zero Task Force, and that work was completed last month, I think.

So the recommendations have been finalized. They lay out a long-term roadmap to put Cambridge on the trajectory to getting to Net Zero, greenhouse gas emissions from building and energy use.

And so, that -- Tom Sieniewicz was the Planning Board's representative on that task force. So, I think he will be there for that

discussion. So that should be an interesting item.

August 10th is the summer meeting of the City Council. I'm actually just going to stop there. There's a lot of Council hearings that are scheduled in August, but I think we can update you on those in the coming weeks.

So, thank you so much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Liza, are there any meeting transcripts to approve them?

LIZA PADEN: We have the transcripts from June 2nd, June 16th, and June 29th, and they have been certified.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I make a motion to approve them.

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

All in favor?

(Unanimous with show of hands.)

PUBLIC HEARING:

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. We are now going to have a continuation of the public hearing about the Planning Board Petition to amend Section 13.10 of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to the Volpe site.

This is a continuation of the joint hearing that took place two weeks ago with the Ordinance Committee.

Let me tell you where I think we are and what I think is going to happen tonight and in the future.

I think it is clear from the joint hearing that the Ordinance Committee and the City Council are not prepared to act very quickly on this matter, whereas this petition will expire mid- to late-September.

I think it's pretty obvious that the

petition is going to have to be refiled.

That being the case, what we are going to do this evening is have a discussion amongst the Board members who are here, who were at the joint hearing with raising the issues that we wish to pursue further.

A lot of them will relate to economic issues that the Ordinance Committee also indicated that they wanted information on, and CDD is working on that, but does not have the information for us right now.

And so, after we discuss things, we will then open up the discussion to public comment again. Hopefully the public comment -- the people who comment will be those that did not have an opportunity to speak at the joint hearing.

And it's clear that there will be at least one further public hearing on this

matter at a date to be determined in the future as we get the information we're looking for.

That's how I envision things happening procedurally.

What I would like to start with is going through where I think we are with Volpe in terms of the petition.

As we discussed at the joint hearing, this is all a very difficult balancing act, that there are four or five major issues that need to be addressed one way or the other, and that if you increase one issue, you have to either decrease or increase something else to make up for the change. And so it's a very careful balancing act.

We think what has been proposed that we worked over several months with CDD on, was a fine attempt at balancing things, but we now

have received information from the public and from the Ordinance Committee, and I think we're going to perhaps reconsider some of those issues.

It is not possible, in my opinion, to have an absolute wish list of everything that we would like to see occur on this site.

The city doesn't own the land. Currently, it's owned by the Federal Government, and presumably at some point, about ten of the acres will be owned by a private developer, so we can draft zoning to try to get as much as we want, but we're not going to get everything. That's just going to be an impossibility.

So we're going to have to prioritize, you know, what we think the city wants and how to go about doing it, and what other issues that's going to raise.

As I see the major issues that I hope my colleagues and I will discuss this evening, and then the public can chime in on is the percentage of residential versus commercial office space on this site. The percentage of open space that we want to see on the site, the percentage of low and moderate income housing that we feel is necessary, and also whether there should be a percentage of middle income housing.

I would like to side track on that for a moment, that when we had our discussions about this, there were strong arguments made in favor of the fact that as much as we wanted to promote moderate and low income housing, there was a desperate need also for middle class housing, that the middle class was disappearing, if not has disappeared from Cambridge, and it was necessary to provide

some housing for that group of people.

That led to our determination that there would be 15 percent of subsidized housing, ten percent for low and moderate and five percent for middle class.

It was certainly never our intent, as has been stated by some people, that we were going away from the 11 and a half percent to ten percent because, in our view, 15 percent was serving two distinct, but equally needed populations. That is something that can be reviewed again.

Also, I want to remind people that the way that the petition was drafted, was that it was a base of 15 percent, and that if the city went to a larger percentage, that larger percentage would apply.

So obviously we're going -- the Incentive Zoning Petition is being discussed

right now, as I said. We will be meeting with the Affordable Housing Trust member.

Other issues that then play into everything are the height of buildings, because if we want a certain density and a certain number of units and a certain amount of office space, note that there's limited acreage once you take into account the open space.

And so, that may necessitate buildings taller than some people might like. So that's a discussion area.

There's also going to be questions of where the taller buildings should be located and whether there's some sort of limitation on the area in which they can be located.

And, finally, one of the issues that seemed to be on many of the Ordinance Committee members' minds was the retail

component, where it was going to be located, and what sort of retail it was going to be.

Those are the issues that I think we need to discuss now, and to get further information from CDD. And then thereafter to get the public's thoughts and comments about things.

So if somebody would like to kick things off?

STEVEN COHEN: Well, there are a number of things I would like to talk about. And then, as you know last time, I was the strongest advocate on the subject of the affordable housing.

I would like to start with just a different thought today because one of the important components of this that you didn't mention, Ted, is that the purchase price that a developer has to pay, the central role that

that number is playing in this entire planning process, and the lack of clarity that we have and what that number is.

And combined with the fact that we're going under premise, of course, the purchase price is, in essence, what it will cost to build a new transportation building, and we've heard numbers of in the neighborhood of 300 million dollars. We heard some lower. We have even heard higher. But the notion that it's going to cost something like that, it sort of generates the entire process here. And I trust for us to be going through this process, when (a) we don't really know what that number is, and (b) we're operating on the premise -- and I'm not entirely sure where that premise came from -- that if Volpe is going to build a new facility that there are absolutely no funds available from the Federal

Government or any other sources to help support that construction, and that, therefore, every dollar of that new facility has to come from the private developer developing the site.

There's just a lot of unknowns and imponderables in there, and, yet, you have the morass of value and funding, and so forth, is really generating this entire planning process it seems to me.

As we go through this planning process, instead of coming from the percent this is really getting a unique parcel and a unique opportunity to create a really unique and amazing development in the heart of one of our most important commercial areas and what is the absolute best way we can develop this and design this. And, you know, for the next 100 years and for posterity in Cambridge and

instead of coming at it from that perspective, we're coming out from the perspective. We're coming at it from the perspective of -- we have to enough value here for the developer to support this purchase price, which is, as I say, is subject to all of this uncertainty.

And then you lay on top of that less than ideal and less than certain process, the notion that we have to do this quickly, because if we don't move quickly, the opportunity may be lost and there will be a new administration in DC, and they may not want to do anything.

And, again, that, too, just strikes me as a little bit speculative and uncertain just to say the least.

Well, there are a lot of specifics that I would like to talk about those issues that you raise, open space and affordable

housing, and so forth, and we're trying to accomplish a lot in this site that may be the classic case of a ten-pound -- well, you know the metaphor.

I just find the whole thing just a little bit confusing and unsettling just the nature and the uncertainty, and the pressure, and the speed, and then the politics of the process.

It just seems to me that our first focus should be what is the absolute best way to develop this site for the City of Cambridge.

And it's not that I dramatically disagree with the directions that we're going in. I'm not quite sure or clear what the development plan will actually look like. There's so many different possibilities.

I can't say that any of the studies or

drawings that I have seen, you know, jump out at me and say, "Wow, this is a great design, a great example of urban planning."

It's just that, again, I don't think that's been our focus, and I wish it were our focus.

And just to give you one small example, it's actually -- and, again, I don't want to get into all the details or the percentages and so forth, and we'll probably get more into that as we get along this evening -- but I remember one city councilor expressed the view -- the opinion: "From a design perspective, wouldn't it be great to have a really beautiful lively plaza of the sort that you see in many European cities or Italian cities, and instead of assuming we're going to have open space or green space, that it actually be a, you know, hard-scape plaza

with cafes," and so forth.

Well, look, I don't know whether that's feasible here. I don't know whether it's desirable. But the point is, it's a great question. It reflects a vision for creating a great space here, a unique memorable signature space out of this large parcel.

And, as I say, I don't know whether that's the right course, but it seems like it's the right conversation to be having, and I'm just not sure that we're having that kind of a conversation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I mean, I think we're attempting to have some of that conversation right now.

I think what we do and what the Planning Boards have always done is have to come up with zoning for portions of the city

that change over time. But if you look at Kendall Square ten or 15 years ago, it was a very different situation from what it is now. There was the C2K2 study that was done that came up after several years with proposals for what would be in this area. Volpe was always somewhat -- you know, no one thought it was going to be developed at any time in the immediate future, and to believe DOT and GSA came to us, and said, "This is what we want to do."

And so I think it is necessary for us to react to the reality of the landowner saying, "This is what I want to do," and being mindful of the fact that there may be a change in administration in a year and a half or so, and that may have a dramatic impact on the willingness of the Federal Government to cooperate with the city and do what the city

wants.

And so, you know, I personally think it's an opportunity for us to try to come up with the best we can at this particular moment in time knowing as much as we can know right now.

I mean, clearly, Volpe says they want a 400,000 square foot building somewhere on the site. And, yes, I heard 300 million, I've heard 400 million. So I'm assuming that's in the ballpark of what this is going to cost some developer to do.

And what we heard from Volpe so far is that they're not going to convey the land to the developer until they get their facility and have moved in.

So they probably know better than I, you know, what the time is to build things like this, and what the development costs are

for building things like this, and trying to get some handle on the economics and how far, you know, we may be able to push a developer to get what the city wants.

And, you know, we do that with lots of other properties that the developers come and say, "This isn't what I want to do there," and Zoning either allows it or doesn't allow it, or goes for a Special Permit.

And I just think, you know, we meet with staff, and then the Ordinance Committee and the City Council have to do the best job we can.

And, you know, I personally don't know that we have the luxury of a lot of time to try to get every detail pinned down.

I think it will be important for us to get economic information from staff -- and I know they're working on that now -- but, you

know, if we do want to see a large public park there, well, that's one thing we can say we want to see, and then take into account, "Well how does that impact on, you know, now it's 40 percent residential, and if we decide to change that or the city decides to change it to 50, 60 or 75 percent, where is that going to go? And how big is it going to have to be to make up for the fact that we may have a large park right in the center of everything?

So I think, you know, we have to move forward the best we can, and have the discussion here and try to come up with some priorities that we think are important.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think we have -- in the K2 process, we have done a study that was prior to this all about making a deal with Volpe and made conclusions of that study, as in the broadest terms were that it was

important to have additional high-tech space available on that site to support the technology innovation district that's there.

You can see the rate at which the development is occurring and the parcels that are available, and essentially, in the next ten, 15 years, there's going to be no more vacant space for more technological development.

So it's important -- this is without Volpe. And Volpe is only going to take a few years of that, and any proposal we put forward.

So that is -- and to me, that's the most important goal for this site is to support the technology center.

Now, the question -- it also has the opportunity to fix some problems in the present development.

So one of the biggest problems with the present CRA development is very little housing. So that's where -- why there's been a feeling that this would be roughly a thousand units of housing on the Volpe site. And I support that. And I support the idea that we should get the best affordable deal we can get for that.

And I know that we can think of deals that the GSA will say, "Well, it's not going to work," but -- so tonight, I don't want to discuss what is the best deal, because I think that depends quite a bit on the economics and that's where the studies are going.

And the other deficiency of the area -- in a way, it's not a deficiency, there's loads of open space. It's just not very usable right now. It's not very friendly. It's a barrier. It's barrier open

space rather than a connecting open space.

If you go in the next room, you see the Connect Kendall Square display, including the projected scheme where they -- the concept scheme that had come up and was selected. And the interesting part about that scheme to me was it's all about connections, and it's taking the open space that exists at the Broad Canal trying to provide using the open space to connect east to west on the site so that the neighborhoods that are north of Broadway which are not well connected to the open space, providing that connection is very important.

You know, the Marriott Hotel block along Broadway is not very nice in terms of open space, so it's important to create some open space.

I think Steve's focus was to do it

along the Sixth Street connector to essentially blow out the Sixth Street connector on the Volpe site to create a significant space that new development and the existing development are on two sides of that could benefit from, and also to provide -- to enhance that pathway that exists.

So, to me, the Planning roles are relatively straightforward, and they have been established through a public process of planning, and what is left is the balancing act.

And the GSA comes into it because they're going to say, "Well, it's our land, our goal is to also take the 400,000 feet that the Transportation Center is working in now, and give them 400,000 square feet of 21st Century space, not mid-20th Century space.

And so, they can look at our proposal

and say, "We don't think this is going to achieve our goals," but I think we should -- I think we can say what we want to achieve, and I think we have said in our proposal what we want to achieve.

And, you know, it's like I was very impressed by the hearing because many people came and said, "We want more, we want more housing, we want more affordability, we want more open space."

And very few people said, "We want more height."

I'm not sure anybody from the public said, "We want more height." And -- but height is important because it's, you know, the less -- the more you go up in the air -- first, height is important because when you go up in the air, the housing gets more valuable. It also costs more to build. You know, these

needle buildings going up in Manhattan that are a thousand feet tall, each apartment costs millions of dollars. I don't think that's our goal for Kendall Square.

You know, if it's necessary for a project to work, to have so much of those components, okay. When they're stressing things about that kind've housing in Manhattan, it's mostly not occupied by people who live and work in Manhattan, it's occupied by people who want a place to camp out in Manhattan and have more money than they know that to do with.

And having empty apartments in Kendall Square doesn't serve our goals. I don't think we're in a position tonight to do the balancing or rebalancing.

You know, I think we heard clearly that people would like to see more public

benefits, and that's part of the balancing.

My own feeling is that included in the balance, allowing some more height for the residential, if that helps, is good.

I mean, we took up the Chonga Challenge and got halfway there. And I think that studies have shown that maybe one slender 40-story or so building might not be so bad. A bunch of 30-story buildings would be bad. And the idea of a hundred-story building is very hard to understand.

I think the Connect Kendall Square project shows you can create significant open spaces that function without making five-acre parks. And I think this is the wrong place for a five-acre park.

I say that because I think there are many people feel like every place is the right place for a five-acre park, that the more open

space we can get in our city, the more livable it is. But I think that -- I think that I don't agree with it.

If you want five acres everywhere, then you can go to Lexington and take the consequences. Lexington is a very nice place, but it's not a city.

I think I covered what I want to cover.

LOUIS BACCI: I kind've agree with the one thousand-foot tower is kinda out of place. I'm not so sure a couple of 500s aren't.

The numbers are always a problem. It's all faith on our part, but we do kind've have to try to build a special place here, I think. We have been looking at it for 30, 40 years? Finally something can be developed there. I don't think it has to be a five-acre park. I think it needs some kind of a

standalone -- I like the plaza idea, but I also like a flexible use park of some sort mixed in the mix. It gets hard with the tall buildings, you get a lot of shade.

But I think there's some pretty smart design guys out there. Also noted possibly Volpe could be built simultaneously with another piece of property, a piece on that property. That's a deal that has to be made by the principals.

I like the idea of continuing the Broad Canal and that long view up through that section. I don't know if it hurts it or helps it. It kinda chops up the parcel.

But I think we have to concentrate on two things: The people that are going to live and work there and people that have to live around it.

I think the idea of connecting it and

making a connector -- I prefer the connector to be in the plaza.

But the place deserves a beautiful location and it kinda needs to stand out. We're getting pretty commercial, and we need some people scale enjoyment in that area, I think.

I'm not sure how you get there exactly. I think we have done a lot to try to make the economics work. We can add a lot of height, if they need it.

And I would also like to see the middle income housing increased if we could. I think a lot of working people are in a bad way that would like to stay here. A lot of people that work in the area can't live there.

So, that's about where I am.

STEVEN COHEN: Second round?

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you want -- or

I'll go, whatever.

STEVEN COHEN: Let me say, I have a few thoughts.

First of all, on the specifics, I agree with you, Ted, Hugh, and with the planners in that this is really one of the, you know, high-tech and biotech centers of the country and in the universe, and we've got a good thing going, and we should build upon it by all means. So I certainly support that concept and goal.

On the housing side, I do think, and I agree with Hugh, and the planners that the housing part is important in my mind for two reasons: (1) We want to enliven the entire district of Kendall Square, and while, you know, engineers and working folk during the day, they'll make it a pretty good afternoon and need evening activity and you want weekend

activity, and that's the sort of activity that comes from local residents, and that's what makes a great neighborhood.

So, absolutely, we need to introduce more residents into Kendall Square, and that's a premise that we've all accepted for a long time and, yes, we need more affordable housing, in general, in the city.

I have been an advocate for more of the middle income segment, not that there isn't a need for low-income housing, a very, very -- there's an unlimited need for low-income housing, but I will say that there are facilities in Cambridge, low-income housing. There will never be as much as there is in demand, but at least, we've made a really solid effort, a volatile effort probably over the last decades to satisfy those needs.

I don't think we have made much of an effort at all for middle income. And so, more and more we're becoming a city for low-income folks and high-income folks, and this is a malady that you see in many urban centers throughout the country. And it's not something that we should sit and observe idly when we have the opportunity to do something else.

So many folks, so many families grew up in the City of Cambridge, their children, who no longer can afford to live here.

So, I really do think it's important that we come up with that sort of component.

By the way, having said that, you know, that reflects my values and my desires and my ideals, but I'm also -- you know, you've got to be an evidence-based board here, and I must say, and we have discussed this,

that as much as we may desire to provide housing opportunities for middle-income people, it's not entirely clear that middle-income people will wish to avail themselves of those opportunities when it's so easy to move to other nearby towns and get so much more value, and so much more housing for your dollar and for a growing family and so forth.

I have -- this is just conversation and we all have examples of people that we know who have gone in one direction or the other, but the truth is that we don't have statistics, we don't have reliable evidence or facts one way or the other, and it certainly would be silly for us to make a major component of our planning desired middle-income housing if, in fact, it isn't going to serve the purpose for the folks that

we want it to.

So, on this subject and on so many others here, gosh, we need more facts and evidence so we can make reasonable evidence-based judgments.

So, anyway, I think we're in agreement with a mix of housing and commercial, the need for some sort of subsidized -- you know, my own analysis that I've shared with you guys suggests to me that going up to as much as 20 percent on the residential portion, which is only 40 percent or so of the site, and the running through the numbers that I've done, I don't think it's infeasible to do that. In fact, I think it's very feasible to do that.

But, again, I'm dealing with only half a deck of cards. And, again, we don't have the numbers, and we don't have the financial analysis to ascertain whether it's feasible to

do so.

I firmly believe that it is, based on my analysis, but I certainly heard from others in the city that it's not feasible, and that it's already going to be difficult to make this work. So, you know, we need facts on that.

But, again, when we talk about economic analysis here, the underlying assumption is that somehow or another, the development needs to support a 400 million dollar nut to build and relocate the Volpe building. And, you know, again, I just wonder whether we have spoken with our representatives and our senators, state -- not the state, but, you know, Federal and whether it's really a totally firm and inflexible assumption that this important Transportation Center can't be supported by an additional

hundred million or two hundred million from the Federal Government. It gets into politics, it's beyond our bailiwick.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think we're going off into --

STEVEN COHEN: Well, we are going off, and, yet, we are making assumptions on precisely that subject, okay, and that's generating because while I agree with everything we're talking about, about the mix and the goals and so forth, it's ultimately the gross floor area and the FAR that we are including in our zoning that is most directly related to the financial needs here.

And then, Hugh, let me say that there has been a K2 study here -- and you're going to remember this better than I -- but I believe it would take some study, the desired FAR -- you know, what? I think it was around

the high 3s or 4s in areas.

And I must admit in our first go-round, I thought that we were talking here a slight increase to 4.5 or so, but I believe -- and I'm still not a hundred percent sure of my understanding -- but I believe that didn't include the Volpe building.

And if you add in the Volpe building, then we're actually talking about an FAR of something more in the neighborhood of 5.5.

Now, I don't have any predisposed notion of about what the appropriate FAR is for this site or any site, I need to see studies to see what actually that means and plays out.

But what I have seen on some of the massing studies that have been done here, you know, I have preferences for some studies and models than others, but my overall impression

is, wow, that's a lot of square footage to try to assemble on this site in the way which is appealing from an urban planning perspective and that also fulfills our open space desires and, you know, lovely and desirable public open spaces, and so forth.

So we keep coming back to that subject. I mean, the reason we're talking about such a high FAR is in order to support the presumed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Why don't we wait and see if staff can get us some further information on that. I think for the moment, though, we ought to assume that Volpe wants to get what it wants, that it owns the land, that the government owns the land and this particular congress is not going to give them three or four hundred million dollars to build something new, and that this proposal that

they have come up with is what is workable for them for the moment, and I think it's fine for staff to look -- you know, talk to the people again, see if that is, you know, truly a hard and fast concept or whether there is some grounds for improvement.

But I think we ought to stick with that, and move on to our other discussions about it because speculating about -- you know, that's just adding something to the wish list. We wish Volpe was going to have a smaller site for less money and then we can do more on the rest of the site.

STEVEN COHEN: And I understand that we would be happy to move forward, and we can't just be bitching about what we don't know.

The only thing that I would say is that even in the face of this given that we're

working with, and even in the face of our uncertainties about that, given, you know, I feel that we should be focusing on what we believe to be the best development plan for the city here and not be unduly pushed beyond what we feel comfortable with in order to somehow support a presumed purchase price of four hundred million.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think we all agree with that. I think we all want to see the best thing possible on this site.

So I will make a couple other comments and then we'll open it up.

I spent a lot of time in Kendall Square of late looking at all the buildings that are going up, and partly coming with my son, and I realized how difficult it is to find anything on at an affordable price, including for someone who is working in

Kendall Square, who's making a fairly decent salary for a single person, but it's still very unaffordable.

And so, Hugh, I agree with your comment, but you know that the K2 study was going to support the tech industry and get more space for them.

I'm moving more towards, you know, we do obviously have to do that, but maybe the balance of 40/60 is not quite right, that we do need more residential in the area.

I do think, you know, with regard to height and open space, I think clearly Cambridge is a very liveable city. You know, people want to come here, people want to stay here. They're not moving out because they don't have open space. There's very little open space in North Cambridge. There's very little open space in mid-Cambridge. There's

lots of other neighborhoods that are very liveable that people have been very happy living in there that don't have enormous open space areas.

I think when K2 was in the process, it was before the Rogers Street Park was developed, which is now a very large area in the middle of -- whether you want to call it Kendall Square or East Cambridge or whatever.

I also want to point out when we talk about tall buildings, and the height of buildings, there are a lot of sort've five, six, seven-story buildings in this whole area that Alexandria has been building and others have been building, and I think it would be nice to have some taller buildings around them. You don't want it to look like it's a suburban office park with everything being the same height. The buildings on Broadway,

having tall buildings along Broadway, would really have very little impact on any other neighborhoods.

I think it would be perfectly sensible to have taller buildings there. I think it would modulate the height we have already, and would allow us to have a lot of the other things we wish.

People have also talked about, you know, Central Park and Union Square in New York, and I will point out that those are ringed/runged by tall buildings, you know. They are open spaces that have lots of development all around them. So maybe that is the type of thing we ought to have. And that it's a tradeoff if you have a bigger open space.

I agree five acres seems like a lot, but if we have a large usable open space,

maybe it gets surrounded by other buildings.

We have a place for people to spend time in Kendall Square. People want to live there, people want to eat there and people want to go grocery shopping there, and we need to provide for all of those things.

I agree, you know, we need to think about the low and moderate and the middle-income housing. It's a difficult question about middle-income housing. I think it's very chicken and egg because people can't afford to stay here. They move to other places. It has an impact upon the schools. It has an impact upon a lot of things and I think if there were more middle-income housing and people felt more comfortable staying here and sending their kids to school here, you know, it might generate more.

I mean, we have been looking at how

Kendall Square is also a chicken-and-egg thing that, you know, to get people, you have to have restaurants and shops; to get restaurants and shops, you have to have the people. And, fortunately, we seem to have crossed the tipping point with that, but we still need a lot more residential, and the residential will support more retail grocery stores, the drugstores and the other things that we want.

You know, I agree we're not going to have a one thousand-foot building, but the concept of something wonderful, when you come over the bridge and enter into Cambridge right at the intersection of Broadway and Third, you know, I think a spectacular building there would be great. Maybe it's 500 feet. Maybe it's 400. Maybe it's something else. Maybe it's two towers. Maybe it's whatever.

But I think something there would be

great, and then, perhaps you could get the large open space behind it or around it or whatever.

So that's where I'm coming from, and I think we had accomplished a lot of those goals, but I think, you know, we have the opportunity now to fine-tune it into other things.

And I don't know whether the staff has anything they want to add right now?

ASS'T CITY MANAGER FAROOQ: Mr. Chair, just a couple things that we can add. In terms of -- I think this discussion is great, and it's exactly the sort of topics that we need to be talking about.

In terms of vision, I think it's important, as Hugh mentioned, that we started with the K2 plan which, you know, so we're harking back to 2011 and 2012 that has

actually set the stage for the work that we're doing right now.

We have been talking to the Board about that from that time, and really, in earnest working on the zoning since November of 2014.

So I was just looking on our website of when was the last presentation we did at the Planning Board. It was the first presentation we did that was focused on this zoning consideration.

So, we actually have been working on this with the Board for quite some time, and certainly refining each step of the way as we have gone along.

So it's also, I think, helpful to think about the entire life cycle of the initial vision, and that the refinement and the final actual creation of the buildings and

the public spaces.

So this, in some ways, is the first time we're taking all of that vision and kinda jelling it into -- I mean, not today -- but as part of the zoning petition, creating the next stage, the big framework for what we see happening and the guidelines.

So I would think if the zoning and the design guidelines have sort of the refinement of the vision that was created during the K2 process. So this is the Board's opportunity to weigh in and further define what you think is really important and formed by the discussion from the community.

And then there will be yet another level of refinement when the PUD proposal comes before you.

So that will be the time to really dive into much more detail about the nature of

each space, and how much of it's hard-scape versus green area, and what kind of activities are we trying to encourage exactly were around the site.

But I do think that it's really helpful to articulate things that we really care about at this stage.

So, for instance, if the Board and the community collectively care about some of the things that came up during Connect Kendall, like thinking about connections through this site, I think that's an important thing. That's actually consistent also with the K2 plan, but that would be a really important thing for us to make sure that it gets captured in the design guidelines.

If we really think that the visual access from the Broad Canal through the site is an important thing, we should just make

sure that that gets encapsulated into the guidelines.

So that's -- whether it's, you know, this set of Board members and staff who are working on this project over the next five, ten years, perhaps more -- actually more if history is any indicator -- then we should give them the best tools that we can to make sure that that vision carries forward into the future and not just, you know, with this group of people.

So I would say that that's a really important charge for all of us as part of this process.

In terms of the housing question, I think one thing that we may not have talked about inasmuch detail as we could have, is that we looked at -- when we were doing the K2 process, we had Greg Clancy look at what is

the optimal amount of housing in Kendall Square. And we sliced it in sort've three different ways. So one is to look at what is the job housing balance, what is it in Cambridge right now, and trying to make sure that we retained a similar jobs housing balance in Kendall Square that the development here would not skew it completely off the charts.

The second question we posed was: How much housing do we need to add life to the streets?

If we're suggesting that certain areas need to have retail to enliven the streets, what do we need to do in order to support that retail? And we know that residential units or each square foot of housing actually supports more retail than each square foot of commercial because residents generally meet

more of their retail needs close to home if those services are, in fact, available in the area.

We looked at how much housing reasonably fits into Kendall Square, and we also looked at how does this all work with transportation impacts.

And so, in looking at all of that, we came up with a number of roughly -- each of those interestingly brought us to, roughly, let's say, a large range, anywhere from 1,500 to about 3,000 units for all of Kendall Square.

So in K2, we were looking at the MIT development, we were looking at the MSD District, we were looking at Volpe, as well as the Cambridge Research Park area, an in-fill development there.

So the MIT area and Volpe are probably

the largest areas where you would have development, and the rest of the areas it's more in-fill.

So the classic thing would be a little bit less, although on the Cambridge Research Park site, we talked about a hundred percent residential as being -- trying to use that catalyzed development on the Eversource parcel and as an add-on on the parcel -- the constellation parcel to try to get some development to happen. And modify those sites to be more appealing parts of the district.

So when you say out of the 1,500 to 3,000 range, which is reasonably a large range, to place the responsibility for a thousand plus units on this particular parcel, that's a pretty significant component of that responsibility for this parcel.

So by the 40/60, I think it's fair to

say that we're not selling the housing short on this particular development.

So there was some logic that we used to come up with that recommendation.

I'm trying to think if there was anything else significant that I missed.

Oh, just the idea about including the Volpe building in the FAR calculation or not. And we batted this around a lot at the staff level. And we could certainly include it, but the basic fact of the matter is that the Federal sovereignty always trumps whatever we may do.

So we were just trying to be really upfront about it and say, "Look, the DOT and the GSA have actually been very forthright in telling us what it is that they are looking for in trying to work with us collaboratively. So why not just take that trusting and

collaborative relationship to the next level and recognize that certainly they could do something completely -- even if we were to say this is not allowed, that really does not preclude a Federal facility from happening on the site."

So that -- we certainly don't want to take what is a positive relationship and turn it into an adversarial one.

That's really been one of the driving forces that we continued to work together. Because as long as the relationship is positive and collaborative, we have a much better chance in creating a positive outcome for Cambridge in Kendall Square that also includes a positive outcome for Volpe Center and DOT in Kendall Square.

So that's all I wanted to say.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Why don't we open things up to the public comment now.

Is there a sign-up sheet? We'll just take hands.

People who have not spoken before at the previous session, I would hope they speak first. We will not go beyond 9:00 tonight on this because we got three other matters we have to deal with this evening.

If you don't get a chance to speak to tonight, there will be further hearing on this topic and you will have an opportunity to speak at that time.

ASS'T CITY MANAGER FAROOQ: If we could get people to walk in through this door just because there's a lot of cords in the way here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: When you come up, please state your name and address for the

stenographer, and generally, you can speak for three minutes.

THE REPORTER: Chair? Could they spell their name because we don't have a sign-up sheet?

H. THEODORE COHEN: And would you please spell your names, too, if it's anything but Jane Doe.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

Spell your first and last name for me, please.

ZURI BALL: My first name is Z-U-R-I, Ball, B-A-L-L.

JONAH SCHWARTZ: My name is Jonah Schwartz, J-O-N-A-H, and my last name S-C-H-W-A-R-T-Z.

ISABELLA MEJIA: My name is Isabella Mejia, first name I-S-A-B-E-L-L-A, last name M-E-J-I-A.

ZURI BALL: The address, 689 Mass Ave.

ISABELLA MEJIA: I also live at 689
Mass Ave.

JONAH SCHWARTZ: I live at 12 Maple
Ave.

ZURI BALL: Okay. Good evening,
everybody. My name is Zuri Ball, and today,
I'm presenting alongside Jonah Schwartz and
Isabella Mejia, and we are here to speak on
the development of the Volpe site.

We believe that the creation of green
space, retail shops for the non-night park
commuters, the ability to walk throughout the
area, public plazas, and the addition of
affordable housing are vital to the Kendall
Square area and the future of Cambridge
residents ourselves.

Despite our beliefs, however, much of
discussions surrounding the development of the

Volpe site has been centered around the heights and the dimensions of the buildings, how tall they are, the floor-to-area ratio, et cetera.

Although it's a very important issue, we do like to assert that how an inviting and attractive whole space or area is, is as important as what the building looks like on land rather than it would on paper.

And regardless of what is built there, it is not just a necessity, it's a necessity to our lives that there is ample space and a combination of green and plaza space for the people to come together as a community from all areas of Cambridge.

The current area is one of the most distinct places in the city. Because of its rapid initialization after NASA moved out in the 1970s, and as tech labs continue to be

built over the past 12 years, it quickly grew into a haphazardly produced industrial zone.

Today we have been faced with the issue of deciding what to do with the new space. And as the youth of Cambridge, we believe that it is our job to say something and take a stand.

We feel that Kendall Square has become unwelcoming to the families and the natural residents of Cambridge. And it's lack a public spaces and basic storefronts create a depressing area, and the Volpe site has given us an opportunity to open up Kendall Square to everyone and continue the trend of being the diverse community that we think it to be.

ISABELLA MEJIA: Kendall Square is an area strictly devoted to the 9:00 to 5:00 crowd of Cambridge. This means the outside traditional work hours is completely empty.

The development of the Volpe site is an opportunity for Kendall Square to reinvent itself and become an inviting educational space for students, families, residents and nonresidents alike through the inclusions of plaza and green space regardless of heights, widths, sizes, shapes and colors of any proposed buildings, thus, more accurately representing the City of Cambridge.

We believe that a space where people of all ages and backgrounds can come together and enjoy Kendall is an important asset to the city.

Today, if I were to walk through Kendall Square quote, unquote after hours, it would be completely deserted, empty. Housing, green space, plaza space and local businesses are the missing pieces of the rapidly changing puzzle that is Kendall Square.

These four components would allow the Volpe development site to attract more people and increase the area's popularity ultimately creating more revenue.

An exemplary model for the part of the Volpe site would be Harvard Yard, a long-known location in Cambridge, of course, but well-known outside of Massachusetts as well. Harvard Yard is inviting and comfortable. It abstracts those who wants to think, relax, work or study.

We would like to see the same atmosphere throughout Kendall Square. We want the area -- we want an area that can bring the community together. A multi-utility plaza where we can have farmers' markets and local art events the sort of -- this sort of area that forges community and positive ambience. An inviting space, such as this, would allow

Cambridge residents to be integrated and welcomed to Kendall Square. It would even allow the many tourists to have a new site to visit on their itinerary.

JONAH SCHWARTZ: Hello. Our goal is to close the bridge between the emotionally draining Kendall Square and the lively and vibrant community of Cambridge that we call home. We want to ensure Cambridge's diverse and energetic community is accurately represented throughout all places, especially Kendall Square.

To achieve our goal, we must make it clear, as mentioned previously, that how a space feels and appeals to the people is just as important, maybe even more important than the dimensions of the building.

One of the defining features of Cambridge is our mixed housing. By combining

affordable and regular housing together in the same buildings, we have created a unique environment. This sort of environment should be represented in Kendall Square.

By allowing more affordable housing, Kendall Square will start to accurately reflect the other communities that we interact with on a regular basis.

Creating a more livable Kendall Square should be a priority. The addition of the more shopping areas would attract more local consumers to the square. This would boost -- overall boost the earning potential for ground level retail.

Keeping this in mind, enforcing a policy of the creation of welcoming local business is vital. As it stands, Kendall Square lacks such important amenities as grocery store or a pharmacy.

We can't even begin to focus on housing until we take these businesses into consideration.

Kendall needs a boost because, as it currently stands, it is dead compared to the rest of the city.

If housing in the square is to remain realistic, more effort needs to be put into turning Kendall Square into the type of place that people want to and can live in.

Being close to work is not enough, therefore, we feel that it should be important for the Planning Committee to keep the public realm in mind when considering the different proposals for the Volpe site.

Imagine food trucks, open play space and water fountains, a place that is not just full of over-priced cafes, a place where people can bring their families, a space for

the people of Cambridge. This vision is not that far. Actually, it's right in front of us.

Volpe is one of the last opportunities to mold Kendall into one of these communities into our Cambridge. Let's not waste this opportunity.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wishing to speak?

JOHN HAWKINSON: Good evening, John Hawkinson, H-A-W-K-I-N-S-O-N, 84 Massachusetts Avenue.

It occurred to me when I reviewed the changes from the prior draft to the current draft of the petition that when the Board increased the height limit, the previous draft had an incentive for middle income associated with going in the top tier of height, I guess,

from 200 to 250, and that incentive went away here. And I wonder whether it's appropriate to use an incentive like that. It doesn't have to be for middle income, but for something that we want and not just unconditionally grant the height at that top tier. So I just wanted the Board to think about that.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else that wishes to speak?

MARK JAQUITH: Good evening. For the record my name is Mark Jaquith, J-A-Q-U-I-T-H. I reside at 213 Hurley Street.

I would like to thank Steve Cohen for your opening remarks. Exactly where we need to be. Thank you.

And I have to correct Ted Cohen on his statement that the Rogers Street Park wasn't

around during the K2 study. It was, in fact, an established fact by then.

I will be brief.

Down in East Cambridge, we're not stupid. We're not uncivic-minded and we're not newbies. But this is, in fact, our backyard, and to have this big zoning package fast-tracked without any input from us is still -- I'm still stunned that that happened.

If you look around Kendall Square, at all the good in Kendall Square, most of that came from us. We should be included. We would like to be included. It will be better if we are included.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else?

CATHERINE HOFFMAN: Hi. Catherine Hoffman, Pleasant Street, just a --

THE REPORTER: Can you spell your

first --

CATHERINE HOFFMAN: C-A-T-H-E-R-I-N-E,
H-O-F-F-M-A-N, Pleasant Street.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

CATHERINE HOFFMAN: And I was really interested in what you were saying, a number of you, about including Ted, at the end about families, and feeling like this -- that really what we want is a vibrant community built around families who would send their children to public school, presumably in Cambridge and also about young people who have grown up in Cambridge and can't live here anymore. So, it made me wonder what it would be like if we started with that premise that if we want to create on this site spaces for families who will send their children to public schools in Cambridge, what do we want to build that would be family friendly and go from there, and

sort've think about different creative designs for that as opposed to creating units and then hoping that families will fit into them.

It also strikes me in terms of the number of housing whether there is enough or isn't enough that the more commercial you build, you are actually building something that then creates more housing demand because those are more people coming for those jobs as opposed to building for families that are already wanting to stay here.

So to me, that's about -- thinking about that balance.

Also, with my own experience, and it's limited, but friends of mine, who are younger who are part of this innovation economy, who have been to MIT, or whatever, they have come out of college, they have ideas about innovation, startups, and they actually are in

spaces in Kendall Square, but you don't see them because they're buried in those buildings. Literally going and being there all night long, working, thinking, planning, and by their own words, the notions about building community in Cambridge, or thinking about a larger civic purpose isn't who they are at that point in their life.

So to me to focus around building for the tech community, there's a conflict in terms of thinking about building for community that enhances Cambridge, and I don't know how to revolve it. I'm only just sort've sharing my own observation.

And that when those people either do succeed or don't because it's such a volatile industry and then think about wanting to have families or whatever, then where do they live? Where do they go? I don't know.

But I really don't want to be thinking about building for that demographic in its frozen moment in the '20s and '30s. So that's another thought I have just about --

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up.

CATHERINE HOFFMAN: And two other thoughts. One is just this question that has been brought up before -- I don't know about it -- about the question of ownership of the land in the future. There was some discussion that people brought up about the CRA actually owning the land, or leasing it, and I just -- I don't know what the thought is on it.

And, finally, this question that has been brought up a lot about infrastructure in terms of parking, traffic, all of that, and as this is being taught about, who's thinking about those things?

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

KEN TAYLOR: Ken Taylor, 23 Berkeley Street.

THE REPORTER: T-A-Y --

KEN TAYLOR: T-A-Y-L-O-R.

THE REPORTER: 23?

KEN TAYLOR: 23 Berkeley Street.

I am encouraged by what I have heard tonight about this very unusual opportunity that the city has. I think it has enormous potential. I think you have an owner of property who is saying to you: "We will give you ten acres of land or 11 acres of land if our simple needs are met." And I think they're very specific other than telling you exactly where the Volpe Center is supposed to be, or maybe that you've discussed that or no, but I think Cambridge needs to do the same

thing on the other side, and that is to say we appreciate the offer that you're making to us, and, in fact, this is what we would like to get out of this process.

Steve Cohen, I think, very correctly said there needs to be a vision for what Cambridge needs. And, in fact, we've heard various bits and pieces of that. It makes a huge difference of whether you are doing this for the tech community, or whether you are doing it for the overall community, the whole City of Cambridge because what I perceive East Cambridge lacks right now is any sense of neighborhood, any sense of being a livable place. It's basically like a suburban office park without the amenities that go with it.

Cambridge Street has shops, the best fish monger in the city is on Cambridge Street.

You need to bring that into Kendall Square, and you need to zone a significant amount of retail into an open space park plaza, whatever you want that people have been talking about, and it needs to be done on the south side of the site.

You have a 14-acre site that is on -- the south side is on Broadway, on the north side is Binney, and if you build tall buildings on the south side of the site, you basically are devaluing the rest of the site because you are casting them in shadows.

I think the height of zoning that you have indicated in the proposed ordinance should be reversed. I think the tallest building should be on the Binney Street side where they don't impact the quality of life for the rest of the site. The open space ought to be on the south side of the site. It

ought to be on Broadway, and it ideally would be surrounded on two or three sides by retail and housing that's no more than 70 feet high.

A vision like that could go to begin to create a community. You can put as much density and as much height as you want --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could you finish up with your comments?

KEN TAYLOR: -- on the north side of the site, but whether that's the right vision for Cambridge, I mean, somebody -- you probably have to decide what the vision for Cambridge is.

But I think you owe it to the city and you owe it to the GSA to tell them what the vision of Cambridge is of this site.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

MARILEE MEYER: Hi. I'm Marilee

Meyer, M-A-R-I-L-E-E, Meyer, M-E-Y-E-R.

And actually, I would like to second what the previous speaker just said. He kind've took my thunder.

But I really want to reiterate the proportion of the buildings. I'm visual. I'm an architectural historian. I leave it to crunching numbers to other people, except for height. But the main throughway to Cambridge is Broadway. You have your most traffic and density or through traffic there. Binney is wide, and it's a boulevard, and to draw the parallel between Central Park and the small park we're talking about now, Central Park in New York can take the tall buildings because it's acres and acres and acres of land that is being surrounded.

If you keep the lower buildings on Broadway, it's more like Chicago where you

have more space.

The one piece that I keep harping back to, yes, you were talking about a particular case here, the Volpe case, but you cannot ignore what will happen at MIT in the overall planning process.

You are coming over the bridge from Boston and you have an MIT building staring you in the face, they are going to be three buildings there on Main Street on the -- in front of Main Street, you go down Broadway. To me, that is not necessarily a place for a tall signature building on the Volpe site.

But that being said, overall planning really does have to take in what MIT is doing and what their residential towers are doing and what their retail and market rate housing is doing, too, because that can also contribute to the housing of Kendall Square.

So do not dismiss and subdivide the two projects because one will affect the other.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Excuse me. Before you speak, is there anyone else who has not spoken yet that would like to speak?

Well, you spoke two weeks ago. So we're just trying to get new people tonight first.

JOHN SANZONE: John Sanzone,
S-A-N-Z-O-N-E, J-O-H-N.

So I won't get into any specifics, although there are plenty, hundreds of details we could all go into. But with timing and the perspective or potential that the petition can be refiled, I think, in general, we just have to let some dreams flourish a little bit in the meantime, instead of being confining and jamming things around, and saying what we

can't do, or whatever constraints are, even what the context might be right now.

I think the most exciting for me so far has been the Connect Kendall Square open space winners concept for the site, and it's hard to say that would be a bad thing, and why can't we see something like that, the extension of the Broad Canal and some ecological significance to the site?

So, in general, I think we have a couple of months, at least, and maybe some outreach to people, like these very young people who spoke earlier, to dream up some things before we get too bogged down in the dimensional details and then the zoning which, of course, is going to come.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEPHEN KAISER: My name is Steven

Kaiser, K-A-I-S-E-R. First name is
S-T-E-P-H-E-N. I live at 191 Hamilton Street.

My concern on the 29th, and it is
tonight, too, is the role the GSA here because
the GSA is the Federal property owner. They
are the ones who have the clout, and
basically, Volpe is a tenant, and they're not
even part of the Federal budget.

So the priority of clout is GSA. They
should be the folks we should be talking with.
And somebody needs to inform them, "Hey, look
the zoning is in trouble," either in terms of
schedule or content or the plan, that there
are unanswered questions on transit. This
Board hasn't mentioned the word transit
tonight. It's crucial to the success of
Volpe. And also the new idea that has come up
tonight -- I hadn't thought about it -- which
is in the fall of next year, we might have a

different administration and a different set of priorities to deal with.

And if I'm a developer trying to respond to a GSA RFP saying, "What I am going to propose on this site? What do I say about the zoning? What do I say about transit? What do I say about the next administration?"

The developers, in effect, are in a very, very difficult position, and it should be the goal of this Board, and all the citizens, is to help make that job easier for them so they can put in a good bid and come up with something appropriate.

And I think the transit thing is one of the most crucial ones here and that's why I emphasized it on the 29th.

I did find one fascinating part of the zoning, which I think is worth noting, it's a very positive one. Oddly enough in the

context of the 500-foot building, if that would be approved only if it met "exceptional architectural quality," and my immediate thought was: "Gee, I wonder what that is. I would love to see that defined as my first thought."

My second thought was: "Well, does this mean for anything less than 500 feet we don't care about exceptional architectural quality?" Let's have all the buildings meet exceptional quality standards, okay?

And the cover letter is slightly different in wording. It mentioned high standard of architectural excellence, and also, signature landmark building. And I think we need a good discussion of what a signature architectural building is all about.

Now, there is a problem with the text in the zoning as it stands right now because

"exceptional architectural quality" could mean exceptionally good or exceptionally bad. So let's work on that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's not the word we're looking for.

STEPHEN KAISER: Yes, okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up your comments?

STEPHEN KAISER: Sure, okay.

So the last thing I think we should really do is get the conversation going on transit, and to try to get folks from the city in here to help you. Suzannah Bigolin from CDD, she's transportation and environment. She could help out --

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up?

Thank you.

STEPHEN KAISER: I'm trying to be

helpful, sir.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I understand that.

STEPHEN KAISER: Okay. The other thing is the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority is doing exceptionally good work at trying to get a handle on the transit situation, and so is Boston Properties, and MIT is supposed to be coming out with a report this month.

So the time we can improve particularly in the area of transit, if refiling is involved, and that should be one of our priorities is used in the next two months to do that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up your comments?

STEPHEN KAISER: I have done so.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

LEE FARRIS: Lee, L-E-E, Ferris, F-like "Frank"-A-double R-I-S, 269 Norfolk

Street.

I wanted to first say thank you to the Board for having heard the concerns that the public and the Councillors raised at the joint meeting, and for Ted Cohen saying this will be refiled, and I'm really happy that we'll have some time to make it a better balanced petition.

I also wanted to second what I took to be the direction of Steve Cohen when he was saying that this zoning should represent what we want to see primarily rather than what GSA needs to make the site work because I don't think they'll even know the numbers that it takes to make the site work until the developers bid and they have things in front of them.

So I think this is our chance to say what we really want, and then when we come

back around, when the developer says, "Well, we can't do what you really want," which we'll definitely happen, then that's when we should ask to see the chosen developer's numbers and say, "Show us why it can't work," so that's my big picture.

And then the points people have made about developing a vision for the area that comes from what we really want, that's what I think we should do.

And I guess I really differ with this vision that all of this Volpe land should be about supporting the tech community. There are so many parcels of land in Kendall Square that are supporting the tech community. And I think these young people very clearly expressed what I feel is that I'd like some of the land in Kendall Square to reflect what regular residents want and need, and I really

would like it to feel like more of a community there. I would like there to be more than a 1,000 units of housing. And that's why I think that the ratio of housing and commercial needs to change. And I would like to flip it 60 percent residential, but I would note ECAPS had called some years ago for, I believe for 75 percent. So it's sort've dwindling down and down.

And then as part of this --

ASS'T CITY MANAGER FAROOQ: It was 40/60.

LEE FARRIS: I'm sorry?

ASS'T CITY MANAGER FAROOQ: It was 40/60.

LEE FARRIS: Okay. As part of this, but just like other things are getting updated, we're just hearing all the time about Cambridge doesn't have enough housing of any

sort, so that's one of the reasons why I would like to see more housing there as well as specifically the reason of making it feel more like a real place that can support retail as some of you guys pointed out.

The --

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up?

LEE FARRIS: Okay. The last point --

H. THEODORE COHEN: We have received your written comments.

LEE FARRIS: Right.

The last point I want to say which are not in my written comments, is -- and I've said it before here, but I want to remind folks -- when we went through C2 and K2, the public was told, "No, you can't speak very much or have very much role in how those turn out unless you are one of the 20 or so people

on the respective board, and your chance will come when it's time to make the zoning, when it's time to turn C2 into zoning for Central Square and time to turn K2 into zoning for Kendall Square.

So what is happening in Kendall Square is it's being turned into zoning, piece by piece by piece. And I don't take the -- I take the numbers that were figured out in K2 as being good information, but I don't take the decisions that were made in K2 as something that residents have really had a chance to weigh in on.

And I just really strongly oppose this idea of taking whatever is in K2 as a given and that's what we've got to do.

So, thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you wrap up now?

LEE FARRIS: Thank you.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hi. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street.

And I'm going to talk a little about how we got where we are, and this has to do somewhat with what Lee was just saying.

Now, we had ECAPS, and that had tremendous community involvement, and that seems to me to have been pretty much the last shot that the residents got at really shaping our neighborhood, because the ink was barely dry before developers started chipping away at it.

The next huge change was Alexandria, and you may not recall, but I will remind you, that the Rogers Street Park and the Triangle Park were specifically to be mitigation for the Alexandria up-zoning. You don't get to count them twice. They're already paying for

something.

So what Volpe is doing, that has to -- that needs its own open space because that's what keeps happening. Residents get one shot. Developers get infinite numbers of shots, and every time we say, "But wait a minute, we already made a deal here," we're told, "Well, that deal is old."

So we get to this, and how many months has this been batting around with no public hearings until June 29th? None.

You guys had how many meetings -- four at least -- where you talked about it and took no public comment?

And then you wonder why the public is unhappy, why the public says, "We have been shut out."

What Lee said about K2 is absolutely correct. It was almost all developers. There

were a couple of people who weren't.

So if you -- we're the people that have to live with this, and as Mark said, we aren't newbies. We show up, and you know that, we show up for good projects. We show up for good zoning. So it makes me dismayed that we were cut out of this pretty much completely until you finally -- and I don't even know if you did it because I heard one of you saying something about the GSA did it. I don't know who wrote this. It's sent in under your names. But whoever wrote it, why could we not have been included in the discussion so that it could have been shaped in a way that would have made this a whole lot more productive?

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: For the record, we

wrote it.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: So, thanks. James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place, Cambridge.

THE REPORTER: Spell your last name.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Williamson,
W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S-O-N.

So I'm going to start with something that's maybe a little bit heretical, and that is, you know, I'm not -- I sort've wonder how much I really care about what happens here.

Living in Cambridge for 45 years, I think a lot of people probably don't really care. It's terra incognita for many of us. It's like somebody else's territory, "Well, let them do whatever they want."

And one thing that -- as I thought about that, which is not a very happy or welcome thought, I thought, "Well, okay, what could be achieved here that I might care

about," and that would be something for the adjacent neighborhoods for the people who live in the adjacent neighborhoods, something about this that might help enhance life for people in Area 4, people in Wellington/Harrington, people in East Cambridge and what might that be?

Well, you get into some of the park ideas, the ECOS study, the connecting different park spaces and having ways for people to get through this area to perhaps the Broad Canal, perhaps to the river.

But then I thought listening to people tonight, "Well, what if we tried to think about how could we make this place a place where people who live in Cambridge where we would care about it again?"

So what would it take to do Volpe, the rezoning and imagine what might be there --

along the lines that Steve and others have talked about -- what could we imagine doing with this Volpe site that would make it a place that lots and lots of people who live in Cambridge would begin to care about again?

And I'm not sure what that might be, but on -- but I think that's a good place to start.

And on open space, I am glad Ken Taylor said what he said. I hope and presume you are already thinking about the ECOS. They already have a framework for a wetlands, you know, is that really a good way to start thinking about the open space? I'm not sure.

But my final observation is about what I think was the failed space on Sydney Street, in that -- for a city area, where open space was created, I think Peter Valentine had an interesting idea of having it on the other side of the buildings -- that didn't happen --

but it's an example of a space that now people bend over backwards to try to activate by having things like the Taste of Cambridge, which has now been postponed, until Thursday night.

So, please don't make that mistake again when you think about the open space.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have one comment for you which is that I have been here for the same 45 years you've been here. And up until probably ten years ago, there was no reason to go to Kendall Square. It was really a wasteland, and now through, you know, staff, and City Council, and predecessors on the Board, we have created a place, we have businesses, and we got people living there and we're looking into how we can make it better.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: I love going to the

F and T.

JAN DEVEREUX: Hi. Jan Devereux,
D-E-V-E-R-E-U-X, 255 Lakeview Avenue.

I will be brief.

I want to say I really enjoyed this discussion, and I have appreciated the comments, both from particularly Steve Cohen and Mr. Bacci, not to slight any other comments, but I thought you introduced some new ideas.

I would definitely second what Ken Taylor said about orienting more of the big buildings toward Binney Street.

And I want to bring in just two big picture issues that I know that CDD is juggling at the same time, but haven't been mentioned. One is the master plan because this is looking like it's not going to happen on such a fast track, and in which case, we

have a master plan process starting, I hope, this fall. And I believe the first phase was supposed to be Alewife, but whatever happens in Kendall is going to have a ripple effect in Alewife even though many people in my neighborhood when you start to talk to them about Volpe, look at you blankly. And I think that points to some of the public process -- a lack of public process, lack of coverage of this issue. People are not really aware, and they have no idea of the citywide impact that this project would have if it were developed at the scale we have been talking about.

And so, I think it has to be almost done in the context of what are we doing with this master plan and what is the vision for the city?

Someone shared with me a document that was generated by the Kennedy School in 1998

entitled "Addicted to Growth." It talked about choices that Cambridge had made to prioritize commercial development versus Brookline and a couple other cities, Somerville and Peabody, and it's an interesting document, it's not a complete document, you know, and it was a graduate student project. But I think it's worth perhaps reviewing in the context of the vision of what we're doing in the master plan because it plays into this conversation we're having about what Volpe should be. Should it be more of a neighborhood, or should it be simply, you know, an office place, a commercial center for the tech community?

The second big picture item that hasn't been mentioned is the climate change vulnerability assessment that was just done which, I believe, identified this exact area

as one of the most vulnerable along with Alewife.

So those are two other balls that are in the air very much and I think need to be incorporated in this discussion.

And thanks for all the good ideas tonight.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Does someone want to be the last speaker tonight?

If not, then, thank you all.

There will be a further public hearing. I don't know the dates, although I'm sure it will be posted, and anyone who is given notice of their desire to be informed will be given notice.

Thank you all for coming and for all your information and your ideas, and we will take a five-minute break and then we will

return to discuss Harvard Square.

(Short recess taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, we're all set. We'll now take up Planning Board 300, 16-18 Eliot Street Special Permit to waive the parking requirements (Section 20.54.4) and relief from the yard requirements for residential use (Section 20.54.5) to add approximately 11,935 square feet of residential Gross Floor Area, with 15 dwelling units, in a three-story addition above an existing two-story retail building at 16-18 Eliot Street. 16-18 Eliot Street, LLC is the applicant.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Board.

For the record, my name is James Rafferty. I'm an attorney with offices at 675 Massachusetts Avenue.

I'm here this evening on behalf of the applicant, 16-18 Eliot Street, LLC. The manager of that LLC is Bruce Gorsky, G-O-R-S-K-Y. Mr. Gorsky is seated in the front row. The project architect is Peter Quinn, who will be providing the presentation materials here this evening.

This is a property, I presume known to most Members of the Board. It's somewhat of a non-descript building on what might be considered the backside of Harvard Square and Eliot Street. It was a building that had previously -- a location where a building had burned down. It was a companion building for a number of wood-framed structures that abut it, and there was a more ambitious plan for this building years ago, but for a variety of reasons, the then owner, Robert Banker, did not pursue that plan and built this present

building.

It's a two-story, wood-frame structure. It has served as the home of a variety of restaurant uses since its opening.

It was the first California Pizza Kitchen to come to the Greater Boston area, but it didn't last too long. It was a TGIF Fridays. They didn't last too long either. And it was a -- downstairs it had a below-grade restaurant that Mr. Sidel opened called Pomfret's and he had a very Parisian authentic theme to it. That didn't last long too long either.

Now, it's the proud home of the International House of Pancakes and a number of other restaurants.

But it's kind've a unique building in that it's always had restaurants, and, frankly, the current restaurant mix is working

and that's -- I don't want to knock the location -- but the location has had challenges. But this end of Harvard Square, as you know, is becoming more active and engaged, and the Board recently saw and approved the Kennedy School project across the street.

So Mr. Gorsky acquired the building within the past year or two, and has spent some time and effort considering how to increase the building.

And the proposal before you tonight is one that would add three stories to the building, each story being approximately 4,000 square feet, there would be five dwelling units, five apartments on the each of the three floors, and all of this is going to occur without disrupting the tenanted restaurants in the building.

So all of the existing restaurants will continue to serve patrons and customers while three stories of construction goes on above them.

So the building has a certain charm to it in its current condition, but, admittedly, it was -- I think it has been described as a place hold a building or interim building, and Mr. Gorsky has spent a great deal of time soliciting feedback. Most of it, you know, he sought, some of it unsought.

But at any rate, we've had a series of meetings with a variety of different interests in Harvard Square. Probably the most extensive and formal where the three different appearances before the Cambridge Historical Commission. The property is located in the Harvard Square Historical Overlay District, and the Zoning Ordinance designates this as an

area where the Historical Commission has shared jurisdiction, I would suggest, with the Planning Board on design matters.

So the materials, the massing, the setbacks, all of the features of the building were greatly informed by that process.

We also had the opportunity in the midst of that process to come and consult here with the design review staff at CDD to solicit feedback about what was being proposed.

As noted in application, there are really two issues that the application presents to the Board.

Given the size of the building, it doesn't require any dimensional relief in terms of its project review. But there are two issues here that are present. As I'm sure the Board knows, in the Harvard Square Overlay District, there's a special provision around

the parking requirements, and it says, "A building can be exempted from those requirements upon the issuance of a Special Permit by this Board, and the payment of 50 percent of the cost of the construction of the spaces into something called the Harvard Square Improvement Fund." And you may see some correspondence as to what the Harvard Square Improvement Fund is and how decisions are made about how that money gets spent, but that's perhaps a conversation for a later time. But at any rate, we actually had some thoughts about how that might be spent as well.

I hope the Board has had an opportunity to see a memo that arrived today from Mr. Sullivan because it's a -- I would say, a very helpful analysis of the design issues we went through with the Historic

Commission, and also provides an interesting history of this historic wall behind the building.

The wall really can't be seen from the public way of this building, but if you were on Winthrop Street, or if you spend anytime in a recently constructed beer garden behind Charlie's Kitchen, you could really experience this wall as close as you ever care to.

And it's there for all to see and enjoy, but it is in a period or a state of decline and there has been -- it's a shared wall, there are three abutters that share it, and this process has prompted Mr. Gorsky to collaborate with the two other property owners about sharing some repairs to the wall. But it's a wall of some significance as Mr. Sullivan noted.

So the standard for these parking

waivers are really twofold: One is that the design of the building is actually enhanced by the absence of the parking. And I think that certainly the case here introducing a driveway into a somewhat small street frontage and putting more vehicles across that sidewalk when we've got next-door to us is a very active driveway for a very useful public parking garage.

The other criteria is the availability of other parking opportunities within reasonable proximity to the site, and this garage, the garage next-door, operated and owned by Trinity Property, does do leasing, they do monthly leasing. And the owner of that garage was at some of our prior hearings and our understanding is that opportunities do exist if residents here were looking to lease a parking space, and it would as

proximate to the building as one could ever contemplate other than being in the building.

Similarly, we have checked with the Charles Square Garage, and they also do monthly parking. But the strong belief here, of course, is that this is a type of dwelling that is likely to attract a non-auto owner. And it's for that reason, I think the introduction of these housing units into this location of Harvard Square is perfectly consistent with the stated goals in the Harvard Square Overlay District about creating housing here.

Aside from the parking, the second issue involves setback. And there is -- this property is in a business district, and there is no setback requirement, particularly front setback if one were to build a commercial building, an office building. But if you

build housing, you do have to have a setback.

So we find ourselves in a situation where the first two floors of the building don't require a setback, but the top three floors would require a setback.

Aside from the awkwardness of that geometry, there's structural issues and we think that it's an appropriate candidate for the Board to waive that setback requirement which the Board is authorized to do in the Harvard Square Overlay District.

So those are the two issues before the Board.

Much of the discussion, as you might imagine to date, has gone largely into, frankly, issues unrelated to parking -- some emulate to parking. I would say there's been little commentary that the building should be obligated to introduce parking.

I think a lot of discussion, both at the Historical Commission and the Harvard Square Advisory Committee and meeting with others has been the facade material, and particularly the top floor and Mr. Quinn will walk you through where the building ended up. But there was -- as you will see tonight, there was a good deal of effort and focus placed on the top floor, how to make this building be as compatible as possible.

It's got a wood-frame building on one side of it, it's got the large masonry garage on the other side of it. And we're starting with a base that's a little funky to begin with. So we're hoping that you will reach the same conclusion that the Historical Commission ultimately did was that the design being proposed here actually does a very good job of balancing the variety of interests here. At

the end of the day, it has to provide the egress and code access requirements for dwelling units on those three floors. In many ways there's a fortuitous alignment with the existing lobby and elevator egress -- second egress stairs can fit into the building. And there will be reasonably sized units in a range of somewhere between 400 and close to 650 square feet.

So there will be some small, certainly not large units, but given all that Harvard Square has to offer in terms of its amenities, its transportation access, and the like, it's every reason to believe that this will be an attractive and appealing housing location for a variety of residents.

So we're eager to get the Board's reaction and answer any questions and Mr. Quinn will now walk you through the plan.

LIZA PADEN: Excuse me, Ted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LISA PADEN: Could we find out from the applicant if he would be willing to be heard by five members?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.

Ms. Paden did alert me to the fact that there were only five members available for tonight's deliberation, and I have reviewed that with Mr. Gorsky, who the record should show is nodding affirmatively, and Mr. Gorsky has agreed to waive his right to be heard by seven members and is prepared to go forward recognizing that the five members assembled tonight will remain the five members in the case in deliberation and votes are limited to the five of you, and these applications require five affirmative votes.

So you all look well-rested and tanned. So he thought he'd go ahead.

PETER QUINN: Mr. Chairman, my name is Peter Quinn. Members of the Board, I'm Peter Quinn of Peter Quinn Architects. I don't have a microphone.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You could stand there?

PETER QUINN: Thank you. As you can see, the building we have -- I don't know if Jim mentioned -- it's actually a steel-framed building. It was designed, as far as we can tell, to take the additional height. There are some earlier drawings by Ben Thompson showing a five-story building. This building is located in a slightly different location on the site. However, it seems to have been considered that it eventually would be added to.

We struggled quite a bit with the proportions of this building thinking that this was a serious building, and then we realized looking at it long enough, that, in fact, it was kind of a post-modern pastiche of different shapes and sizes.

The arch over the window, large spaces of window openings below and then these tiny ones on the second floor. A secondary arch in the back here.

These are kinda somewhat pompous flagpoles on the front, but it did have this nice feature of a recess that's approximately eight feet, a entry area that you can enter into the restaurants from there as well as up to the second floor which is also a restaurant.

There are also a couple other things I want to point out because they will play into

our design as we move forward.

There's a recessed courtyard over here. This steps back at least 15, 20 feet. It's on the side of the Banker Building as well. It does not have any doors opening up onto it. I think at one time it did, but it doesn't now.

Then on the other side of the building over here, there's an alley which now has a brick pavers. It goes all the way around the building and becomes a walkway in the back where the wall is.

I'll show you some pictures of that later.

This opening is about 30 -- a little more than 30 feet here, and then it narrows down because of the angularity of the lot lines to about 11 feet where the building ends.

Existing building height is about 26 feet high. The building on the left is about 33 by our measurement.

You can see next-door is the large parking garage. I took the time to measure the height of the cornice and the top of this. This is about -- I'm measuring from brick -- counting the bricks -- it's about 64-1/2 feet to the peak. So, slightly higher than the 60 feet that's allowed in this district.

This cornice line here which is predominate is just under 49 feet.

Then there's a further cornice, that's stepped back about five feet, I believe, from the front wall. And that's another four or five feet.

You can see down here in this alley what we're talking about.

There's trash back there, and a

dumpster and grease collectors and so forth.

There's a good picture of the courtyard there. Most of the buildings to the left are three story. They start a flank of historic buildings around to Charlie's Kitchen and then wrapping around up to Winthrop Street.

This is kind've a better view. You can see right here that there's basically a concrete block wall in the back here. And this is the JFK -- 57 JFK building sort've in the back corner of it.

I think you may remember this. We presented a proposed addition on that thing to you several months ago.

The historic part of the wall actually starts as you go around the corner. This is just basically a ten-foot high concrete block wall, and then a three-story high building

there.

Now, the building is typically laid out, as Jim mentioned, with the -- these are existing plans. This is the basement, an elevator, stairway, stairway and then flanking retail spaces on each side. First floor here, Ihop, of course, and then the space in the back is the trash area, and so forth.

And this is our second floor, which is now going to be occupied by a new Korean restaurant just about to open up.

This is the tall entry porch looking down to the space below.

All right. We're proposing a five-story building in the context of several buildings that are five story. In the foreground not seen is the Kennedy School that would sit right here. The new bridge across connecting the two buildings sits right in

this area here.

This is the garage, of course, and then going around the Banker Building this is the building that houses a few retail shops and then Charlie's Kitchen. And in the back here, this is the Red House Restaurant, and then next to it's the Hasty Pudding Club.

This building here which looks enlarged shows what it would look like if you were to give a Special Permit to the owner of that building for the three-story addition that we're proposing there.

This is Grendel and the Boys Institute and the residences in that building block there.

Over here, this is Winthrop Square, of course, and Winthrop Park and then JFK Street here, just to give you an idea.

So we really sit at the edge of a lot

of larger five-story buildings or close to five-story buildings. This block in here and across the street, and then this does step down kind've has its own integrity as smaller over historic buildings.

Our site plan: We're not adding any footprint to the buildings and we're working with the footprint we have. Starting in the front here, we retained this open alleyway in the front. We have a little bit of a short-term bike parking on the side here, and then we actually provide a gate here. There is a problem with security in the back here. With a wall, the wall starts at about eight foot high right here. This is why you didn't see the wall, you just saw a concrete block back here. But as you turn the corner, the historic wall starts here, it then turns its corner at this property line and then goes

down into where my cursor is for Charlie's Kitchen and their Beer Garden.

So we've introduced a bike shed here, an enclosed bike shelter, to give you an idea of the image of that.

Tucked into this corner are these very high walls on both sides. We then have areas for trash and recycling all enclosed in trying to keep that area compact and secure, and the reason why we're introducing a gate system here is just really to protect the wall, protect the residents who will then have access back here. This is one of the hangout areas in the square, and we've discussed this with our abutters and how this will be important to reduce -- to increase security back here.

Now let's discuss the building. To give you an overall idea of our proposed

addition, we're actually re-cladding the entire facade all the way to the ground, all to the grade and a little bit of the sides as well.

As I mentioned, our cladding -- I didn't mention that. So we're re-cladding everything to the fourth floor with kind've a medium gray. See where my cursor is here on the materials board? This is a high-density fibrous cement material, such as Eternit. There are a number of other brands. I will show you some samples of images later.

And then we go to a lighter color on a step-back, fourth floor -- fifth floor.

And then we have a large somewhat bold cornice which follows the curb in the street. It's broken where we have a balcony. That's a common balcony for the residents.

The change of colors is important to

allow that top level to feel a little bit lighter.

Another thing that I would like to point out is that we took the idea of the symmetry sort've the deadpan symmetry of this original building and tried to use that in a more loose way by adjusting the window locations a little bit where we had that ability to be somewhat arbitrary with it.

That's also true, we think, after a lot of discussion with Community Development and with the Historic Commission, the need to make some kind of adjustment to these windows here that I'm pointing out to on the existing building.

Unfortunately, we're not able to actually change those at this time because of the lease that the tenants have. So what we came up with is a shutter system that will

allow their signage to be placed on the outside, as they have now, and we would -- these would open and shut at will. These windows, I think I may have mentioned in a previous presentation to another board, that these windows are fixed. They are, in fact, venting so somebody can open them up and move these shutters. I'll show you how the shutters work in a minute, but they basically pull back on themselves.

The bottom area down here, we will continue with the fibrous cement. We have a black base here. This dark color here. And then we also introduce another medium gray around the windows. We have this kind've play of different grays and off-whites of this material played against this wood material, which is actually a high-density wood material -- I'm trying to recall the name. It

will come up when we get to the materials slide. But it's a material that can be wood and cut and machined to give us these sorts of shades.

On the sides of the building, we have introduced these bays which serve a number of things: One is they introduce a little bit of lightness to the building, as you will see in the slides ahead. They're intended to have a primary window that looks out toward the river. They also give us a chance to break the material, so we have the facade material and then kind've a lighter weight residential scale material in the back here.

The shutters that we have do continue to the side. We have the same kind of square windows as well there.

The awnings that you see, which I want to bring up, or actually just to kind've comes

with the lease, and, you know, I think as time changes, we'll try to make this more uniform, but it's not something that can be done right now.

This is a recreated recessed opening, so we still keep that space that is right there, but we open it up all the way, and we have a small canopy that holds a sign, a dress sign for the building, and then we refinished the interior with this same width material.

Let me make sure I've got everything here.

So moving on to other views, you can see here the bays just peeking over the Banker Building, the shutters, how they work, and the step-back on the fourth floor which is about a foot.

So this view is across Eliot Street, kind've at the end of the Kennedy School.

This is in the opposite direction coming up Eliot Street. Eliot Street has quite a bit of slope to it. Again, the bays, the shutters, the step-back, cornice.

Further view, this is the back at the corner of JFK and Eliot Streets.

I know this looks taller than that, but this is actually five feet taller. They also step back about three feet and it sits at a lower grade elevation. It creates the prospective line of sight that makes it look tall than our building looks tall.

This is a view further out on Eliot, more the corner where you come up at Charles Hotel Plaza.

This is a rearview here. You can see the JFK with its staggered three-story addition, if approved. The Hasty Pudding Club, Reynolds, the Boys Institute and the

condominiums there and Banker Building. The JFK or the Kennedy School building is not shown here, but that would sit as a-five-story structure right here. And that's the garage as well.

To discuss the materials and facade in a little more detail, you can see this is our shutter system. You're able to see through it. These are actually slats of wood that are held together with a backer bar.

The materials themselves, this fibrous cement material is a rain screen-type of material that has joints, and the joints are laid out in a geometry to create a little bit of greater sense of scale and motion in the facade.

We also have about a six-foot high mechanical screen setback about 12 to 18 feet from the top -- from the front in order to

enclose all of the extensive mechanical equipment that this building will have on its roof.

To compare the heights here so, as I mentioned before, this is 48-1/2 feet. We're about 49.5, but because we're just slightly higher than the garage, it's a little hard to tell exactly where these alignments are, but they're approximately the same height. And, of course, this is a lower height here of 60 feet than the 64.6. This building sits lower as well. This is just some adjustments.

You can see the three bays on the side. These are staggered. They're not all perfectly aligned as you may have seen in the 3D models.

Back here this courtyard is actually a one-story section of the building, and on the upper level, there's always been kind've an

upper screen that makes it look like it's a two-story structure. It's actually not.

I believe the tenant is trying to get seating out here.

In any case, we took the same idea with the shutter and slats to extend that across this area here to create a facade wall. The same detailing as used in our gate as well.

You can see how we've used -- introduced the wood paneling elsewhere in the building as well to kind've counterpoint the gray fibrous cement.

There's a sample of wood right there.

That's a side-view. This is the alley side, again the staggered bays. This is kind've a standard fiber cement about a ten-inch exposure. This existing material down here is a rehabilitated existing metal

panel system that's on that building which we want to clean it up and paint it. The shutters here as well.

The rearview of the building, some utilities on it. The other side, this is that one-story section with its false front, western front.

Now the materials, this is, as I mentioned the fibrous cement, again, the green screen material. There's a couple of different examples. In fact, this Board did approve, I think, this building at 22 Water Street that's exactly the same material or similar to it.

And this building here, actually like this example, if you know the Korean Church in Brookline Village, it actually is attached to an older brick building, and we found this gray material to actually worked fairly well

with the bridge and created kind've an interesting dialogue between the two.

So given how much brick there is in that area, we're hoping to create the same sort of milieu.

The wood material, high pressure wood composite, these are some examples you may be familiar with. This is a shutter system where we were inspired by the idea, say, you would have a bar in the back to hold the slats together, and they fold back as needed on a rail system.

These are some other wood composites. I know you are familiar with these such as the Realm Building, Children's Museum. This is a close-up of the Children's Museum.

These have sat outside for a long time and have been fine. Some of the other materials is the clapboard with a ten-inch

exposure that I mentioned. Some kind of metal screen for the upper level.

These are actually showing here, not so much the fibrous cement, but the windows that we're proposing would actually have color in them on the front. So we would have kinda like a bronze color and then a lighter wood-like wood tone with color up above in a few other locations. That's what you're seeing here.

I do have a shadow study, if you would like me to go with that, Mr. Chairman?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think we have seen it.

PETER QUINN: Okay, fine. I'm happy to answer any questions.

The rest of my presentation is just CAD drawings, but I will just show you briefly how the units are laid out that seems germane.

We have units that range in size from about 815, that's this the back corner, and I think the smallest most of them are one bedroom. There's a couple of twos on each -- let's see. There's a two, one, one bedroom, one bedroom. And then on the top floor, we have a step-back and this becomes a smaller studio. I think that says 325.

I'm happy to take any questions. I think I've covered everything. I hope I have.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a question about the material on the side. So is that cream color, whatever it is?

PETER QUINN: Yep, that's the clapboard.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's a different material than what's shown on your board?

PETER QUINN: Yes. We don't have a

sample of that here.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's essentially the same material?

PETER QUINN: I would just try and point out that the high-density weighs about two to three times more per cubic foot, if you will, than the standard CertainTeed clapboard. CertainTeed is kinda what would be called the medium density, a light-to-medium density material. It's prepainted, it goes up, but it does require maintenance over time, whereas the Eternit or equal high-density fibrous cement, it is machine finished, its color are solid all the way through, it never really decays or erodes. It's like a stone-type material. That's what you're seeing here.

I think I will just go to that picture. That's it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other

questions right now?

STEVEN COHEN: One quick question:
What would be the setback requirement?

PETER QUINN: It varies.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's the formula
setback.

PETER QUINN: It's a formula. I do
have it in here if you want...

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's in the
application.

PETER QUINN: It's in the application
under the zoning.

If you can read that, I think that
says 18 or 16, or something like that.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

PETER QUINN: It says 8-1/2 the rear
and five-something up here.

So it's a formula. I'm sorry that I
can't just tell you that.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's the height plus the length divided by seven.

STEVEN COHEN: Works out to be 16 feet, you said?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: At the longest facade is the side facade. It's about 17.

STEVEN COHEN: The building is on the front lot line?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes. And the existing building because it's not residential wasn't subject to any of those setbacks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Does the staff have any comments they want to make right now?

Hugh, you have a question?

HUGH RUSSELL: I have a question about the floor plan. I thought there was a requirement --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sir, is there a mike you could use, please?

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a requirement for the distance that stair entrances have to be separated from each other?

PETER QUINN: Of one-third of the distance of that building? Yeah. But we may be needing to move that stairway there. Put a...

HUGH RUSSELL: I wanted to make sure you address that.

PETER QUINN: We will. It's an internal plan issue.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I have a question relative to the plan as well, Peter. And it relates to the issue of setback I'm mulling in my head. Just the decision about the disposition of those bays, the triangular bays forward on the side that abuts the garage and generally setback on the other side. How did you arrive at -- what is the logic behind

those positioning?

PETER QUINN: We were actually trying to place them -- and you can see it varies a little bit. We were trying to place them in a way that achieved a cutoff, so I need to go back to the 3Ds to see what you're talking about.

When you're standing here, the bays serve to cut off the view going back in there and actually give it a defined line.

And this one, because the way this courtyard is recessed, it makes more sense to set that further back.

If we -- and also, it's more open in here, whereas the other side of those bays were that far back, they would be recessed so far back as to have no effect.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: In terms of blocking view down the alley?

PETER QUINN: Blocking the view down the alley, but also not providing kind've a forward view looking out into the river onto the Kennedy School.

So this gives it an advantage of having it sort've -- because it's a narrow space there, so to speak, putting it on the right side a little bit forward to the left side. So what Tom is talking about is that this is the most forward, there's another one right behind here at this level -- I'm sorry -- at this level. Another one down here.

So you create -- we wanted to bring them forward a little bit so they actually were relevant to the views in given the narrow space. On the other side, you have a much more openness on this side because this is a three-story building and you have this little one-story addition.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I don't know if this is the time to get into this --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Why don't we have your public comment and then we can deal with it?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Peter, can you do me a favor and put up the plan that has the little terrace and the bike, please?

H. THEODORE COHEN: James, state your name.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Yeah, yeah. So James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place, Cambridge.

As one 45-year resident to another, I certainly didn't mean to suggest there hadn't been a lot of development in Kendall Square. It's just that I don't think a lot of people in Cambridge really care -- have cared a lot

about what has been happening there and that was my point there.

It's kind of relevant in a way to a piece of this. I think this is kind've a putrid color. I'm sort've not happy about that.

And I was wondering, the cornice, Peter, did you trim back the cornice? I think you did a little after?

PETER QUINN: During the Historic Commission reviews, we did.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Right. I went to all those meetings, and so, there's a lot of back and forth.

I think it's a shame to lose arch -- the curved arch as part of the entry. As I say, I don't particularly like this color, but you know, I'm ready to sort've give up on all of that.

And my interest in this is focusing on the retaining wall, and the possibility that offers. And I think that Charlie Sullivan's memo doesn't go quite far enough, and the idea that I have is, first of all, the building up here, the Raj Dhanda Building here is coming before you next week, I believe, the Kennedy School building over here is going to have this new entry with a bridge that was mentioned, and I think there's a fantastic opportunity for a path, call it a meander, if you will, right across the street, right up this alley and here there is a cinderblock wall, but at the other end of the alleyway, coming down along Raj Dhanda's Building, there's actually a stairway right on that side that comes down and then hits up against this cinderblock wall.

So the idea would be to open up a path

and you could move this gateway if you really wanted to have that gateway for various reasons, you could move that gateway to right here offering some security and protection here, and opening it, you know, whenever that could be, you know, decided on for some public access to the retaining wall, but that you would have people -- people would be able to walk up here, walk up the stairs, walk here and walk through Winthrop Square to Harvard Square. I think that would be fantastic opportunity that would also make the whole business of the retaining wall make some sense because then people could actually see it. It doesn't really matter to a lot of people if the retaining wall -- I mean, it's not a bad idea to spend some money fixing it up, but if it's not going to be something that people are going to be able to, in some way, enjoy, have

some access to, then, you know, why should it really matter? How can that really be considered satisfying a public interest the way it might if it were connected to an opportunity for people to actually see it?

So one of the problems is that I think that Charlie Sullivan, you know, has rightly met with the owners, the property owners and abutters, but there is a public constituency potentially that would, for this idea of the retaining wall, that should be brought into this, I think, can and should be brought in and that would enhance, you know, the overall public constituency for a public interest in something really potentially quite positive happening here.

So, that's really my idea is a pathway and working to enhance the proposal, as framed to you by Charlie Sullivan, to actually

include that and make that a condition.

In other words, not release the money for just the partial thing that's in this memo, but at least approve giving the money to the Harvard Square Improvement Funds, as suggested, only if this idea is explored in a way that I have suggested.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

Yes?

MARLENE MEYER: I am Marlene Meyer, M-E-Y-E-R, 10 Dana Street.

I have to commend the architect in that this has been through such a process from where it started to where it ended. It's still of problematic building for me, but at least there's been a lot of work.

My question is: On the entrance, what is the difference between the height of the arch and the new entry, the double height square of the door.

PETER QUINN: Through the Chair.

MARLENE MEYER: From the original arch to the --

PETER QUINN: Is that all right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, if you can answer it.

PETER QUINN: If you look right here, you can see that the height of this arch relates to maybe two-thirds of the way up to the height of that window, but actually behind there, there's a recess --

MARLENE MEYER: Right.

PETER QUINN: -- that goes a bit higher. And we just took advantage of that whole recess. So it goes high as the windows.

MARLENE MEYER: So it's basically the same height?

PETER QUINN: It's the same space.

MARLENE MEYER: Because the arch looks a little bit more human scale than an office building lobby entrance just to height.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could you give us your comments rather than having the discussion about it?

MARLENE MEYER: Okay. I find the material, the color too light, and I find the building, in general, still a little bit too busy, but at least they tried to bring it down a little bit, but the rest of everything else I give up on.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

If not, then we'll have our

discussion. Does staff have any comment -- we received a memo from staff. Is there anything else you wish to add at this time?

JEFF ROBERTS: We're happy to answer any questions. I don't know if Suzannah wants to cover what she said. The applicant accurately described the zoning relief that's requested, and just as a reminder, it's interesting that despite the fact that relief is related to parking and setbacks, the criteria that the Planning Board is evaluating, which are laid out in that memo, have to do with the urban design and how it continues and conforms with the development guidelines that are in place for Harvard Square.

Do you want to add?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Thanks, Jeff.

The memo does set out most of the

urban design issues, and sorry, I think I might be losing my voice, but, obviously, it's been through a robust review process with the Historical Commission, and also through staff and the Harvard Square Advisory Committee.

The overlay district and the development guidelines do support contemporary creative design. So the project responds to that kind of an initiative in the guidelines and also encourages diversity as well.

We looked at the projects for quite some time, and have sort've looked at the fifth floor setback as possibly something that could be further explored in terms of setting it back a bit further so it does actually recede from view lines.

At the moment, it's kinda neither here nor there, it's only about a foot. So looking if that would actually help the building fit a

bit better within the streetscape and also provide more usable private open space.

And as Peter mentioned, the second floor windows and the shutters, we've had a lot of discussion about that as well, and we would have preferred the windows being the sides that match the windows above, just to create a better order and sort of balance across the facade as well.

Some of the other areas where we thought improvements could be made were sort've associated with the existing first-floor and second-floor tenant spaces. Those side facades are just blank, but if the public can access that alleyway a little bit and if residents can as well, if there was a possibility to make those facades more interesting or even provide windows or some sort of activation.

We also would love to encourage access to the historic wall, as staff mentioned that when we discussed the 57 JFK straight building, so any public access would be great. And I believe the owner is encouraging access for tour groups. So how that can be sort've arranged through the permit and also how we could encourage that experience so it's not just through sort've the side alley and passed dumpsters, so how that could be a better experience.

And, also, the other aspects looked at the public realm in improving the paved sort've courtyard spaces and the guidelines do encourage landscaping and greening and flowers and sort've enhancing those areas for the public realm. So at the moment, there's no street trees, and it's pretty sort've bare, so if there was the possibility of landscaping.

That our summarizes our main comments.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any questions for Jeff or Suzannah?

STEVEN COHEN: One question I'm not quite sure what you said, or where we are with the public access down the alley, and the point that James raised about the possibility of having access not just to view the wall back there, but to actually go through the block beyond the building. What were your thoughts on that?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I believe it's an ADA issue because it would require use of the stairs to sort've connect through so that was the issue that came up when we were talking about 57 JFK.

STEVEN COHEN: Would ADA apply?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, sir. Are you familiar with the Zero Hour Street Theatre

at Arrow Street to Mount Auburn Street? So when that was being approved, one of the strong desires was to have a pedestrian connection through there, and the slope wasn't quite sufficient, so we had to go to the architectural access just to get a slight deviation in the slope. The grade change there is somewhere in the nature of 15?

PETER QUINN: It's at least ten feet.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Ten feet to get from ten -- we certainly can't speak for public easements into abutting properties.

What was stated and referred to by Ms. Bigolin is there is a need to lock this gate, bicycles are going to be back there. That's going to be the way some people who access the building by bicycle, will come in that backway, and unfortunately, if you saw some of the photos, it has become a bit of an

attractive nuisance. There's a lot of graffiti and there's a lot of activity that goes on there after hours that's best done out of public view, and we're looking to change that dynamic. But what Mr. Gorsky had said was, he was exploring the possibility of giving certain people, tour groups in particular, a key that would allow them to access and maybe during daylight hours there could be some type of access, and that he would work around doing that and continue to explore that.

I suspect that may become more prominent if the decisions around the Harvard Square Improvement Funds focus on the wall, I would think that might be a place that that type of access would be memorialized.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you go back one?

STEVEN COHEN: One way or another going through the block is another story.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: First of all, because from our end physically if you look --

STEVEN COHEN: It's a problem.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: But these stairs that are being described here, it's a very generous use of the word "stairway."

STEVEN COHEN: On the other side of that wall.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: There's no stair from that point down into the alley, though.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Well, there's stairs on the other side of that wall coming down from 57. From the alleyway next to 57, there's actually a stairway behind that cinderblock wall. It's already there.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, I know --

JAMES WILLIAMSON: It goes to nowhere.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Right. But it's behind the cinderblock wall.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Right. Well, why not open up that wall?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's not our building.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: That's why the collaboration with Raj would hopefully open up a possibility.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't know the answer. If it were opened, do you still have the ADA problem of the stairs are not compliant and you would have to put in something else?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: And that's an area that serves loading for the building that that we don't control or own. We have a need to -- we've got bicycle storage in front of that area, we've got a need to store dumpsters

and trash. It's a very tight site, and there are residential requirements that we're struggling to find locations for, so. And, frankly, it's not a viable option for us.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just I would like to weigh in on this. This comes from my background of one of my acquaintances here. A teenage kid went wild in Harvard Square 25 years ago before he shaped himself up, but he described at some point various byways in the square that were good for getting out of sight and doing things and doing drug deals and stuff like that.

This kind of a walkway would fit into his criteria. He's now a school psychologist in Maryland devoting his life to just the kids like himself.

So it seems to me, this is not an area that is secure, it's not a design line, it's

full of garage disposal and it's not pleasant. And even though a Bostonian is to find someone who would rather walk down an alley than walk down a street.

I think in this case if you compare the -- there are a couple spaces that are very tight. There's one through the -- past 44 Brattle Street that comes down, and that space is very highly finished and that's got a lot of amenities and there's also a second lot because of the way it lines up with Church Street. There's a little alleyway next to the Hill House Center which, again, is landscaped to death.

So, you know, yes, there's a very elegant trash shed along that walk. I've never seen anybody else walk it and I didn't. I just like to say it's an alley and I'm a Bostonian.

But I don't think this is a good candidate, and it's a shame because of the historic wall is a piece of history. So the proposal to get it preserved and that it's available when it's under control seems to me to be some kind of a compromise. It recognizes the problems.

Also, as long as I've got the mike here, Suzannah recommended looking again at the fifth floor setback, and I'm curious to know what comments Peter might have about that, and I don't know what Suzannah is thinking about. Is it another foot or is it four feet, or what scale of setback becomes significant in your mind?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I was probably thinking around five feet in total to move it back from that principal facade.

HUGH RUSSELL: What is the depth of

that recess in the middle?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I might add, I realize it does impact on the units layouts quite significantly.

PETER QUINN: We would probably lose a unit. As you can see, cutting five feet off that, it's a tough one.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's a microunit.

PETER QUINN: It would be very micro.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: While you change the stairway, you may gain some more ground.

PETER QUINN: It might go the other way, but...

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you want to continue with your other comments?

STEVEN COHEN: What about that one, Hugh, what do you think about the setback?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think they're both right. That is to say Suzannah is correct,

but I think I would prefer to see more of a setback there.

STEVEN COHEN: What else?

HUGH RUSSELL: I can see from the designer that given the -- you would have to redesign the top floor and change the unit. You might lose -- you probably would end up combining that space with an adjacent unit. You might lose a bedroom.

I haven't studied it and it's not really my job to study it.

If somebody said you had to do it, they would find the best solution to it, but it would involve compromises.

The other general comment is that I feel like we have to credit the work of our brother or sister board at the Historic Commission because they reviewed this project, and we don't know what happened -- what the

history of that was. So I think we have to be careful to think of it as something that's already been through design review.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Mr. Chair, to that point, I mean, it would take a minute -- because this was the subject of great focus and attention, and that balcony was created in response. I thought maybe Mr. Quinn could just walk through the iterations that have taken place in the fifth floor.

We had our third and final meeting with the Historical Commission which was devoted entirely to the fifth floor.

It was at our second meeting -- no, but our second meeting it became the question and the setback is not what it is now. So the changed material, the introduction of the cornice line, and a number of devices and focus about the fifth floor might be of some

value to the Board, if we just shared it with you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have no objection to that, but I know I have a couple other questions that might factor into what you want to tell us about the Historical Commission, but do you have any further comments, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: The only other comment I would make is that I think we could condition providing street trees if there are no utilities by the sidewalk that prevent that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Have there ever been trees on Eliot Street?

LOUIS BACCI: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LOUIS BACCI: There were trees. I worked at Kennedy School across the way.

STEVEN COHEN: How wide is the sidewalk there?

LOUIS BACCI: It's quite wide.

PETER QUINN: It's generally quite wide. It's over 12 feet.

My understanding was that there was some urban redesign street edge redesign in the works on the other side.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I believe so, and I think there may be some utilities under there that may be an issue that we need to look into for the street trees.

HUGH RUSSELL: The survey shows no electric bank that runs down the middle of the sidewalk.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Tom.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Thank you. Most of the other Board members touched on my concerns as well.

I just want to get back to the issue of the setback, and was thinking about what was the wisdom of the ordinance in demanding a setback for housing here and just go back to the first principles, and it seemed to me that the condition at this site where you are retaining the bottom two levels as retail means that the housing is some dimension above the public way.

I would imagine that setback was anticipated as a way to deal with housing that might be too close to a sidewalk in a commercial area.

So I don't have an issue relative to that request on the setback. I think given that the housing is fully two stories above grade, it makes perfect sense for this Board to consider a waiver of those requirements.

So that leads me to what -- about

setbacks up in the air, and I'm with Hugh. I want to respective, very thorough discussion and good work just done by a careful Board, but then I come back to the bay windows that I started to ask the architect about previously, and I think this relates to an issue of setback.

I'm taking a perspective that's slightly different than yours, and I imagine that's fine. You are the proponent. There's ways in which you can imagine views out of that building that are important. I actually don't have an issue with that. I think that's one of the better, nicer features as outside of the building, those the wonderful bays.

I'm just sad that the three-quarter view -- and I'm looking at this resident here which shows the three-quarter view down Eliot Street -- there you go -- which obscures the

bays on that side, and I think that that elevation that's not setback at the risk of tampering with a lengthy discussion at the Historical Commission might be improved with the added element of one of those bays moving forward.

As far as the top floor setback, just sketching here, I'm with Hugh, you are right both ways, both to set it back and to move it forward. The proportion of the building I think is better with the -- with it as proposed as shown to us tonight. So it's just a minor adjustment. What is the public interest of moving a baseboard and tampering with your good and well-considered design is simply adding delight to this particular corner here for a perspective of citizens in the future.

I'm sorry that the awnings have to

stay. I understand it's probably the condition of the lease. I would like some consideration of that, okay, what happens when the lease expires? Just a commitment that those would be made more consistent with the quality of the architecture and design here.

And access to the public wall. I agree entirely. It seems hostile to imagine a public way back there, public free access. It's not a fenceable space by any definition. That notwithstanding, should we encourage the restoration of that wall, and I think we should because it's probably going to exist long after this building has gone through its useful life. It seems to make sense to make an investment there, and I think periodic access by local historical -- interested historical citizens would be good, and I think -- from time to time, and I think that's what

the proponent is suggesting.

The parking, I think, is also a nonissue relative to -- there shouldn't be a property more adjacent to parking than this.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve?

STEVEN COHEN: I think I'm not wanting to repeat anything that has been said. So the only two comments I would make, if I understood Tom's point correctly, I agree that on this elevation here. Peter, you focused on the views from the units. I think my focus is the views of the building from the public, and from this side perspective, and I think getting some bays or just some more visual interest on that portion of the side elevation, which is visible from the public way would be beneficial.

PETER QUINN: May I speak to that point, Mr. Chair? It has been brought up

twice.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure. Take them one at a time.

PETER QUINN: There's something that this very same subject came up at the Historical Commission, and what I explained at that time was someday this building's going to be restored. And what I tried to do here was actually create a little bit of a blank wall behind that building when you see it, that this kind of angle would stand out. I mean, who knows? It probably had very nice cornices at one time in front, it was bracketed, you know, there's quite a bit of window detail.

So I was just simply trying not crowd it for the potential restoration with the bays going forward.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have to say the blank wall was what irked me the most about

the design especially when you're coming around the curb and walking down or driving down Eliot Street.

I mean, I generally like the design very much, and I like the bays, but suddenly, you know, the thing you are first seeing as you come around the corner is really a blank wall.

Since I'm talking, I may as well have my other comments. I agree with the Historical Commission that perking up Harvard Square was not a great idea the way to bring modernity into it, but what I do miss are the clapboard buildings, which we have lost a lot of, and I'm not wild about this material, and I was wondering whether there had been discussion at the Historical Commission about other materials and why this ultimately was chosen and also why that color palate. I'm

really sort've tired of grays and neutrals everywhere.

And then the other thing is maybe talk, if there was any discussion. I understand your idea of mixing up the penetration, but the windows on the right on the third floor really get my CDD going, you know, it's just two great big slabs of gray right in the middle of everything else where everywhere else it seems to have a nice rhythm.

You know, I agree the parking is not an issue, and I think the setback in residential is not an issue. I understand the issue of the setback on the fifth floor. I hear everybody's comments and don't have a strong point one way or the other on that.

Lou?

LOUIS BACCI: I guess I have to

kind've agree with Ted about the cement material and the color. When I look at it, I see a remodeled factory building. I see a big grid. It doesn't look very residential for one thing. And the entrance is a little cold also. I know you are stuck with what you have to work with. It would be nice to be able to get some warmth into this a little bit. It's pretty cold.

PETER QUINN: With the wood.

LOUIS BACCI: Yeah, the wood's very light. I guess I'm stuck with brick.

But overall the design is good, but it's just kind've cold. That's how I see it.

STEVEN COHEN: Just finishing my thoughts on that blank side, when you see a blank side like that, Peter, at least when I see it --

PETER QUINN: You're talking about

this space right here?

STEVEN COHEN: Exactly. And the minimalist window up front there, so even where there's windows, there's not much, and, you know, it sort've suggests what you sometimes see where there's just a cube of block and then people do a nice, you know, two-dimensional design on the front, and the rest of it is bare. You certainly don't want to be conveying that impression.

But that's the sort of impression that I get. I understand what you're saying about the possible and event and speculative ultimate redevelopment of the adjacent building, but in the here and now, I would like to see something more. You really have this nice bay design going, and unlike some of the comments we've heard, I kinda like -- I wouldn't call it pumpkin -- I don't know what

you're calling it, but the pumpkin bays are appealing, and I think it really would enhance that side.

PETER QUINN: We call them ears.

STEVEN COHEN: Oh, they're pumpkin ears. I like that.

We mentioned the trees. You know, you may have limitations on the trees. It may not be possible, but I would suggest that to the extent it's possible and practicable that you provide for some trees there, and if it's not practicable, you don't do it.

LOUIS BACCI: It would certainly warm it up.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Is there an opportunity to bring that bay forward?

PETER QUINN: The whole set of bay could be brought forward.

STEVEN COHEN: I think that would do a

great deal for your building.

HUGH RUSSELL: But there's a column that is sort've unfortunate when you start moving those.

PETER QUINN: Yeah. I mean, I would have to look at the plan and make sure it worked.

STEVEN COHEN: It doesn't have to be precisely that, but, you know, some sort've composition incorporating the ears.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So --

HUGH RUSSELL: That fixes the whole side.

PETER QUINN: If you look at this side, do you see how they're brought forward?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I spotted that on the third floor where that could --

PETER QUINN: I think you're right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So what would we

like to do now?

HUGH RUSSELL: Talk about exploring the setback drama on the fifth floor.

PETER QUINN: I don't know if I want to recall those memories, but basically, you know, we came in a lot of different designs, most of which were much more formal, and I think that was when we started to introduce lightness with the eaves and with the somewhat arbitrariness with the windows that the building started to open up.

But we have never properly addressed its relationship with the garage. And seeing the garage -- primarily it's a 60-foot building was too much of a one dimension. In fact, it's a building that's about 50 feet high which then steps back, and we were encouraged many times by the Historic Commission to look at some way to address that

cornice line I was just gliding over here, and to also make the building less. If you could have seen it earlier, the perspectives, to make the building less. I think the expression was bossed out that the Historic Commission used.

We also had a much more ambitious cornice up here at one point which we cut back, and then gave it this curve that follows the street, which is a little subtle for these perspectives, but it's there.

So it was just an evolution of changes of color, material, cornice, projecting forward with this balcony to create -- actually, this is a main part of our open space requirement for the building, and wrapping that one foot step-back around the side till it meets the bay.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: The cap was

bigger.

PETER QUINN: It's about a foot wider.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Was there any discussion with the Historical Commission about a different material, different color schemes?

PETER QUINN: We certainly heard from members of the public who strongly wanted a different color. There were many that wanted brick. But we were never discouraged by the Historic Commission and using this material, and indeed, with Community Development as well as long as it was done right, and we understand that, of course. The geometries of this and how it's detailed and has to be done very, very carefully to make it work.

All these pieces fitting together give a sense of scale and detail to the building. It's important.

We will be doing a mock-up. But some of our other designs had much darker gray which made the building a little overly modernistic and serious. So I think pulling back a little bit with a lighter gray was the right way to go.

It's a touch one to revisit because there's just been an awful lot of discussion around that topic and compromise.

This building seems to have to address a lot of different issues, you know, with the street, with its neighbors, in a little valley of brick and then it becomes clapboard. So it's appropriate material and we struggled with it, of course.

STEVEN COHEN: Peter, does the balcony handle the public way?

PETER QUINN: No, it does not. It only looks like it does, but if you see the

site plan, you see how you have -- the building is tangential to the site's property lines. So our balcony just hangs right out to it.

STEVEN COHEN: I was just going to ask, what are the open issues? It's really just a setback on the fifth floor, if anything. I mean, I think most of us agree it would be nice to have a great setback. How strongly we feel about it, and whether you would like to defer to prior process --

HUGH RUSSELL: I just looked at the medium gray, that's the material, and looking at the renderings, I can tell it's very challenging, and when you project them, they look one color, and then they look another color. Just very simply, this is -- that material looks much warmer than that of the rendering and the actual material is somewhere

in the middle.

It's considerably warmer than that rendering is and I think that's important. You know, there's a blueish tinge to that rendering that isn't found on the material itself. When it's in the sunlight, it's going to get warmer. And I think those are -- those kinds of things are very helpful.

PETER QUINN: If you look at these --

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think this is a case where the building will look better than the renderings.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Part of my concern with the gray, and maybe it's mixing apples and oranges, but the Novartis Building on Mass Ave, the screen that's going up, or it's mostly up is so gray and so fortress-like now that, you know -- it's my recollection of the renderings was it was sort've of a honey-ish

color.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's granite stone. That's a stone.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, it's --

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: That was a quarry purchase for that stone. It took every bit -- that's been meticulously added by the artist known as Mya Lin.

H. THEODORE COHEN: My recollection is that it was going to be a somewhat different color stone, and that what is there now, I mean, it's very interesting, but it's a very, I think, forbidding looking screen at the moment. And so, I'm concerned that this is either forbidding looking or cold looking.

And I hear what Hugh has to say, he certainly has much more knowledge about this than I.

HUGH RUSSELL: When you look at the rendering, and I mean, you electronic folks

and us paper folks see different things.

But to me, that depiction looks cold and gray, and this looks warmer, and I think the material is, in fact, warmer, and I think that's a crucial difference here that this -- look at this rendering in the picture, it's the -- exactly the same rendering. It's just -- it gets printed on paper and it turns out to be different. And this looks like -- this is kind of fun. There's a lightness to the material, and you look at that, it looks like somebody painted it battleship gray and painted the building.

PETER QUINN: Our intention, of course, to is create a warm gray. It's been a problem trying to render a gray.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Mr. Chair, one of the challenges the building faces is the Harvard Square Development Guidelines, as

noted by Mr. Roberts, the finding the Board needs to make in this application is whether this building conforms with them in which case, there's a presumption that the relief being requested, the Special Permit, should flow. And I think we understand that that this building more than most, in my experience, generates a lot of subjective evaluations based on a range of criteria for what amounts to about a 12,000-square foot addition, three floors on the backside of Harvard Square, but I would think that the Board if there's an opportunity to develop consensus and I'm bringing the bay forward and I'm going to design a year-around color, that type of stuff. But we could spend a lot of time here and we enjoyed the time here, but to be candid with you, they were applying the same design guidelines that you're now

struggling with, and they reached one conclusion, and one has to, at some point wonder, does the building conform to the guidelines and if so --

H. THEODORE COHEN: There's no question that's what we have to do, and that's just my personal aesthetic versus somebody else's aesthetic, and we have already gone through the Historical Commission, and we have several architects on the Board who seem content on liking it, so it's just a discussion that we're having.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: No, no. I appreciate that. I didn't mean to suggest otherwise, I just meant that from a permitting perspective, we're trying to just figure out what is next.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's all for parking and setback.

LOUIS BACCI: But dependent on the design review.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Absolutely.

LOUIS BACCI: So would you like to --

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, no, no. I'm not suggesting the focus is not in the right place. I think the question is: What constitutes conformity with design guidelines and what constitutes "Well, I would rather see this" or "I think if you looked that and looked at that..."

LOUIS BACCI: Do we have a chance to look at it before tonight? That's why we're having this discussion.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: I won't want my comments to suggest the discussion isn't appropriate.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We understand.

STEVEN COHEN: The color is, in fact,

pumpkin, and with the additional years or more prominent years, there will be even more visible pumpkin, and the pumpkin presents itself against the relatively neutral background. So, you know, I'm fine with it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Now, I don't know how much awnings cost, but I don't think they cost as much as buildings, and I think Tom's observation that those are really ugly awnings --

TOM SIENIEWICZ: That's what I was thinking.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So I would like to encourage you to replace the awnings on that cover exactly the same area, they can be precisely the same color, if you can't negotiate them, but they stick out a little more and have a little more shape to them.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: If I can speak

to that? That also came up, and it's a very valid point. So the owner inherited the tenants and inherited leases that is permitting the awnings. But now that the new design has come forward, we're hoping that the tenants will see the advantages of having awnings that are more compatible with this contemporary design.

So we said we would willingly attempt to engage the tenants at our cost in the design and construction of a more appropriate style awning and Mr. Gorsky's prepared to do that.

STEVEN COHEN: I imagine the tenants will be very cooperative as long as it doesn't cost them a nickel.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: You don't spend much time with pancake people.

HUGH RUSSELL: I see there's a

corporate entity issue.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I will say that I do like the shutters quite a bit and especially to the extent that they look like sort've like shoji screen. I know it's a Japanese restaurant.

The question is: Do we want to see anything else, or are we content with things as they are and prepared to take a vote on it?

STEVEN COHEN: Did we get to closure on the setback on the fifth floor? Is everybody okay leaving it the way it is, or is there any sense to go along with Suzannah's recommendation to pull it back a little bit?

HUGH RUSSELL: I would recommend leaving it the way it has been evolved in the design.

LOUIS BACCI: How about the screen for the mechanicals, can that be moved at all?

That will reduce the height. It doesn't show on your rendering, but...

PETER QUINN: Mr. Chairman, actually, the --

LOUIS BACCI: You know what I mean? That may --

PETER QUINN: The screening is in the 3D model here.

LOUIS BACCI: Right.

PETER QUINN: It's just that you can't see it there.

LOUIS BACCI: That may help you reduce the height a little bit maybe.

PETER QUINN: It is in the 3D model. You can see it there.

STEVEN COHEN: In the elevation you will see it, but probably not in the 3D.

LOUIS BACCI: Right, right. But I don't know, you know, if you have some

flexibility there, maybe that will knock the height back a little bit.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Moving the screen further back.

LOUIS BACCI: Yeah. See, it's right on the front elevation.

PETER QUINN: I don't think --

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's 18 feet from the face of the building.

STEVEN COHEN: It's already setback.

LOUIS BACCI: You can't see it.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's reading flat, but just in the same way that those ears look coplanar it's setback, so maybe on the fifth floor on the new Kennedy Building, you might see the screen, but that might be the only place you can see that screen.

LOUIS BACCI: So this is not a clear representation of the screen.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's one dimensional. You can see it peeking over the balcony.

LOUIS BACCI: Gotcha. I see it on the roof line.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It looks like it's flush with the face of the building.

LOUIS BACCI: Maybe not even flush, it's near the edge.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Relative to the setback, the front elevation we're looking at here, I would argue proportionately is much stronger with the plane brought forward. As you push that back, it's -- to the extent that's an important perspective, I'm not a -- I think we should -- I would encourage the solution to rest where it is.

I'm also feeling guilty because I told my wife that we'll get through this thing and

I'll be home by 10:00, so I'm also mindful of the hour here.

I would love to see trees going in. And we talked about whether there are real constraints in the civil engineering.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: But if the opportunity exists --

STEVEN COHEN: Exactly, we should ask for the --

LOUIS BACCI: Are you doing any work on the sidewalk?

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: I imagine at the end the day, we will. But a condition to the extent feasible, work with DPW to install trees.

LOUIS BACCI: That will soften it up also.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: We'll get soft trees.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, do we make a determination of where the funds go and what they're being used for?

JEFF ROBERTS: An excellent question. I did look at the zoning earlier that I have for this and other projects, and I'll just say that I know this is absent anything that's been sort've done in the past. I know sometimes there's been projects where this has been discussed and been commented on by the Planning Board. But the Zoning says the Planning Board has to issue a Special Permit making the determinations that we put forward in our memo, and that the other condition of the parking waiver is that -- is to make the contribution of Harvard Square Improvement Fund, it says that the -- it lists the uses that it can be used for which includes provision of public parking, preferably for

short-term users, improvements to public parks or restoration of historic structures, monuments and other features owned by the City of Cambridge, or other public agency, or a nonprofit organization, and extension throughout the Harvard Square Overlay District of the surface improvements as installed by the MBTA is part of the Red Line Subway extension, brick sidewalks, light posts, et cetera. You can probably tell when this was written.

And it goes on to say that the Harvard Square Advisory Committee will comment on any proposal for the expenditure and that the Community Development Department determines the value of the cash contribution.

So it seems clear that it's intended to be a payment that's made to the city rather than something that can be decided in lieu of

improvement on private property.

We would have to have further discussion. We would have to talk about Harvard Square Advisory Committee when I consult with the Historical Commission on, you know, how we could make that work, or how we might be able to make that work for something like this, which appears to be entirely on private property.

It's not owned by any or controlled by any public or nonprofit interest.

HUGH RUSSELL: But it's --

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Just by way of perspective --

HUGH RUSSELL: If an easement were given to the city, then it would become a city feature.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: But is it my understanding that the office building that's

completing construction now in front of the Charles Hotel, that there were -- there is verbiage around the contribution there being used towards the restoration of the Conductors Building, a privately owned building about a hundred yards from this site.

So I think the application of this is a little more varied than has been suggested. I think that building -- I don't know the current status of it, but it's my understanding that that building received the same Special Permit, there's no parking there, and my understanding is that the restoration funds -- that was seen as having public benefit, but I think it remains to be seen. I mean, if you look at the criteria, Mr. Roberts, the priorities reflect different thinking around parking and public parking and all that.

But I think in that case it seemed to be the view of the Planning Board, the view of the Advisory Committee, but I think it is the administration's ultimate determination. They may be benefitted by perspectives of the Historical Commission.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we could express in our decision our desire to have the wall be preserved and stabilized and restored. That's a value we have, period. And without making a condition, without making suggestions, but then when the public process decide how to allocate the funds, they may listen to that statement particularly from the Historical Commission.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I think that's in the spirit of what Mr. Sullivan was asking.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: It was analogized that the Historical Commission

means the way the CPA funds have come into being, they didn't exist at this time, and they have been used. It's a balancing of public interests and it's open space or preservation of historic resources. And we certainly understood, and I would assume that to the extent that were to occur, then the commitments around access to the wall would have greater nexus to that.

HUGH RUSSELL: The other thing I would like to comment is that is the Business Association has either individually, as members, or the association in Harvard Square, they have an active voice in trying to get the public realm improved. So they're strong advocates for these kinds of projects.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. So where do we stand with regard to the ears?

STEVEN COHEN: We're suggesting that

the pumpkin ears be somehow --

H. THEODORE COHEN: So can we condition it on further design review with staff, or is that something we want to see, or...?

STEVEN COHEN: I think it's good.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I think it has to probably be a joint review with the staff and the Historic Commission as well as our staff because --

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Our certificate is required, that they would review any modifications.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The question is: Are we ready to vote on this now?

Jeff, I think you provided us with findings or the criteria. So we had the -- we have no problems with granting the Special Permit to waive the parking, and that we would

recommend that the funds -- the capital improvements made by the fund would be restoration and improvement and stabilization of the historic wall in the back, and access thereto at least on a limited basis for people who have interest in seeing the wall.

We can conclude that the exemption from parking and loading results from the building design that's more appropriate to its location and the fabric of neighborhood, and it's in conformance with the objectives and criteria contained in Harvard Square Development Guidelines which have been provided to us. I guess those are the citywide urban design objectives.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: There's a Harvard Square Development Guidelines.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do we have those?

JEFF ROBERTS: It's provided. It's in

summary form, I think.

What I have attached is the Citywide Urban Design Objective, the summary of that.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: That's a summary on Page 3 of the goals for the Harvard Square Development Guidelines.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm looking at the wrong --

HUGH RUSSELL: We concluded that the building is in conformance and the Historic Commission has been using those same rules.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. I was looking at the wrong attachment.

So the findings in the July 7, 2015 staff memo there are the summarized findings. Staff has reviewed them all, and we've reviewed them and conclude that they make funds that they do comply with the Harvard Square Design Guidelines and the

Citywide Urban Design Guidelines.

And we also are in agreement we're going to authorize the waiver of the setback of the residential building in a commercial zone because of the fact it's being built over an existing structure, and it has gone through the Planning Board, it's gone through the Historical Commission, which has approved the design, and then we also have the general criteria for Special Permit Section 10.43 which, I think, we already concluded it doesn't apply with all of those criteria.

So, do we have a motion to approve with conditions as appropriate?

HUGH RUSSELL: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And conditions would be that we will undergo continuing design through staff and the Historical Commission, particularly with regard to the

bays or ears especially as they relate to the west elevation, and that to the extent possible, they're looking at the possibility of putting in trees or other landscaping on Eliot Street, and that it would be our recommendation to the extent possible, that the funds required by the parking waiver can be used to restore and stabilize and upgrade the historic stonewall and make at least occasional access available to people who have interest in it.

Are those the conditions, Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Unanimous with show of hands.)

(Short recess taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: We're back and

we're here to, I guess, give final approval for the plans for 100 Binney Street in accordance to the Special Permit granted in 2010.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: That's exactly correct, Mr. Chairman. James Rafferty on behalf of the applicant, Alexandria Real Estate Equities. Joseph Maguire in the front row, Michelle Lower. You all remember David Manfredi, busy now finding a home for the Olympics. He was looking at that cycle track on Binney Street the other day, and he thought it would be a good venue for Olympic bicycling, but Joe hasn't finished building it yet.

This building was the first building and we actually got design approval on this building back when the Special Permit was approved, but it contained an interesting

phrase that said, "Final design approval of the building permit set will occur at the Planning Board," which is not -- you guys don't generally see the building permit set, but in this case, it's a lot of details.

We reviewed with Ms. Bigolin and the staff and Kent Nelson from Mr. Manfredi's office is here to kinda walk you through this. There's been a few modest changes to the building, but in many ways, it's very much a building that was approved at the time of the original PUD. And Mr. Nelson --

KENT KNIGHT: Mr. Knight.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Mr. Knight? I'm sorry. Ken Knight. Who's Kent Nelson?

LIZA PADEN: It's late.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: Oh, it's very late. Sorry.

KENT KNIGHT: Mr. Chairman and Members

the Board, good evening.

The aspect ratio on the projector is not what the drawing shows, so these are going to be squeezed a little bit proportionately.

HUGH RUSSELL: The printed materials are correct?

KENT KNIGHT: The printed materials are correct, that's right.

What we've done is to put together a side-by-side comparison of the 2010 drawings, the perspectives and elevations that were approved with the current design that reflects the building permits as submitted.

There were some comments from staff that we have addressed, and I will be brief and tell you what those were as I go through them -- the presentation.

So this was the view from 2010 at Second and Binney Street, and not the exact

same perspective. As the perspectives evolved, the angles changed a little bit, but we're showing a very similar design.

One of the issues that came up was the design of the mechanical penthouse, which is two levels high, it's about 40 feet just as it was back in 2010. It had a curvilinear shape, a sculptural shape that I believe the Board liked.

You can see in this 2010 rendering, it had horizontal emphasis, and that has changed to the same sculptural shape, the same curvilinear forms have been used, but we have gone to a vertical panel for ease of construction to allow those panels to move around the curves easier. We still have two strong horizontal reveals that you see running around the curved form, and it's the same combination of smooth panels, more striated

textured panels and vertical louvers to provide the mechanical requirements.

From the south side and also the west elevation, the comment the Planning Board here had was that that vertical glass element needed to be stronger.

What we have done is to recess it into the building by a few feet. The return on the side is actually glass now instead of masonry, and we've added -- it's a little hard to see here, but you can probably see it in the renderings that you have in books -- we've added a vertical orange metal panel stripe the full height of the building to emphasize that recess.

Another change that was back in 2010, we showed at the head of all of the windows. You see that white element, that was a projected metal trim on the window, which did

provide some shading. We have removed it for two reasons: One is that in doing the energy modeling, it really didn't provide a lot of benefit or very little benefit. We feel without it, the vertical orange metal trim that is projected reads stronger as the single projected element in the design, and by having a uniform pan ning detail where the window meets the masonry facade, it gives more strength to the design and keeps the reading of the masonry stronger.

You see we've kept all the other elements that we had back in 2010 in terms of the stone base of the building, the second floor glass that sets back a little bit, the blue metal panel piece at the end of the building, and, of course, the penthouse. So all those of elements remain to articulate that facade.

There was a question in the plan at the loading dock. This is the 2010 version. The building permit set actually showed a 50-foot truck that needed to be on the sidewalk to be accommodated in the loading dock.

We have reconfigured the dock so that 50-foot truck can be accommodated completely inside the loading dock area. So we have reverted to the 2010 design in that sense.

And then I'll show you, take you around the building with all the exterior elevations. Again, comparative views between 2010 and where we are today, very similar.

The south elevation and, you see -- it's very hard to read in this elevation, but those horizontal white projected metal trims at the head of the window were there, and then without them.

These are the actual construction documents that we put color on so they're a little less rendered than the original elevations.

HUGH RUSSELL: What's the nature of the masonry material, is it brick or over-scale brick?

KENT KNIGHT: It's a Roman brick. It's iron spot sort've medium brown color. There, of course, will be a mock-up panel made on site sometime in the fall, which will be available for viewing and review.

HUGH RUSSELL: This rendering doesn't show the texture that you get.

KENT KNIGHT: I think that's fair to say. Again, it's a little hard to read here, but one of the comments -- the garage overhead door and the loading dock overhead door -- there's three overhead doors; in 2010, we were

suggesting kind've a gridded pattern.

As the design evolved, and we have overhead coiling doors, it's really made -- it's a door made of a series of slats.

What we're proposing is to take the slats that align with the horizontal enforcing in masonry, make them a little darker to carry that articulation across the face of the facade at the pedestrian level.

This is a comparison of the east elevation. No changes here.

There was discussion on the west elevation. You will see the bay that's closest to Binney Street was fully glazed in 2010, through the design evolution and accommodating mechanical needs in the garage that they got infilled completely with louvers on the permit set.

We have since revisited that to bring

back two-thirds of the glazing, rework the louvers to push them further down that facade and maintain at least two bays of -- it will be Virginia Creeper that will grow on a gridded wire system to provide some greenery and be part of the landscape in that west passage that connects Binney Street to Linskey. So that's another --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Excuse me. Could you go back?

KENT KNIGHT: Sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: So we're talking about the first floor?

KENT KNIGHT: Right, right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So that's a garage door that's moved to one bay to the left?

KENT KNIGHT: These are all in the -- in the new design, these are all louvers and panels that access fans and such behind the

wall.

The glazing I'm referring to is in this two-thirds of the first bay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Was that -- the louvers were similarly located in the 2010, but --

KENT KNIGHT: They were. This first bay was fully glazed. If you look at the building permits, which we're not showing, it had louvers in this bay.

So what we have done is to bring back two-thirds of the glazing in that first bay. And we still have the plant material, it's just in different bays.

HUGH RUSSEL: And behind that is the bicycle storage?

KENT KNIGHT: That's on the other end of the building.

The ramp down to the parking garage

occurs there.

There's a plenum zone where we've located -- supplied exhaust for the parking and for the transformer vault. We have the meter racks, gas meters rack behind the access panels, so they won't be seen. The bike storage is on the other end.

HUGH RUSSELL: So can you see through the glass?

KENT KNIGHT: Yes. The glass would be right here, actually in the tenant space.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

KENT KNIGHT: Now, the permits that show this sort've large six-by-ten shaft, which is the supply area for the garage ventilation in this corner, and so, what we did is we actually pull that all back, pull the louvers associated with it back closer to the ramp, and open up this tenant space with

vision glass.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Have the windows changed in the glass part, or is that just differences in the renderings?

If you can go back one more?

KENT KNIGHT: I think that's just differences in rendering technique.

We still have the same curtain wall on Binney Street that's organized in the same pattern of alternating every two floors in an offset rhythm. There's vision glass and then adjacent to it are vertical narrower slits of translucent glass.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's the same thing it was in 2010?

KENT KNIGHT: Right. The rendering from Binney Street, you can see the glass that we added back in on that corner, and then the landscaping treatment that goes through on the

west passageway.

The height of building is the same. It's 140 feet to the top of the tenth level, the top of the last occupied floor. A change that we made was to reduce the parking from the six levels to the two and a half levels.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is that the parking for the Athenaeum building next-door?

KENT KNIGHT: Yes. And just the comparison on the landscape plan, basically the same approach to landscape, just some detail changes to work with the building's design as it evolved.

I think that covers where we are this evening.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a question. It hasn't changed from the old to the new, but is it not possible to cover all of the chimneys on the roof with the penthouse

screen?

JOE MAGUIRE: We have to get above the screen for some of the things. That's based upon wind studies that were done.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's what I thought.

HUGH RUSSELL: So will you be back for 41 Linskey Way at some point in time?

JOE MAGUIRE: My name is Joe Maguire from Alexandria Real Estate Equities.

Yes, we will be back to 41 Linskey. We plan on being back sometime this -- probably late, late fall or early winter this year. We want to wrap up all that construction at about the same time. So the answer is yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And is it just a rendering issue, a slightly different perspective in 2010 on the right-hand side,

you don't see the blue edge whereas you do see it in 2015?

KENT KNIGHT: This piece that is here?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

KENT KNIGHT: This is actually more accurate. That's further down the facade. I could go to the front so you are actually seeing this edge.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Change that edge.

Jeff, what do you need from us?

JEFF ROBERTS: I just need the Board to conclude the design review and let them proceed to get their building permit, that would be a motion.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you or Suzannah have any comments upon this?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I'd like to point out that the changes are generally kind've

detailed modifications with the curtain wall. There was some -- a change in terms of the relationship between the blue volume and the masonry, there was a glass panel in between, which is -- and that's on the south elevation and the west elevation.

KENT KNIGHT: Suzannah is referring to this slot of glass, and as the design evolved, the blue panel is adjacent to the masonry.

And then also on this elevation, it's the same sort of condition.

STEVEN COHEN: My preference would be to go back to the way it was.

KENT KNIGHT: Yeah, I think that it would be our purpose to --

JOE MAGUIRE: That was a good catch, Suzannah.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: That was Stewart that looked at that.

ATTY JAMES RAFFERTY: I never saw his lips move.

KENT KNIGHT: Sometimes as these get into the detailing of CDs, you lose some of the original intentions. That's a fair comment. We can revert to the 2010 design.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You can revert to that?

JOE MAGUIRE: Yes.

LOUIS BACCI: Back to the white trim, why exactly was that removed?

KENT KNIGHT: The two reasons I mentioned. When we ran the energy models with W. Season and Kent Engineer, it really did not have any benefit on the energy model for the building. It wasn't helping us.

And the other reason, I think, is that by having -- the two other reasons: The consistent metal panning trim, I think, makes

the window and masonry read stronger. And the third reason was that it allows that vertical orange projected metal trim to be a stronger element, to be the only projected element on the facade, not be compromised by a horizontal projected the element.

LOUIS BACCI: The reason for putting that white trim started off as an energy conservation move?

KENT KNIGHT: That was part of it.

JOE MAGUIRE: Well, one of the reasons why was we preferred not to have it on this, not to have places where ice can form and come off the building, and it was -- and so, to that extent not having it and also for durability away from the window system having that projection just introduced an area that possibly could be a moisture problem in the future. It just wasn't really doing anything

for us.

LOUIS BACCI: Except it added some detail to the design of that kind've flat facade.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I actually think it looks sleeker without it.

HUGH RUSSELL: I didn't say it was.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If there are no other comments, I want to make a motion that we approve the plans as presented to us with the proposed change of going back to 2010 with regard to the reveal next to the blue metallic feature.

Hugh, do you still have questions?

HUGH RUSSELL: I was chasing down the white caps on the various sides of the building in trying to form an opinion. They're only projected on the south side?

KENT KNIGHT: The south and the west.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it was projected on the other facade.

KENT KNIGHT: I believe that's correct. It's where we have the masonry expression.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm looking at the -- where the masonry wall comes up against the curtain wall, and I think I'm sort've of happier with the new expression and, if you will, the sleekness of the current design seems to be more in keeping with the sleekness of the glass curtain wall.

KENT KNIGHT: That would be this view on the east side and this view.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, Teddy remembers that there was a lot of discussion about this building in 2010, and a lot of working on it, and it has the different facade treatments that are unlike anything else that we have

seen in the way in which they've worked together, but the corners are very important. I think the other thing about them is the perspectives tend to go to places which are -- there are graphs less frequently populated. Like here, you're backed up way across the street, but where the perspectives are flatter when you are on the street, these things I think work more comfortably. So the real views are -- you can see the -- particularly that corner to the 2015 view, that's from the street, that one, I think, that is much more -- it's a place that you're more apt to see it from because you are on the other side of the street and the blue form isn't as strident, it's providing a scale and an interest to that corner, but it's not yet that form which is on the 2010 rendering.

It seems -- you know, I think I credit

your understanding about the actual places people are going to stand and how this building will be seen. Some of these things are -- work better. This is a long way of saying I'm remember going back five years and remembering this building, even with these small changes, all have been positive, and I'm way more comfortable with this design than I was five years ago.

I'm excited to see what it's going to look like when it gets built. I do know from seeing a number of buildings that Elkus and Manfredi have done is that the detailing of the building always surpasses the expectations what you get in the renderings. That's what they bring to the table when they're handling materials and the real scale.

And I'm excited to think I'm going to be able to see this in a couple years.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So we have a motion, is there a second?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Further discussion?

All those in favor?

(Unanimous show of hands.)

JEFF ROBERTS: Yeah. So just before we conclude, so you might be wondering why the 284 Broadway BZA came up, and that's actually because I pulled it, and the reason why I did it, if the Board could indulge me for a couple minutes, is because it's an example of an issue that we're actually studying fairly closely now in planning, and that's the issue of our commercial use classification system the way we define different land uses in our Zoning Ordinance, or Table of Uses, and the way that it matches or in many cases doesn't

match the types of businesses that people are currently trying to start in Cambridge.

This is something -- I don't know if anyone knows this or has any guess -- we have a classification of uses that that dates back to 1961. It hasn't really changed that much except for a couple of odd things that were added over that period of time, but in terms of the types of businesses we have now, particularly home-grown types of small businesses that don't fit into any clear use category, or doesn't match with the 1961 formulation of what types of businesses we were expecting to see, it can be a real problem and make it very difficult.

For example, it's for brewery companies that make artisanal foods and beverages on a small scale tend to have an issue. A lot of times that even if it's on a

very small scale, it can be classified as an industrial-type of use, which means that even if it's very small, it's only allowed in some of our limited-use types of districts, and often the only relief, as is the case here, is to seek a use variance which is something that's legally very difficult to grant.

Many of the businesses, at least the ones I talked to, don't bother applying for one.

Here we have a case where they're going for it. And so I thought it was worth bringing it up.

This particular proposal is basically for a microbrewery and tap room that is not anything that's specifically listed in the Zoning Ordinance, and the closest category would be bottling of beverages, which is industry use only allowed in the highest

density industrial districts. It's in a Business A District. It's in an existing building where the back part extends into Residence C1. It's common of many preexisting buildings.

I just wanted to note some of the things that area allowed in the Business A District. Bottling of beverages is not. But what is allowed are offices, labs and banks, restaurants and bars are allowed, so long as they do not provide dancing and entertainment, which is still a distinction in our ordinance. Retail bakeries are allowed, print shops, photo studios and art studios allowed. Auto sales and rental mortgages are allowed. Mortuaries are allowed. Sales of agricultural products, commercial greenhouse and gardens are allowed. And then several uses are allowed by Special Permit, including

manufacturing, assembly or packaging of consumer goods which can be a fairly broad category, but it has to be provided that at least 50 percent of what is produced is sold at retail and premises.

Display place for wholesale goods is also allowed by Special Permit. Fast order food is a Special Permit. Theaters and commercial recreation are Special Permit. Veterinaries and kennels are a Special Permit. Gas stations, auto repairs and car washes are Special Permit. And exhibition, lettering, sale appraise zones require a Special Permit.

That's basically the range of uses that are defined in the zoning ordinances applying in this district.

Like I said, this is something that we're working on in Planning. We have been working with a consultant to look at these

general issues to come up with a report that is going to highlight some of the issues and some thoughts about how we might make modifications.

I think the applicants, the folks from Lamplighter Brewery are here along with their attorney.

So since I brought it up, I thought if the Board had any questions, either from me on the zoning, or for them on the proposal, then we could do that.

STEVEN COHEN: No questions here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have no questions. I walked all around today. There's a restaurant right across the street. There are a number of other stores right down the block. It's currently an auto repair shop.

Is the auto repair shop on the corner

going to remain? That's not part of this proposal. For what it's worth, there was a gentleman who was here earlier today who said that he was a representative of a neighborhood and that he had sent a letter. I told him I hadn't seen it. He said that the letter indicated that the neighborhood was all in favor of this. And I told him we were not decision-makers and he should go to the ZBA and testify since I told him I didn't think we would get to it before 10:30 or 11:00 and he chose not to remain.

I think this is one we could either leave up to the ZBA to make a determination, or we could make a recommendation either supporting it or opposing it.

STEVEN COHEN: I'd be happy to make a recommendation to support it.

LOUIS BACCI: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any further discussion?

HUGH RUSSELL: The basis of the recommendation would be what Jeff pointed out that a portion of the use is clearly permitted in the district, and that the impacts and the parts that are not permitted are seemingly less than what is permitted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Having thought about it in 1961, it might have --

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think there were microbreweries.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any further discussion?

STEVEN COHEN: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor making such a recommendation?

Good luck to you.

(Whereupon, the Planning Board

Meeting was adjourned at 11:45 p.m.)

ERRATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript, note any change or correction and the reason therefor on this sheet. Sign and date this errata sheet.

PAGE	LINE	
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____
_____	_____	CHANGE: _____
		REASON: _____

I have read the foregoing transcript, and except for any corrections or changes noted above, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statement(s) made by me.

CERTIFICATION

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Norfolk, ss.

I, Jill Kourafas, a Notary Public
in and for the Commonwealth of
Massachusetts, do hereby certify:

That the hearing herein before set
forth is a true and accurate record of the
proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
set my hand this 20h day of July, 2015.

Jill Kourafas
Registered Professional Reporter
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 14903
Notary Public

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

<u>.</u>	<u>16-18</u> [7] - 2:11, 2:15, 2:15, 110:5, 110:12, 110:13, 111:2
<u>'20s</u> [1] - 80:3	<u>16th</u> [1] - 9:13
<u>'30s</u> [1] - 80:3	<u>17</u> [1] - 148:6
<u>0</u>	<u>18</u> [4] - 4:15, 139:18, 147:14, 204:8
<u>02139</u> [1] - 1:7	<u>191</u> [1] - 89:2
<u>1</u>	<u>1961</u> [3] - 242:6, 242:12, 248:10
<u>1</u> [1] - 38:15	<u>1970s</u> [1] - 67:19
<u>1,000</u> [1] - 96:3	<u>1998</u> [1] - 107:19
<u>1,500</u> [2] - 60:11, 61:13	<u>1o</u> [1] - 157:14
<u>10</u> [1] - 2:10	<u>2</u>
<u>10.43</u> [1] - 216:10	<u>20</u> [3] - 42:10, 97:19, 126:3
<u>100</u> [4] - 3:3, 5:1, 19:19, 218:2	<u>20.54.4</u> [2] - 2:12, 110:6
<u>1000</u> [2] - 102:3, 152:13	<u>20.54.5</u> [2] - 2:13, 110:8
<u>109</u> [1] - 2:16	<u>200</u> [1] - 75:1
<u>10:00</u> [1] - 206:1	<u>2010</u> [19] - 218:4, 220:10, 220:18, 221:7, 221:10, 222:16, 223:13, 224:2, 224:10, 224:14, 225:19, 226:15, 228:5, 230:15, 232:19, 235:6, 237:11, 238:17, 239:18
<u>10:30</u> [1] - 247:11	<u>2011</u> [1] - 54:19
<u>10th</u> [1] - 9:3	<u>2012</u> [1] - 54:19
<u>11</u> [3] - 15:8, 81:14, 126:18	<u>2014</u> [1] - 55:6
<u>11,935</u> [2] - 2:13, 110:9	<u>2015</u> [5] - 1:4, 215:14, 233:2, 239:11, 251:10
<u>116</u> [1] - 3:4	<u>20h</u> [1] - 251:10
<u>11:00</u> [1] - 247:11	<u>213</u> [2] - 75:14, 99:3
<u>11:45</u> [1] - 249:1	<u>21st</u> [4] - 5:11, 5:14, 5:15, 31:17
<u>12</u> [5] - 8:5, 66:4, 68:1, 139:18, 176:5	<u>22</u> [1] - 142:12
<u>12,000-square</u> [1] - 197:10	<u>23</u> [3] - 81:3, 81:7, 81:8
<u>13.10</u> [2] - 2:6, 10:6	<u>240</u> [1] - 3:7
<u>14</u> [1] - 1:4	<u>25</u> [1] - 169:8
<u>14-acre</u> [1] - 83:7	
<u>140</u> [1] - 231:3	
<u>14903</u> [1] - 251:13	
<u>14th</u> [1] - 4:5	
<u>15</u> [9] - 2:14, 15:3, 15:9, 15:15, 24:2, 28:7, 110:10, 126:3, 165:8	
<u>16</u> [2] - 147:14, 148:3	

<p><u>250</u> [1] - 75:1 <u>255</u> [1] - 106:3 <u>2551</u> [1] - 6:9 <u>26</u> [1] - 127:1 <u>269</u> [1] - 93:19 <u>284</u> [2] - 5:7, 241:10 <u>28th</u> [4] - 5:11, 5:13, 5:14, 6:9 <u>29th</u> [4] - 9:13, 89:3, 90:16, 100:11 <u>2nd</u> [1] - 9:13</p>	<p>31:17 <u>41</u> [2] - 232:8, 232:11 <u>44</u> [1] - 170:7 <u>45</u> [2] - 102:11, 105:11 <u>45-year</u> [1] - 152:15 <u>48-1/2</u> [1] - 140:5 <u>49</u> [1] - 127:12 <u>49.5</u> [1] - 140:6 <u>4s</u> [1] - 45:1 <u>4th</u> [2] - 7:5, 7:6</p>
<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>
<p><u>3</u> [1] - 215:5 <u>3,000</u> [2] - 60:12, 61:14 <u>30</u> [3] - 35:16, 126:15, 126:16 <u>30-story</u> [1] - 34:9 <u>300</u> [3] - 18:8, 25:9, 110:4 <u>325</u> [1] - 145:8 <u>33</u> [1] - 127:3 <u>34</u> [1] - 1:7 <u>3D</u> [4] - 140:16, 203:8, 203:14, 203:17 <u>3Ds</u> [1] - 150:6 <u>3s</u> [1] - 45:1</p>	<p><u>5.5</u> [1] - 45:10 <u>50</u> [4] - 27:7, 116:4, 189:16, 245:4 <u>50-foot</u> [2] - 224:4, 224:8 <u>500</u> [2] - 53:16, 91:8 <u>500-foot</u> [1] - 91:1 <u>500s</u> [1] - 35:12 <u>57</u> [6] - 5:15, 128:11, 163:3, 164:16, 167:15 <u>5:00</u> [1] - 68:17</p>
<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>
<p><u>4</u> [2] - 2:3, 103:5 <u>4,000</u> [1] - 113:14 <u>4.5</u> [1] - 45:4 <u>40</u> [4] - 27:4, 35:16, 42:12, 221:6 <u>40-story</u> [1] - 34:8 <u>40/60</u> [4] - 49:10, 61:19, 96:12, 96:15 <u>400</u> [4] - 25:10, 43:11, 53:17, 122:8 <u>400,000</u> [3] - 25:8, 31:15,</p>	<p><u>60</u> [4] - 27:7, 96:6, 127:9, 140:10 <u>60-foot</u> [1] - 189:14 <u>617.786.7783</u> [1] - 1:19 <u>64-1/2</u> [1] - 127:8 <u>64.6</u> [1] - 140:11 <u>650</u> [1] - 122:9 <u>675</u> [1] - 110:18 <u>689</u> [2] - 66:1, 66:2</p>
	<u>7</u>
	<p><u>7</u> [1] - 215:14 <u>70</u> [1] - 84:3 <u>75</u> [2] - 27:7, 96:8</p>

<u>7:00</u> [1] - 1:4	224:8
<u>8</u>	<u>accommodating</u> [1] - 226:16
<u>8-1/2</u> [1] - 147:16	<u>accomplish</u> [1] - 21:2
<u>815</u> [1] - 145:2	<u>accomplished</u> [1] - 54:5
<u>84</u> [1] - 74:12	<u>accordance</u> [1] - 218:3
<u>9</u>	<u>account</u> [2] - 16:8, 27:3
<u>9</u> [1] - 2:4	<u>accurate</u> [3] - 233:6, 250:13, 251:8
<u>9:00</u> [2] - 64:7, 68:17	<u>accurately</u> [4] - 69:8, 71:10, 72:6, 160:7
<u>A</u>	<u>achieve</u> [4] - 32:2, 32:3, 32:5, 71:13
<u>a-five-story</u> [1] - 139:3	<u>achieved</u> [2] - 102:19, 150:5
<u>a..</u> [1] - 149:7	<u>acquaintances</u> [1] - 169:7
<u>ability</u> [2] - 66:13, 134:9	<u>acquired</u> [1] - 113:8
<u>able</u> [8] - 26:3, 134:16, 139:8, 155:8, 155:19, 185:7, 209:7, 240:19	<u>acre</u> [4] - 34:14, 34:16, 34:19, 35:18
<u>absence</u> [1] - 118:3	<u>acreage</u> [1] - 16:8
<u>absent</u> [1] - 207:7	<u>acres</u> [8] - 13:11, 35:4, 51:18, 81:14, 85:16
<u>absolute</u> [3] - 13:6, 19:17, 21:11	<u>act</u> [4] - 10:16, 12:10, 12:16, 31:12
<u>absolutely</u> [4] - 18:19, 39:4, 100:18, 199:3	<u>Acting</u> [1] - 4:8
<u>abstracts</u> [1] - 70:10	<u>activate</u> [1] - 105:2
<u>abut</u> [1] - 111:15	<u>activation</u> [1] - 162:19
<u>abuts</u> [1] - 149:17	<u>active</u> [3] - 113:4, 118:8, 212:14
<u>abutters</u> [3] - 117:13, 132:15, 156:9	<u>activities</u> [1] - 57:2
<u>abutting</u> [1] - 165:12	<u>activity</u> [4] - 38:19, 39:1, 166:2
<u>accepted</u> [1] - 39:6	<u>actual</u> [4] - 55:19, 193:19, 225:1, 240:1
<u>access</u> [25] - 57:18, 122:2, 122:13, 132:13, 155:7, 156:1, 162:15, 163:1, 163:4, 163:5, 164:6, 164:8, 165:6, 165:17, 166:9, 166:10, 166:17, 180:7, 180:9, 180:17, 212:8, 214:4, 217:10, 227:19, 229:5	<u>ADA</u> [3] - 164:13, 164:17, 168:12
<u>accommodated</u> [2] - 224:5,	<u>add</u> [12] - 2:13, 37:10, 45:8, 54:10, 54:12, 59:11, 61:9, 110:8, 113:13, 160:3, 160:17, 172:2

add-on [1] - 61:9
added [8] - 124:18, 179:5,
 195:7, 222:10, 222:13,
 230:18, 237:2, 242:8
Addicted [1] - 108:1
addiction [1] - 197:11
adding [3] - 47:10, 131:6,
 179:16
addition [9] - 2:14, 66:14,
 72:10, 110:11, 128:14,
 130:11, 133:1, 138:18, 151:19
additional [4] - 28:1, 43:19,
 124:13, 200:1
address [5] - 64:19, 66:1,
 149:9, 189:19, 192:10
addressed [3] - 12:12, 189:12,
 220:15
adjacent [7] - 103:2, 103:3,
 173:8, 181:4, 186:14, 230:12,
 234:9
adjourned [1] - 249:1
adjusting [1] - 134:7
adjustment [2] - 134:13,
 179:13
adjustments [1] - 140:12
administration [4] - 20:12,
 24:16, 90:1, 90:7
administration's [1] - 211:4
admit [1] - 45:2
admittedly [1] - 114:6
Adoption [1] - 2:4
advantage [2] - 151:5, 158:18
advantages [1] - 201:6
adversarial [1] - 63:9
Advisory [5] - 121:3, 161:5,
 208:13, 209:4, 211:3
advocate [2] - 17:13, 39:9
advocates [1] - 212:16

aesthetic [2] - 198:7, 198:8
affect [1] - 87:2
affirmatively [1] - 123:12
afford [2] - 40:12, 52:12
affordability [1] - 32:9
Affordable [2] - 7:10, 16:2
affordable [10] - 7:11, 7:15,
 17:14, 20:19, 29:7, 39:7,
 48:18, 66:15, 72:1, 72:5
afternoon [1] - 38:18
agency [1] - 208:4
AGENDA [2] - 2:2, 3:1
ages [1] - 69:11
ago [10] - 4:12, 10:9, 24:2,
 87:7, 96:7, 105:12, 111:17,
 128:15, 169:9, 240:9
agree [16] - 35:3, 35:10,
 38:5, 38:13, 44:9, 48:10,
 49:4, 51:18, 52:7, 53:10,
 180:8, 181:9, 183:10, 184:12,
 185:1, 193:8
agreed [1] - 123:13
agreement [2] - 42:6, 216:2
agricultural [1] - 244:16
ahead [2] - 124:2, 136:9
air [4] - 32:16, 32:18, 109:4,
 178:1
alert [1] - 123:8
Alewife [4] - 6:12, 107:3,
 107:5, 109:2
Alexandria [6] - 5:4, 50:14,
 99:14, 99:18, 218:7, 232:10
align [1] - 226:6
aligned [1] - 140:15
alignment [1] - 122:4
alignments [1] - 140:8
alike [1] - 69:5
alley [11] - 126:9, 127:17,

141:15, 150:19, 151:2,
154:13, 163:9, 164:6, 167:12,
170:3, 170:18
alleyway [5] - 131:9, 154:14,
162:15, 167:15, 170:12
allocate [1] - 211:13
allow [9] - 26:8, 51:7, 70:1,
70:19, 71:3, 134:1, 135:1,
166:8, 221:15
allowed [14] - 63:4, 127:10,
243:3, 243:19, 244:7, 244:9,
244:10, 244:13, 244:14,
244:15, 244:16, 244:18,
244:19, 245:7
allowing [2] - 34:3, 72:5
allows [2] - 26:8, 236:2
almost [2] - 100:19, 107:14
alongside [1] - 66:8
alternating [1] - 230:10
amazing [1] - 19:15
ambience [1] - 70:18
ambitious [2] - 111:16, 190:7
amend [2] - 2:6, 10:6
amendment [1] - 6:16
amenities [4] - 72:18, 82:16,
122:12, 170:10
amount [3] - 16:6, 59:1, 83:3
amounts [1] - 197:10
ample [1] - 67:12
analogized [1] - 211:19
analysis [5] - 42:9, 42:19,
43:3, 43:9, 116:18
AND/OR [1] - 251:17
angle [1] - 182:11
angles [1] - 221:2
angularity [1] - 126:17
answer [6] - 122:18, 144:16,
158:10, 160:4, 168:11, 232:16

anticipated [1] - 177:11
ANY [2] - 251:16, 251:16
anytime [1] - 117:6
anyway [1] - 42:6
apartment [1] - 33:2
apartments [2] - 33:14, 113:16
Appeal [1] - 3:4
appealing [4] - 46:3, 61:12,
122:15, 187:2
appeals [1] - 71:15
appearances [1] - 114:16
apples [1] - 194:14
applicant [6] - 2:16, 110:14,
111:2, 123:4, 160:6, 218:7
applicants [1] - 246:5
application [6] - 115:11,
115:12, 147:10, 147:11,
197:2, 210:7
applications [1] - 123:18
apply [3] - 15:17, 164:17,
216:12
APPLY [1] - 251:16
applying [3] - 197:18, 243:9,
245:16
appraise [1] - 245:13
appreciate [2] - 82:2, 198:14
appreciated [1] - 106:6
approach [1] - 231:11
appropriate [9] - 45:12, 75:2,
90:13, 120:8, 192:14, 199:17,
201:11, 214:9, 216:14
approval [3] - 218:1, 218:17,
219:1
Approval [1] - 3:3
approve [6] - 9:10, 9:16,
142:12, 157:4, 216:13, 237:10
approved [8] - 91:2, 113:6,
138:18, 165:2, 216:8, 218:19,

219:11, 220:12
apt [1] - 239:13
arbitrariness [1] - 189:10
arbitrary [1] - 134:9
arch [8] - 125:7, 125:9,
 153:15, 153:16, 158:3, 158:6,
 158:12, 159:4
architect [3] - 111:5, 157:15,
 178:5
Architects [1] - 124:5
architects [1] - 198:10
architectural [7] - 85:7,
 91:3, 91:9, 91:14, 91:17,
 92:1, 165:6
architecture [1] - 180:6
Area [3] - 2:14, 103:5, 110:10
area [48] - 6:13, 16:12,
 16:16, 24:6, 29:16, 37:6,
 37:16, 44:12, 49:11, 50:7,
 50:13, 57:2, 60:3, 60:17,
 60:19, 66:14, 66:16, 67:3,
 67:7, 67:16, 68:12, 68:17,
 70:14, 70:17, 93:10, 95:8,
 103:11, 104:16, 108:19,
 112:6, 115:1, 125:14, 129:8,
 130:1, 132:9, 135:11, 141:7,
 143:4, 168:16, 168:19,
 169:18, 177:13, 200:15,
 224:9, 229:15, 236:17, 244:7
area's [1] - 70:3
areas [12] - 19:16, 45:1,
 50:4, 59:13, 61:1, 61:2,
 67:15, 72:11, 132:7, 132:14,
 162:10, 163:16
argue [1] - 205:12
arguments [1] - 14:13
arranged [1] - 163:7
arrive [1] - 149:19

arrived [1] - 116:16
Arrow [1] - 165:1
art [2] - 70:17, 244:14
articulate [2] - 57:6, 223:18
articulation [1] - 226:8
artisanal [1] - 242:17
artist [1] - 195:8
ascertain [1] - 42:19
aside [2] - 119:14, 120:6
aspect [1] - 220:2
aspects [1] - 163:12
ASS'T [4] - 54:11, 64:14,
 96:11, 96:14
assemble [1] - 46:2
assembled [1] - 123:15
assembly [1] - 245:1
assert [1] - 67:6
assessment [1] - 108:18
asset [1] - 69:12
Assistant [1] - 4:8
associated [3] - 74:18,
 162:12, 229:18
Association [1] - 212:12
association [1] - 212:13
assume [2] - 46:14, 212:6
assuming [2] - 22:17, 25:10
assumption [2] - 43:10, 43:18
assumptions [1] - 44:7
Athenaeum [1] - 231:8
atmosphere [1] - 70:13
attached [2] - 142:17, 215:2
attachment [1] - 215:13
attempt [2] - 12:19, 201:9
attempting [1] - 23:15
attention [1] - 174:7
attorney [2] - 110:18, 246:7
attract [3] - 70:2, 72:11,

119:7

attractive [3] - 67:7, 122:15,
166:1

ATTY [44] - 110:15, 123:7,
147:5, 147:9, 147:15, 148:1,
148:5, 148:9, 164:18, 165:10,
167:3, 167:6, 167:11, 167:18,
168:1, 168:5, 168:15, 174:4,
187:15, 190:19, 195:2, 195:5,
196:17, 198:13, 199:3, 199:5,
199:15, 200:19, 201:17,
204:8, 204:12, 205:1, 205:6,
206:6, 206:12, 206:18,
209:13, 209:18, 211:18,
213:11, 218:5, 219:14,
219:17, 235:1

Auburn [1] - 165:1

AUDIENCE [3] - 5:12, 148:18,
166:18

audience [1] - 6:7

August [4] - 7:5, 7:6, 9:3,
9:6

authentic [1] - 112:12

Authority [1] - 93:4

authorize [1] - 216:3

authorized [1] - 120:10

auto [6] - 3:6, 119:7, 244:14,
245:11, 246:17, 246:19

avail [1] - 41:4

availability [1] - 118:10

available [8] - 18:19, 28:2,
28:6, 60:2, 123:9, 171:5,
217:10, 225:12

Ave [7] - 6:10, 6:12, 66:1,
66:3, 66:5, 194:16

Avenue [3] - 74:13, 106:3,
110:19

aware [1] - 107:10

awful [1] - 192:8

awkwardness [1] - 120:6

awning [1] - 201:12

awnings [7] - 136:18, 179:19,
200:7, 200:10, 200:14, 201:4,
201:7

B

B-A-L-L [1] - 65:13

Bacci [2] - 1:10, 106:8

BACCI [26] - 35:10, 175:16,
175:18, 176:3, 184:19,
185:11, 187:13, 199:1, 199:4,
199:12, 202:18, 203:5, 203:9,
203:12, 203:18, 204:5,
204:11, 204:18, 205:4, 205:8,
206:10, 206:16, 235:10,
236:7, 237:2, 247:19

backed [1] - 239:6

backer [1] - 139:10

background [2] - 169:7, 200:5

backgrounds [1] - 69:11

backside [2] - 111:11, 197:11

backwards [1] - 105:2

backway [1] - 165:18

backyard [1] - 76:7

bad [6] - 34:8, 34:9, 37:14,
88:6, 92:2, 155:16

bailiwick [1] - 44:3

bakeries [1] - 244:13

balance [6] - 34:3, 49:10,
59:4, 59:7, 78:13, 162:8

balanced [1] - 94:7

balancing [8] - 12:10, 12:16,
12:19, 31:11, 33:17, 34:1,
121:19, 212:3

balcony [7] - 133:17, 133:18,
174:7, 190:14, 192:16, 193:3,

205:3

BALL [3] - 65:12, 66:1, 66:6
Ball [2] - 65:13, 66:7
ballpark [1] - 25:11
balls [1] - 109:3
bank [1] - 176:14
Banker [5] - 111:18, 126:4, 130:3, 137:14, 139:1
banks [1] - 244:9
bar [2] - 139:10, 143:10
bare [2] - 163:18, 186:9
barely [1] - 99:11
barrier [2] - 29:19
bars [1] - 244:10
base [4] - 15:15, 121:14, 135:13, 223:14
baseboard [1] - 179:14
based [5] - 40:18, 42:5, 43:2, 197:9, 232:3
basement [1] - 129:4
basic [2] - 62:11, 68:11
basis [3] - 72:8, 214:5, 248:3
Bastille [1] - 4:5
batted [1] - 62:9
batting [1] - 100:10
battleship [1] - 196:12
bay [12] - 178:4, 186:17, 187:16, 187:17, 190:18, 197:14, 226:13, 227:16, 228:3, 228:8, 228:10, 228:12
bays [19] - 136:6, 137:14, 138:3, 140:13, 141:16, 149:16, 150:8, 150:15, 178:15, 179:1, 179:5, 181:14, 182:16, 183:5, 187:1, 217:1, 227:3, 228:14
beautiful [2] - 22:15, 37:3
became [1] - 174:15

become [5] - 68:8, 69:3, 165:19, 166:13, 209:16
becomes [4] - 126:11, 145:7, 171:14, 192:13
becoming [2] - 40:3, 113:4
bedroom [4] - 145:4, 145:5, 145:6, 173:9
Beer [1] - 132:2
beer [1] - 117:7
begin [4] - 73:1, 84:4, 104:5, 121:14
behalf [2] - 111:1, 218:7
behind [12] - 54:2, 117:2, 117:7, 149:19, 151:11, 158:14, 167:16, 168:2, 182:10, 227:19, 228:15, 229:5
belief [1] - 119:5
beliefs [1] - 66:18
below [3] - 112:10, 125:8, 129:13
below-grade [1] - 112:10
Ben [1] - 124:14
bend [1] - 105:2
beneficial [1] - 181:17
benefit [5] - 31:6, 210:15, 223:4, 235:15
benefits [1] - 34:1
benefitted [1] - 211:5
Berkeley [2] - 81:3, 81:8
best [13] - 19:17, 21:11, 25:4, 26:12, 27:12, 29:7, 29:12, 48:4, 48:11, 58:8, 82:17, 166:3, 173:13
better [14] - 25:17, 44:17, 63:14, 76:13, 94:7, 105:18, 128:8, 162:1, 162:8, 163:10, 178:14, 179:11, 194:11, 240:4
between [8] - 71:6, 85:13,

122:8, 143:2, 158:2, 224:13,
234:3, 234:4

beverages [3] - 242:18,
243:18, 244:8

beyond [4] - 44:3, 48:5, 64:7,
164:10

bicycle [3] - 165:17, 168:18,
228:16

bicycles [1] - 165:15

bicycling [1] - 218:14

bid [2] - 90:12, 94:16

big [9] - 27:8, 56:6, 76:7,
95:6, 106:12, 106:14, 108:16,
184:8, 185:3

bigger [2] - 51:16, 191:1

biggest [1] - 29:1

Bigolin [4] - 1:15, 92:13,
165:14, 219:6

BIGOLIN [9] - 160:18, 164:12,
171:16, 172:2, 176:9, 214:16,
215:4, 233:18, 234:18

bike [5] - 131:11, 132:3,
132:4, 152:9, 229:6

Binney [13] - 3:3, 5:1, 83:9,
83:16, 85:11, 106:13, 218:2,
218:12, 220:19, 226:14,
227:7, 230:9, 230:17

biotech [1] - 38:7

bit [37] - 20:15, 21:6, 29:13,
61:5, 87:17, 102:8, 125:1,
131:10, 133:3, 134:1, 134:8,
136:7, 138:3, 139:14, 150:4,
151:8, 151:14, 158:17, 159:5,
159:12, 159:14, 161:15,
162:1, 162:15, 165:19, 182:9,
182:14, 185:8, 192:5, 195:7,
202:3, 202:14, 203:13, 204:2,
220:4, 221:2, 223:15

bitching [1] - 47:16

bits [1] - 82:8

black [1] - 135:13

blank [6] - 162:14, 182:9,
182:19, 183:7, 185:16, 185:17

blankly [1] - 107:7

block [10] - 30:15, 128:10,
128:18, 130:14, 131:2,
131:16, 164:10, 167:2, 186:7,
246:17

blocking [2] - 150:18, 151:1

blow [1] - 31:2

blue [6] - 223:16, 233:1,
234:3, 234:9, 237:12, 239:15

blueish [1] - 194:4

board [6] - 40:18, 98:1,
133:9, 135:5, 145:18, 173:17

Board [53] - 2:6, 2:9, 3:4,
4:14, 7:13, 8:3, 10:5, 11:4,
55:3, 55:9, 55:13, 57:8,
58:4, 74:16, 75:7, 89:15,
90:10, 94:3, 105:16, 110:4,
110:16, 111:9, 113:5, 115:3,
115:13, 115:18, 116:4,
116:15, 120:9, 120:10,
120:13, 124:4, 142:11,
160:11, 175:1, 176:18,
177:17, 178:3, 197:1, 197:13,
198:10, 207:11, 207:12,
211:2, 216:7, 219:3, 220:1,
221:8, 222:4, 233:12, 241:12,
246:9, 248:19

BOARD [2] - 1:1, 1:9

Board's [4] - 4:4, 8:18,
56:11, 122:17

Boards [1] - 23:18

bogged [1] - 88:14

bold [1] - 133:15

books [1] - 222:12
boost [3] - 72:12, 72:13, 73:4
bossed [1] - 190:5
Boston [3] - 86:8, 93:7, 112:6
Bostonian [2] - 170:2, 170:19
bother [1] - 243:9
bottling [2] - 243:18, 244:8
bottom [2] - 135:11, 177:7
boulevard [1] - 85:12
Boys [2] - 130:13, 138:19
bracketed [1] - 182:13
brands [1] - 133:11
Brattle [1] - 170:8
break [2] - 109:19, 136:11
Brewery [1] - 246:6
brewery [1] - 242:16
brick [11] - 126:10, 127:7,
 142:18, 143:3, 185:12,
 191:10, 192:13, 208:9, 225:6,
 225:7, 225:8
bricks [1] - 127:8
bridge [6] - 53:13, 71:6,
 86:7, 129:18, 143:1, 154:9
brief [3] - 76:3, 106:4,
 220:15
briefly [1] - 144:18
bring [12] - 70:14, 73:19,
 83:1, 106:14, 136:19, 151:13,
 159:13, 183:12, 187:16,
 226:19, 228:11, 240:16
bringing [3] - 6:19, 197:14,
 243:13
Bristol [1] - 5:4
Bristol-Meyers [1] - 5:4
Broad [5] - 30:8, 36:12,
 57:18, 88:8, 103:12
broad [1] - 245:2
broadest [1] - 27:19

Broadway [14] - 1:7, 3:5, 5:8,
 30:11, 30:16, 50:19, 51:1,
 53:14, 83:8, 84:1, 85:10,
 85:19, 86:11, 241:10
broken [1] - 133:17
bronze [1] - 144:7
Brookline [2] - 108:4, 142:17
brother [1] - 173:17
brought [11] - 60:10, 80:9,
 80:12, 80:16, 156:11, 156:12,
 181:19, 187:18, 188:15,
 205:13, 246:8
brown [1] - 225:9
Bruce [1] - 111:3
budget [1] - 89:8
build [13] - 18:7, 18:18,
 25:18, 32:19, 35:15, 38:9,
 43:12, 46:18, 77:18, 78:7,
 83:9, 119:18, 120:1
building [178] - 2:15, 4:17,
 5:5, 5:6, 5:16, 6:11, 8:16,
 18:7, 25:8, 26:1, 34:8,
 34:10, 43:13, 45:7, 45:8,
 50:14, 50:15, 53:11, 53:15,
 62:8, 67:8, 71:17, 78:7,
 78:10, 79:6, 79:9, 79:11,
 80:2, 83:16, 86:8, 86:13,
 91:1, 91:15, 91:17, 110:12,
 111:10, 111:12, 111:13,
 111:14, 111:17, 112:1,
 112:17, 113:8, 113:11,
 113:14, 113:19, 114:5, 114:8,
 115:5, 115:14, 116:2, 117:3,
 117:5, 118:2, 119:1, 119:2,
 119:19, 120:3, 120:18, 121:6,
 121:10, 121:11, 122:6,
 124:10, 124:12, 124:15,
 125:2, 125:3, 126:8, 126:11,
 126:18, 127:1, 127:2, 128:11,

128:19, 129:2, 129:15, 130:4,
 130:8, 130:10, 130:14,
 132:18, 134:6, 134:15, 136:5,
 136:8, 137:9, 138:12, 139:2,
 140:2, 140:11, 140:18,
 141:12, 142:1, 142:4, 142:12,
 142:15, 142:18, 148:7,
 148:10, 149:5, 151:18, 154:5,
 154:8, 157:18, 159:6, 159:12,
 161:19, 163:4, 164:10,
 165:17, 168:6, 168:16,
 178:12, 178:15, 179:10,
 180:14, 181:12, 182:10,
 185:3, 186:15, 188:1, 189:11,
 189:15, 189:16, 190:2, 190:4,
 190:16, 191:18, 192:3,
 192:10, 193:2, 194:11,
 196:13, 196:18, 197:3, 197:7,
 198:3, 204:9, 205:7, 209:19,
 210:5, 210:9, 210:11, 214:9,
 215:10, 216:4, 218:14,
 218:16, 218:18, 219:2, 219:4,
 219:10, 219:11, 220:13,
 222:8, 222:14, 223:14,
 223:17, 224:3, 224:12, 228:9,
 228:18, 231:2, 231:8, 233:14,
 235:16, 236:14, 237:17,
 238:17, 240:3, 240:6, 240:14,
 244:3

Building [10] - 126:4, 130:3,
 137:15, 139:1, 143:15, 154:6,
 154:15, 194:15, 204:15, 210:5

building's [2] - 182:7, 231:12

buildings [41] - 16:4, 16:10,
 16:14, 33:1, 34:9, 36:4,
 48:15, 50:11, 50:12, 50:13,
 50:16, 50:19, 51:1, 51:5,
 51:12, 52:1, 55:19, 67:2,
 69:8, 72:2, 79:3, 83:10,

85:6, 85:15, 85:18, 86:10,
 91:10, 104:19, 106:13, 128:3,
 128:5, 129:16, 129:19, 131:1,
 131:2, 131:5, 131:7, 183:14,
 200:8, 240:12, 244:5

built [7] - 36:7, 67:10, 68:1,
 77:9, 111:19, 216:5, 240:11

bunch [1] - 34:9

buried [1] - 79:2

burned [1] - 111:14

business [4] - 5:1, 72:17,
 119:16, 155:13

Business [6] - 2:3, 3:2, 6:15,
 212:11, 244:2, 244:7

businesses [8] - 69:17, 73:2,
 105:17, 242:1, 242:9, 242:11,
 242:13, 243:8

busy [2] - 159:13, 218:10

but.. [2] - 172:13, 203:2

byways [1] - 169:10

BZA [2] - 5:7, 241:10

BZA-007137-215-284 [1] - 3:5

C

C1 [1] - 244:4

C2 [2] - 97:16, 98:3

C2K2 [1] - 24:4

CAD [1] - 144:18

cafes [2] - 23:1, 73:18

calculation [1] - 62:8

California [1] - 112:5

CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:2

Cambridge [58] - 1:7, 8:14,
 14:19, 19:19, 21:13, 39:14,
 40:11, 49:14, 49:18, 49:19,
 50:9, 53:13, 59:5, 60:17,
 61:5, 63:15, 66:16, 67:15,
 68:5, 68:10, 68:18, 69:9,

70:7, 71:1, 71:8, 71:19,
74:1, 74:6, 76:4, 77:11,
77:13, 77:18, 79:6, 79:12,
81:19, 82:7, 82:12, 82:13,
82:17, 82:18, 84:11, 84:13,
84:16, 85:9, 93:4, 96:19,
102:3, 102:11, 103:6, 103:16,
104:5, 105:3, 108:2, 114:16,
152:14, 152:19, 208:4, 242:2

Cambridge's [1] - 71:9

camp [1] - 33:11

Canal [5] - 30:9, 36:12,
57:18, 88:8, 103:12

candid [1] - 197:18

candidate [2] - 120:8, 171:2

cannot [1] - 86:4

canopy [1] - 137:8

cap [1] - 190:19

capital [1] - 214:1

caps [1] - 237:16

captured [1] - 57:16

CAPTURING [1] - 1:18

car [1] - 245:11

cards [1] - 42:17

care [10] - 57:7, 57:9, 91:9,
102:10, 102:13, 102:19,
103:17, 104:5, 117:9, 152:19

cared [1] - 152:19

careful [3] - 12:16, 174:2,
178:3

carefully [1] - 191:16

carries [1] - 58:9

carry [1] - 226:7

case [16] - 5:7, 11:2, 21:3,
86:4, 106:19, 118:4, 123:17,
141:5, 170:5, 194:11, 197:4,
211:1, 219:5, 243:5, 243:11

Cases [1] - 3:4

cases [2] - 5:1, 241:19

cash [1] - 208:16

casting [1] - 83:12

catalyzed [1] - 61:8

catch [1] - 234:16

category [3] - 242:12, 243:17,
245:3

CATHERINE [5] - 76:17, 77:2,
77:5, 80:7

Catherine [1] - 76:17

CDD [7] - 11:10, 12:18, 17:5,
92:14, 106:15, 115:9, 184:7

CDs [1] - 235:4

cement [9] - 133:10, 135:12,
139:12, 141:13, 141:17,
142:9, 144:4, 146:13, 185:1

center [3] - 27:10, 28:16,
108:14

Center [6] - 2:8, 31:16,
43:19, 63:16, 81:17, 170:13

centered [1] - 67:1

centers [2] - 38:7, 40:5

central [1] - 17:19

Central [4] - 51:10, 85:13,
85:14, 98:3

Century [2] - 31:18

certain [7] - 16:5, 16:6,
20:8, 59:13, 114:5, 166:7

certainly [17] - 15:6, 38:10,
41:15, 43:3, 55:14, 62:10,
63:2, 63:7, 118:4, 122:10,
152:16, 165:11, 186:9,
187:13, 191:7, 195:16, 212:6

CertainTeed [1] - 146:7

certainTeed [1] - 146:8

certificate [1] - 213:12

CERTIFICATION [2] - 251:1,
251:15

certified [1] - 9:14
Certified [1] - 251:13
certify [1] - 251:6
CERTIFYING [1] - 251:17
cetera [2] - 67:4, 208:10
Chair [3] - 1:9, 65:3, 158:5
chair [5] - 4:9, 54:11, 174:4, 181:19, 196:17
chairman [4] - 110:16, 144:12, 218:6, 219:19
Chairman [2] - 124:3, 203:3
Challenge [1] - 34:6
challenges [2] - 113:3, 196:18
challenging [1] - 193:15
Chamber [1] - 6:5
chance [7] - 63:14, 64:10, 94:18, 98:1, 98:13, 136:11, 199:12
CHANGE [6] - 250:5, 250:6, 250:7, 250:8, 250:9, 250:10
change [21] - 6:15, 12:15, 24:1, 24:15, 27:6, 96:5, 99:14, 108:17, 133:19, 134:17, 165:7, 166:4, 172:10, 173:6, 222:16, 231:4, 233:9, 234:2, 237:11, 250:2
changed [6] - 174:17, 221:2, 221:11, 230:3, 231:17, 242:6
changes [10] - 6:17, 74:15, 137:2, 190:12, 219:9, 226:11, 231:12, 233:19, 240:7, 250:12
changing [1] - 69:18
charge [1] - 58:13
Charles [3] - 119:4, 138:14, 210:2
Charlie [3] - 154:3, 156:7, 156:19
Charlie's [4] - 117:8, 128:5,

130:5, 132:1
charm [1] - 114:5
charts [1] - 59:9
chasing [1] - 237:15
checked [1] - 119:3
Chicago [1] - 85:19
chicken [2] - 52:11, 53:1
chicken-and-egg [1] - 53:1
children [3] - 40:11, 77:10, 77:17
Children's [2] - 143:15, 143:16
chime [1] - 14:3
chimneys [1] - 231:19
chipping [1] - 99:12
choices [1] - 108:2
Chonga [1] - 34:5
chops [1] - 36:14
chose [1] - 247:12
chosen [2] - 95:4, 183:19
Church [2] - 142:16, 170:11
cinderblock [4] - 154:13, 154:18, 167:17, 168:2
cities [3] - 22:16, 22:17, 108:4
citizens [3] - 90:11, 179:17, 180:18
City [12] - 4:8, 4:13, 4:14, 9:4, 10:16, 21:12, 26:12, 40:11, 69:9, 82:12, 105:15, 208:3
city [28] - 13:8, 13:17, 15:15, 22:12, 23:19, 24:19, 26:4, 27:6, 35:1, 35:7, 39:8, 40:3, 43:4, 48:5, 49:14, 67:17, 69:13, 73:6, 81:11, 82:18, 84:14, 92:12, 104:16, 107:17, 208:18, 209:16

CITY [5] - 1:2, 54:11, 64:14,
96:11, 96:14

citywide [2] - 107:11, 214:15

Citywide [2] - 215:2, 216:1

civic [1] - 79:7

civil [1] - 206:5

cladding [3] - 133:1, 133:5,
133:6

Clancy [1] - 58:19

clapboard [5] - 143:19,
145:16, 146:7, 183:14, 192:13

clarity [1] - 18:2

class [3] - 14:17, 15:5

classic [2] - 21:3, 61:4

classification [2] - 241:16,
242:5

classified [1] - 243:1

clean [1] - 142:2

clear [8] - 10:14, 11:18,
21:16, 41:3, 71:14, 204:18,
208:17, 242:11

clearly [5] - 25:7, 33:18,
49:13, 95:16, 248:5

climate [1] - 108:17

close [9] - 6:12, 60:1, 71:6,
73:11, 117:9, 122:8, 131:1,
143:16, 177:12

close-up [1] - 143:16

closely [1] - 241:15

closer [1] - 229:18

closest [2] - 226:14, 243:17

closure [1] - 202:10

clout [2] - 89:6, 89:9

Club [2] - 130:7, 138:19

cluster [1] - 7:1

code [1] - 122:2

COHEN [139] - 4:3, 9:9, 9:15,
9:17, 9:18, 10:3, 17:10,

23:14, 37:18, 37:19, 38:2,
44:4, 44:6, 46:11, 47:14,
48:9, 64:1, 64:18, 65:6,
74:9, 75:10, 76:16, 80:5,
81:2, 84:7, 84:18, 87:4,
88:18, 92:4, 92:7, 92:16,
93:2, 93:14, 93:17, 97:7,
97:10, 98:18, 101:18, 101:19,
105:9, 109:8, 110:3, 123:2,
123:6, 124:7, 144:13, 145:12,
145:17, 146:19, 147:2, 148:3,
148:7, 148:12, 152:3, 152:10,
157:9, 158:9, 159:7, 159:16,
164:2, 164:4, 164:17, 167:1,
167:5, 167:9, 168:10, 172:14,
172:16, 173:3, 175:3, 175:14,
175:17, 176:1, 176:16, 181:5,
181:6, 182:2, 182:18, 185:15,
186:2, 187:5, 187:19, 188:8,
188:11, 188:19, 191:3,
192:16, 193:5, 194:13, 195:4,
195:9, 198:5, 198:18, 199:18,
199:19, 201:14, 202:2,
202:10, 203:16, 204:3,
204:10, 206:8, 207:1, 212:17,
212:19, 213:2, 213:6, 213:14,
214:18, 215:7, 215:12,
216:16, 217:14, 217:19,
227:9, 227:15, 228:4, 230:2,
230:14, 231:16, 232:5,
232:17, 233:4, 233:9, 233:16,
234:12, 235:7, 237:5, 237:8,
241:1, 241:4, 246:12, 246:13,
247:17, 248:1, 248:9, 248:13,
248:15, 248:16

Cohen [8] - 1:9, 1:10, 75:15,
75:18, 82:5, 94:5, 94:10,
106:7

coiling [1] - 226:3

cold [5] - 185:5, 185:9,
185:14, 195:15, 196:2

collaborate [1] - 117:15

collaboration [1] - 168:8

collaborative [2] - 63:1,
63:13

collaboratively [1] - 62:18

colleagues [1] - 14:2

collectively [1] - 57:9

collectors [1] - 128:1

college [1] - 78:18

color [24] - 133:13, 135:13,
144:5, 144:7, 144:8, 145:14,
146:13, 153:5, 153:17,
159:11, 183:19, 185:2,
190:13, 191:5, 191:9, 193:16,
193:17, 195:1, 195:11,
197:15, 199:19, 200:16,
225:2, 225:9

colors [2] - 69:7, 133:19

column [1] - 188:2

combination [2] - 67:13,
221:19

combined [1] - 18:4

combining [2] - 71:19, 173:8

comfortable [4] - 48:6, 52:16,
70:9, 240:8

comfortably [1] - 239:9

coming [20] - 6:7, 8:4, 9:7,
19:12, 20:1, 20:2, 20:3,
46:7, 48:16, 54:4, 78:9,
86:7, 93:8, 109:17, 138:2,
154:6, 154:15, 167:14, 183:1

commend [1] - 157:15

comment [15] - 11:14, 11:15,
49:5, 64:2, 100:14, 105:10,
152:4, 160:1, 173:15, 175:9,
208:13, 212:11, 222:4, 235:6

commentary [1] - 120:18

commented [1] - 207:10

comments [24] - 17:6, 48:12,
84:8, 92:8, 93:15, 97:11,
97:14, 106:7, 106:9, 148:13,
159:8, 164:1, 171:11, 172:15,
175:8, 181:8, 183:10, 184:16,
186:18, 199:16, 220:14,
225:17, 233:17, 237:9

commercial [15] - 14:4, 19:16,
37:5, 42:7, 59:19, 78:6,
96:4, 108:3, 108:14, 119:18,
177:13, 216:4, 241:16,
244:17, 245:9

Commission [28] - 114:17,
115:1, 117:1, 121:2, 121:16,
134:12, 153:11, 161:4,
173:18, 174:12, 175:7, 179:4,
182:6, 183:11, 183:17,
189:19, 190:6, 191:4, 191:11,
198:9, 209:5, 211:6, 211:15,
211:19, 213:9, 215:11, 216:8,
216:19

commitment [1] - 180:4

commitments [1] - 212:8

Committee [13] - 6:5, 10:10,
10:15, 11:8, 13:2, 16:19,
26:11, 73:13, 121:3, 161:5,
208:13, 209:4, 211:3

common [2] - 133:18, 244:4

Commonwealth [2] - 251:3,
251:6

communities [2] - 72:7, 74:5

COMMUNITY [1] - 1:13

community [20] - 56:14, 57:9,
67:14, 68:15, 70:15, 70:18,
71:8, 71:10, 77:9, 79:6,
79:10, 79:11, 82:10, 82:11,
84:5, 95:13, 95:15, 96:1,

99:8, 108:15
Community [4] - 2:3, 134:11,
 191:12, 208:15
commuters [1] - 66:13
compact [1] - 132:9
companies [1] - 242:17
companion [1] - 111:14
comparative [1] - 224:13
compare [2] - 140:4, 170:5
compared [1] - 73:5
comparison [3] - 220:10,
 226:10, 231:10
compatible [2] - 121:10, 201:7
complete [1] - 108:6
completed [1] - 8:10
completely [7] - 59:8, 63:3,
 68:19, 69:16, 101:8, 224:8,
 226:17
completing [1] - 210:1
compliant [1] - 168:13
comply [1] - 215:18
component [4] - 17:1, 40:14,
 41:17, 61:17
components [3] - 17:17, 33:7,
 70:1
composite [1] - 143:7
composites [1] - 143:13
composition [1] - 188:10
compromise [2] - 171:6, 192:9
compromised [1] - 236:5
compromises [1] - 173:14
concentrate [1] - 36:15
concept [5] - 30:4, 38:11,
 47:5, 53:12, 88:5
concern [2] - 89:3, 194:13
concerned [1] - 195:14
concerns [2] - 94:3, 176:18

conclude [4] - 214:7, 215:17,
 233:13, 241:9
concluded [2] - 215:9, 216:11
conclusion [2] - 121:16, 198:2
conclusions [1] - 27:18
concrete [3] - 128:10, 128:18,
 131:16
condition [10] - 114:6, 157:1,
 175:11, 177:6, 180:2, 206:13,
 207:14, 211:11, 213:3, 234:11
conditions [3] - 216:14,
 216:16, 217:12
condominiums [1] - 139:1
Conductors [1] - 210:4
confining [1] - 87:18
conflict [1] - 79:10
conform [1] - 198:3
conformance [2] - 214:11,
 215:10
conformity [1] - 199:8
conforms [2] - 160:14, 197:3
confusing [1] - 21:6
congress [1] - 46:17
Connect [4] - 30:3, 34:12,
 57:10, 88:4
connect [2] - 30:10, 164:14
connected [2] - 30:12, 156:4
connector [2] - 37:1
connecting [4] - 30:1, 36:19,
 103:9, 129:19
connection [2] - 30:13, 165:4
connections [2] - 30:7, 57:11
connector [2] - 31:1, 31:3
connects [1] - 227:7
consensus [1] - 197:14
consequences [1] - 35:6
conservation [1] - 236:9

consider [1] - 177:18
considerably [1] - 194:2
consideration [3] - 55:11,
 73:3, 180:3
considered [4] - 111:11,
 124:18, 156:3, 179:15
considering [2] - 73:14,
 113:10
consistent [4] - 57:13,
 119:11, 180:5, 235:19
constellation [1] - 61:10
constituency [2] - 156:9,
 156:14
constitutes [2] - 199:8, 199:9
constraints [2] - 88:1, 206:5
constructed [1] - 117:7
construction [8] - 19:2,
 114:3, 116:5, 201:11, 210:1,
 221:15, 225:1, 232:15
consult [2] - 115:8, 209:5
consultant [1] - 245:19
consumer [1] - 245:2
consumers [1] - 72:12
CONT'D [1] - 3:1
contained [2] - 214:12, 218:19
contemplate [1] - 119:2
contemporary [2] - 161:7,
 201:8
content [3] - 89:13, 198:11,
 202:8
context [5] - 88:2, 91:1,
 107:15, 108:9, 129:15
continuation [3] - 4:11, 10:4,
 10:8
continue [7] - 67:19, 68:14,
 114:2, 135:12, 136:15,
 166:11, 172:15
Continued [1] - 2:6

continued [2] - 5:17, 63:11
continues [1] - 160:14
continuing [2] - 36:11, 216:17
contribute [1] - 86:19
contribution [3] - 207:16,
 208:16, 210:3
CONTROL [1] - 251:17
control [2] - 168:17, 171:5
controlled [1] - 209:10
conversation [7] - 23:11,
 23:13, 23:16, 41:10, 92:11,
 108:11, 116:11
convert [1] - 3:5
convey [1] - 25:14
conveying [1] - 186:10
cooperate [1] - 24:19
cooperative [1] - 201:15
coplanar [1] - 204:14
CORDS [1] - 64:16
corner [15] - 128:12, 128:17,
 131:17, 131:19, 132:6, 138:6,
 138:14, 145:2, 179:17, 183:7,
 229:16, 230:18, 239:11,
 239:17, 246:19
corners [1] - 239:2
cornice [11] - 127:6, 127:11,
 127:13, 133:16, 138:4, 153:7,
 153:8, 174:18, 190:1, 190:8,
 190:13
cornices [1] - 182:12
corporate [1] - 202:1
correct [7] - 75:18, 100:19,
 172:19, 218:6, 220:6, 220:8,
 238:4
correction [1] - 250:2
corrections [1] - 250:12
correctly [2] - 82:5, 181:9
correspondence [1] - 116:8

cost [8] - 18:6, 18:11, 25:11, 116:5, 200:7, 201:10, 201:16
costs [3] - 25:19, 32:19, 33:2
Council [7] - 4:13, 4:14, 9:4, 9:5, 10:16, 26:12, 105:15
Councillors [1] - 94:4
councilor [1] - 22:12
count [1] - 99:19
counterpoint [1] - 141:12
counting [1] - 127:8
country [2] - 38:8, 40:6
couple [17] - 4:12, 4:19, 5:10, 35:12, 48:12, 54:12, 88:11, 101:1, 108:4, 125:18, 142:10, 145:4, 170:6, 175:4, 240:19, 241:12, 242:7
course [14] - 18:5, 23:10, 70:7, 88:16, 119:6, 129:7, 130:2, 130:17, 140:10, 191:14, 192:15, 196:15, 223:17, 225:10
courtyard [5] - 126:2, 128:3, 140:17, 150:12, 163:14
cover [5] - 35:9, 91:12, 160:6, 200:15, 231:18
coverage [1] - 107:9
covered [2] - 35:8, 145:10
covers [1] - 231:14
CPA [1] - 212:1
CRA [2] - 29:2, 80:12
cream [1] - 145:14
create [15] - 19:14, 30:17, 31:3, 34:13, 68:11, 77:16, 84:5, 139:14, 141:7, 143:4, 151:13, 162:8, 182:9, 190:14, 196:15
created [6] - 56:10, 72:2, 104:17, 105:16, 143:1, 174:7

creates [2] - 78:8, 138:10
creating [7] - 23:6, 56:5, 63:14, 70:4, 72:9, 78:2, 119:12
creation [3] - 55:19, 66:11, 72:16
creative [2] - 78:1, 161:8
credit [2] - 173:16, 239:19
Creeper [1] - 227:4
criteria [9] - 118:10, 160:11, 169:15, 197:9, 210:16, 213:17, 214:12, 216:10, 216:12
crossed [1] - 53:5
crowd [2] - 68:18, 182:15
crucial [3] - 89:16, 90:15, 196:5
crunching [1] - 85:8
cube [1] - 186:6
cubic [1] - 146:6
curb [2] - 133:16, 183:2
curious [1] - 171:10
current [7] - 67:16, 74:15, 112:19, 114:6, 210:10, 220:12, 238:10
cursor [2] - 132:1, 133:8
curtain [4] - 230:8, 234:1, 238:8, 238:12
curve [1] - 190:9
curved [2] - 153:16, 221:18
curves [1] - 221:16
curvilinear [2] - 221:7, 221:13
customers [1] - 114:2
cut [4] - 101:7, 136:3, 150:9, 190:8
cutoff [1] - 150:5
cutting [1] - 172:6

<u>cycle</u> [2] - 55:17, 218:11	<u>defer</u> [1] - 193:11
<u>D</u>	<u>deficiency</u> [2] - 29:15, 29:16
<u>Dana</u> [1] - 157:14	<u>define</u> [2] - 56:12, 241:17
<u>dancing</u> [1] - 244:11	<u>defined</u> [3] - 91:5, 150:10, 245:15
<u>dark</u> [1] - 135:13	<u>defining</u> [1] - 71:18
<u>darker</u> [2] - 192:2, 226:7	<u>definitely</u> [2] - 95:3, 106:11
<u>Dash</u> [1] - 1:16	<u>definition</u> [1] - 180:10
<u>date</u> [3] - 12:1, 120:15, 250:3	<u>deliberation</u> [3] - 2:10, 123:10, 123:17
<u>dates</u> [2] - 109:13, 242:5	<u>delight</u> [1] - 179:16
<u>David</u> [1] - 218:9	<u>demand</u> [2] - 39:16, 78:8
<u>daylight</u> [1] - 166:9	<u>demanding</u> [1] - 177:3
<u>DC</u> [1] - 20:12	<u>demographic</u> [1] - 80:2
<u>dead</u> [1] - 73:5	<u>density</u> [10] - 16:5, 84:6, 85:11, 133:9, 135:18, 146:5, 146:9, 146:12, 244:1
<u>deadpan</u> [1] - 134:5	<u>Department</u> [2] - 2:9, 208:15
<u>deal</u> [13] - 27:17, 29:7, 29:12, 36:9, 64:9, 90:2, 100:7, 100:8, 114:9, 121:8, 152:4, 177:11, 188:1	<u>dependent</u> [1] - 199:1
<u>dealing</u> [1] - 42:16	<u>depiction</u> [1] - 196:2
<u>deals</u> [2] - 29:9, 169:12	<u>depressing</u> [1] - 68:12
<u>death</u> [1] - 170:14	<u>depth</u> [1] - 171:19
<u>decades</u> [1] - 39:18	<u>described</u> [4] - 114:7, 160:7, 167:7, 169:10
<u>decays</u> [1] - 146:15	<u>descript</u> [1] - 111:10
<u>decent</u> [1] - 49:1	<u>deserted</u> [1] - 69:16
<u>decide</u> [3] - 27:5, 84:12, 211:12	<u>deserves</u> [1] - 37:3
<u>decided</u> [2] - 155:6, 208:19	<u>design</u> [55] - 19:18, 22:2, 22:14, 36:6, 56:9, 57:16, 115:3, 115:9, 116:18, 118:2, 121:17, 126:1, 160:13, 161:1, 161:8, 169:19, 174:3, 179:15, 180:6, 183:1, 183:4, 185:13, 186:8, 186:17, 197:15, 197:19, 199:2, 199:8, 201:5, 201:8, 201:11, 202:17, 213:3, 214:9, 214:15, 216:9, 216:18, 218:17, 219:1, 220:12, 221:3,
<u>decides</u> [1] - 27:6	
<u>deciding</u> [1] - 68:4	
<u>decision</u> [3] - 149:15, 211:8, 247:9	
<u>decision-makers</u> [1] - 247:9	
<u>decisions</u> [3] - 98:11, 116:9, 166:14	
<u>deck</u> [1] - 42:17	
<u>decline</u> [1] - 117:12	
<u>decrease</u> [1] - 12:14	

221:5, 223:7, 223:10, 224:10,
226:2, 226:15, 227:18,
231:13, 233:13, 234:8, 235:6,
237:3, 238:10, 240:8
Design [4] - 3:3, 215:3,
215:19, 216:1
designates [1] - 114:19
designed [1] - 124:12
designer [1] - 173:5
designs [3] - 78:1, 189:6,
192:2
desirable [2] - 23:4, 46:5
desire [3] - 41:1, 109:15,
211:8
desired [2] - 41:17, 44:18
desires [3] - 40:16, 46:4,
165:3
desperate [1] - 14:16
despite [2] - 66:18, 160:9
detail [9] - 26:16, 56:19,
58:17, 139:7, 182:14, 191:18,
223:8, 231:12, 237:3
detailed [2] - 191:15, 234:1
detailing [3] - 141:8, 235:4,
240:13
details [4] - 22:9, 87:13,
88:15, 219:5
determination [4] - 15:2,
207:2, 211:4, 247:14
determinations [1] - 207:13
determined [1] - 12:1
determines [1] - 208:15
devaluing [1] - 83:11
develop [3] - 19:17, 21:12,
197:13
developed [4] - 24:8, 35:17,
50:7, 107:12
developer [9] - 13:12, 17:19,

19:4, 20:4, 25:12, 25:15,
26:3, 90:3, 95:1
developer's [1] - 95:4
developers [6] - 26:6, 90:8,
94:16, 99:12, 100:5, 100:19
developing [2] - 19:5, 95:8
DEVELOPMENT [1] - 1:13
development [27] - 19:15,
21:17, 25:19, 28:5, 28:9,
28:19, 29:2, 31:4, 31:5,
43:11, 48:4, 51:14, 59:7,
60:15, 60:18, 61:2, 61:8,
61:11, 62:2, 66:10, 66:19,
69:1, 70:2, 108:3, 152:17,
160:14, 161:7
Development [9] - 2:3, 2:7,
134:11, 191:12, 196:19,
208:15, 214:13, 214:17, 215:6
DEVEREUX [2] - 106:2, 106:3
Devereux [1] - 106:2
deviation [1] - 165:7
devices [1] - 174:18
devise [1] - 68:15
devoted [2] - 68:17, 174:13
devoting [1] - 169:16
Dhanda [1] - 154:6
Dhanda's [1] - 154:15
dialogue [1] - 143:2
differ [1] - 95:11
difference [3] - 82:9, 158:2,
196:5
differences [2] - 230:4, 230:7
different [31] - 17:16, 21:18,
24:3, 59:3, 73:14, 78:1,
90:1, 91:13, 103:10, 114:13,
114:15, 124:16, 125:6,
135:16, 142:11, 145:17,
178:9, 189:6, 191:5, 191:9,

192:11, 195:10, 196:1, 196:9,
210:17, 228:14, 232:18,
238:18, 241:17

difficult [7] - 12:10, 43:5,
48:17, 52:9, 90:9, 242:15,
243:7

dimension [2] - 177:8, 189:15

dimensional [4] - 88:15,
115:15, 186:8, 205:2

dimensions [2] - 67:2, 71:17

DIRECT [1] - 251:17

direction [3] - 41:12, 94:10,
138:1

DIRECTION [1] - 251:17

directions [1] - 21:15

directly [1] - 44:13

disagree [1] - 21:15

disappeared [1] - 14:18

disappearing [1] - 14:18

discouraged [1] - 191:10

discuss [7] - 11:12, 14:2,
17:4, 29:12, 110:1, 132:18,
139:6

discussed [7] - 12:9, 15:19,
40:19, 81:18, 132:14, 163:3,
207:10

discussion [39] - 5:8, 7:9,
7:11, 7:14, 8:7, 8:9, 9:1,
11:3, 11:13, 16:12, 27:13,
54:13, 56:14, 80:11, 91:16,
101:13, 106:6, 109:5, 120:14,
121:1, 134:11, 159:9, 160:1,
162:5, 178:2, 179:3, 183:17,
184:4, 191:4, 192:8, 198:12,
199:14, 199:16, 209:3,
226:12, 238:16, 241:5, 248:2,
248:14

discussions [3] - 14:12, 47:8,

66:19

dismayed [1] - 101:6

dismiss [1] - 87:1

display [2] - 30:3, 245:6

disposal [1] - 170:1

disposition [1] - 149:16

disrupting [1] - 113:18

distance [2] - 149:2, 149:5

distinct [2] - 15:10, 67:17

distinction [1] - 244:12

District [12] - 2:7, 2:8,
4:18, 6:11, 60:16, 114:18,
115:19, 119:12, 120:11,
208:6, 244:2, 244:8

district [9] - 7:3, 28:3,
38:16, 61:12, 119:16, 127:10,
161:6, 245:16, 248:6

districts [2] - 243:4, 244:1

dive [1] - 56:19

diverse [1] - 71:9

diversity [1] - 161:10

divided [1] - 148:2

dock [5] - 224:2, 224:6,
224:7, 224:9, 225:18

document [3] - 107:18, 108:6,
108:7

documents [1] - 225:2

Doe [1] - 65:8

DOES [1] - 251:16

dollar [3] - 19:3, 41:8, 43:12

dollars [3] - 18:9, 33:3,
46:18

done [21] - 23:18, 24:4,
27:16, 37:9, 42:13, 45:17,
83:5, 93:16, 107:15, 108:18,
137:3, 166:3, 178:3, 191:13,
191:15, 207:8, 220:9, 222:7,
228:11, 232:4, 240:13

door [10] - 64:15, 118:7,
118:13, 127:4, 158:4, 225:18,
226:4, 227:16, 231:8

doors [3] - 126:5, 225:19,
226:3

DOT [3] - 24:9, 62:15, 63:17

double [1] - 158:3

down [35] - 26:16, 76:4,
86:11, 88:14, 96:8, 96:9,
111:14, 126:17, 127:17,
129:13, 131:4, 132:1, 135:11,
141:19, 150:19, 151:1,
151:12, 154:15, 154:17,
159:13, 164:6, 167:12,
167:15, 170:3, 170:4, 170:8,
176:14, 178:18, 183:2, 183:3,
227:2, 228:19, 233:6, 237:15,
246:16

downstairs [1] - 112:9

DPW [1] - 206:14

draft [4] - 13:12, 74:15,
74:16, 74:17

drafted [1] - 15:14

draining [1] - 71:7

drama [1] - 189:3

dramatic [1] - 24:17

dramatically [1] - 21:14

draw [1] - 85:12

drawing [1] - 220:3

drawings [4] - 22:1, 124:14,
144:18, 220:10

dream [1] - 88:13

dreams [1] - 87:17

dress [1] - 137:8

driveway [2] - 118:4, 118:8

driving [2] - 63:10, 183:2

drug [1] - 169:12

drugstores [1] - 53:9

dry [1] - 99:12

dumpster [1] - 128:1

dumpsters [2] - 163:10, 168:19

durability [1] - 236:16

during [6] - 38:17, 56:10,
57:10, 76:1, 153:10, 166:9

dwelling [5] - 2:14, 110:10,
113:15, 119:6, 122:3

dwindling [1] - 96:8

dynamic [1] - 166:5

E

eager [1] - 122:17

early [1] - 232:13

earnest [1] - 55:5

earning [1] - 72:13

ears [8] - 187:4, 187:6,
188:10, 189:9, 204:13,
212:18, 213:1, 217:1

ease [1] - 221:14

easement [1] - 209:15

easements [1] - 165:12

easier [2] - 90:11, 221:16

east [3] - 30:10, 226:10,
238:14

East [4] - 50:9, 76:4, 82:12,
103:6

easy [1] - 41:6

eat [1] - 52:4

ECAPS [2] - 96:6, 99:7

ecological [1] - 88:9

economic [3] - 11:7, 26:18,
43:9

economics [3] - 26:2, 29:13,
37:10

economy [1] - 78:16

ECOS [2] - 103:9, 104:10

edge [6] - 130:19, 176:7,

205:9, 233:1, 233:8, 233:10
educational [1] - 69:3
effect [3] - 90:8, 107:4,
 150:17
effort [6] - 39:17, 40:2,
 73:8, 113:10, 121:8
egg [2] - 52:11, 53:1
egress [3] - 122:2, 122:5,
 122:6
eight [2] - 125:14, 131:14
either [12] - 8:3, 12:14,
 26:8, 79:15, 89:12, 112:8,
 112:13, 195:15, 212:12,
 246:9, 247:13, 247:15
electric [1] - 176:14
electronic [1] - 195:19
elegant [1] - 170:16
element [7] - 179:5, 222:5,
 222:18, 223:7, 236:4, 236:6
elements [2] - 223:13, 223:18
elevation [16] - 138:10,
 179:2, 181:10, 181:16,
 203:16, 204:6, 205:11, 217:2,
 222:4, 224:15, 224:16,
 226:11, 226:13, 234:5, 234:6,
 234:10
elevations [3] - 220:11,
 224:13, 225:4
elevator [2] - 122:5, 129:5
Eliot [18] - 2:11, 2:15, 2:15,
 4:15, 110:5, 110:13, 111:2,
 111:12, 137:18, 138:2, 138:6,
 138:13, 175:15, 178:18,
 183:3, 217:5
Elkus [1] - 240:12
elsewhere [1] - 141:11
emissions [1] - 8:15
emotionally [1] - 71:6

emphasis [1] - 221:11
emphasize [1] - 222:14
emphasized [1] - 90:16
empty [3] - 33:14, 68:19,
 69:16
emulate [1] - 120:17
encapsulated [1] - 58:1
enclose [1] - 140:1
enclosed [2] - 132:4, 132:8
encourage [7] - 57:3, 163:1,
 163:8, 163:15, 180:11,
 200:14, 205:16
encouraged [2] - 81:9, 189:18
encourages [1] - 161:10
encouraging [1] - 163:5
end [11] - 77:7, 113:3, 122:1,
 137:19, 154:14, 167:4, 173:7,
 206:13, 223:16, 228:17, 229:7
ended [2] - 121:6, 157:17
ends [1] - 126:19
energetic [1] - 71:10
energy [5] - 8:16, 223:2,
 235:13, 235:15, 236:8
enforcing [2] - 72:15, 226:6
engage [1] - 201:10
engaged [1] - 113:5
Engineer [1] - 235:14
engineering [1] - 206:5
engineers [1] - 38:17
enhance [5] - 31:7, 103:4,
 156:13, 156:18, 187:2
enhanced [1] - 118:2
enhances [1] - 79:12
enhancing [1] - 163:16
enjoy [3] - 69:12, 117:11,
 155:19
enjoyed [2] - 106:5, 197:17

enjoyment [1] - 37:6
enlarged [1] - 130:8
enliven [2] - 38:15, 59:14
enormous [2] - 50:3, 81:11
ensure [1] - 71:9
enter [2] - 53:13, 125:14
entertainment [1] - 244:11
entire [6] - 18:1, 18:12,
 19:9, 38:15, 55:17, 133:2
entirely [5] - 18:16, 41:3,
 174:13, 180:8, 209:8
entitled [1] - 108:1
entity [1] - 202:1
entrance [3] - 158:1, 159:6,
 185:5
entrances [1] - 149:2
entry [5] - 125:14, 129:12,
 153:16, 154:9, 158:3
environment [3] - 72:3, 92:14
envision [1] - 12:4
equal [1] - 146:12
equally [1] - 15:10
equipment [1] - 140:2
Equities [2] - 218:8, 232:10
erodes [1] - 146:15
ERRATA [1] - 250:1
errata [1] - 250:3
especially [4] - 71:11, 183:1,
 202:4, 217:1
essence [1] - 18:6
essentially [3] - 28:6, 31:2,
 146:2
established [2] - 31:10, 76:2
Estate [2] - 218:8, 232:10
et [2] - 67:3, 208:10
Eternit [2] - 133:10, 146:12
European [1] - 22:16

evaluating [1] - 160:12
evaluations [1] - 197:9
evening [15] - 4:3, 4:10,
 11:3, 14:2, 22:12, 38:19,
 64:9, 66:6, 74:11, 75:12,
 110:15, 111:1, 111:7, 220:1,
 231:15
event [1] - 186:13
events [1] - 70:17
eventually [1] - 124:18
Eversource [1] - 61:8
everywhere [3] - 35:4, 184:2,
 184:10
evidence [4] - 40:18, 41:14,
 42:4, 42:5
evidence-based [2] - 40:18,
 42:5
evolution [2] - 190:12, 226:15
evolved [5] - 202:16, 221:2,
 226:2, 231:13, 234:8
exact [2] - 108:19, 220:19
exactly [13] - 37:9, 54:14,
 57:3, 75:16, 81:17, 140:8,
 142:13, 186:2, 196:7, 200:15,
 206:8, 218:5, 235:11
example [6] - 22:3, 22:8,
 105:1, 142:16, 241:13, 242:16
examples [3] - 41:11, 142:11,
 143:7
excellence [1] - 91:14
excellent [1] - 207:4
except [4] - 85:8, 237:2,
 242:7, 250:12
exceptional [4] - 91:2, 91:9,
 91:11, 92:1
exceptionally [3] - 92:2, 93:5
excited [2] - 240:10, 240:18
exciting [1] - 88:3

Excuse [1] - 123:1
excuse [2] - 87:4, 227:9
exemplary [1] - 70:5
exempted [1] - 116:2
exemption [1] - 214:7
exhaust [1] - 229:3
exhibition [1] - 245:12
exist [2] - 180:13, 212:2
existing [15] - 2:14, 31:5, 110:12, 114:1, 118:18, 122:5, 127:1, 129:4, 134:14, 141:18, 141:19, 148:10, 162:12, 216:6, 244:2
exists [3] - 30:8, 31:7, 206:7
expectations [1] - 240:14
expecting [1] - 242:14
expenditure [1] - 208:14
experience [5] - 78:14, 117:8, 163:8, 163:11, 197:8
expire [1] - 10:18
expires [1] - 180:4
explained [1] - 182:6
explore [1] - 166:12
explored [2] - 157:6, 161:14
exploring [2] - 166:6, 189:2
exposure [2] - 141:18, 144:1
express [1] - 211:7
expressed [2] - 22:13, 95:17
expression [3] - 190:5, 238:5, 238:9
extend [1] - 141:6
extends [1] - 244:3
extension [3] - 88:8, 208:5, 208:9
extensive [2] - 114:15, 140:1
extent [8] - 187:10, 202:4, 205:14, 206:14, 212:7, 217:2,

217:6, 236:15
exterior [1] - 224:12

F

F-like [1] - 93:19
fabric [1] - 214:10
facade [19] - 121:4, 133:2, 136:12, 139:6, 139:16, 141:7, 148:6, 162:9, 171:18, 223:9, 223:19, 226:9, 227:2, 233:6, 236:5, 237:4, 238:2, 238:18
facades [2] - 162:14, 162:17
face [6] - 47:19, 48:1, 86:9, 204:9, 205:7, 226:8
faced [1] - 68:3
faces [1] - 196:18
facilities [1] - 39:14
facility [4] - 18:18, 19:3, 25:15, 63:5
fact [22] - 14:14, 18:4, 24:15, 27:9, 41:18, 42:15, 60:2, 62:11, 76:1, 76:2, 76:6, 82:3, 82:7, 123:8, 125:5, 135:6, 142:11, 160:9, 189:16, 196:4, 199:19, 216:5
factor [1] - 175:5
factory [1] - 185:3
facts [3] - 41:15, 42:3, 43:6
failed [1] - 104:15
fair [3] - 61:19, 225:15, 235:5
fairly [4] - 49:1, 142:19, 241:14, 245:2
faith [1] - 35:14
fall [4] - 89:19, 107:2, 225:11, 232:13
falls [1] - 4:17
false [1] - 142:6

familiar [3] - 143:8, 143:14, 164:19

families [10] - 40:10, 68:9, 69:4, 73:19, 77:8, 77:10, 77:16, 78:3, 78:10, 79:18

family [2] - 41:8, 77:19

fans [1] - 227:19

fantastic [2] - 154:10, 155:11

FAR [6] - 44:12, 44:19, 45:9, 45:12, 46:9, 62:8

far [9] - 25:13, 26:2, 74:2, 88:4, 124:12, 150:16, 150:17, 154:4, 179:7

farmers' [1] - 70:16

FAROOQ [6] - 4:9, 5:14, 54:11, 64:14, 96:11, 96:14

Farooq [1] - 1:15

FARRIS [6] - 93:18, 96:13, 96:16, 97:9, 97:12, 99:1

fascinating [1] - 90:17

fast [4] - 47:5, 76:8, 106:19, 245:7

fast-tracked [1] - 76:8

favor [7] - 9:19, 14:14, 152:8, 217:15, 241:6, 247:8, 248:16

feasible [5] - 23:3, 42:15, 42:19, 43:4, 206:14

feature [3] - 125:13, 209:17, 237:13

features [4] - 71:18, 115:5, 178:14, 208:3

Federal [9] - 13:9, 18:19, 24:18, 43:16, 44:2, 62:12, 63:5, 89:5, 89:8

feedback [2] - 114:10, 115:10

feet [37] - 2:13, 31:15, 31:17, 33:2, 53:16, 84:3,

91:8, 110:9, 113:15, 122:9, 125:14, 126:3, 126:16, 126:18, 127:2, 127:8, 127:10, 127:12, 127:14, 127:16, 138:8, 138:9, 139:18, 140:5, 140:11, 148:4, 165:9, 165:10, 171:14, 171:17, 172:6, 176:5, 189:16, 204:8, 221:6, 222:8, 231:3

felt [1] - 52:16

fenceable [1] - 180:10

Ferris [1] - 93:18

few [7] - 28:11, 32:11, 38:3, 130:4, 144:9, 219:9, 222:8

fiber [1] - 141:17

fibrous [7] - 133:10, 135:12, 139:11, 141:13, 142:9, 144:4, 146:12

fifth [11] - 133:14, 161:13, 171:10, 174:10, 174:13, 174:19, 184:15, 189:3, 193:7, 202:11, 204:15

figure [1] - 198:16

figured [1] - 98:9

fill [2] - 60:17, 61:3

final [4] - 55:19, 104:14, 174:11, 218:1

Final [2] - 3:3, 219:1

finalized [1] - 8:13

finally [4] - 16:17, 35:17, 80:15, 101:8

financial [2] - 42:18, 44:14

findings [3] - 213:17, 215:14, 215:15

fine [7] - 12:19, 47:2, 54:7, 143:18, 144:15, 178:10, 200:5

fine-tune [1] - 54:7

finish [1] - 84:7

finished [3] - 146:13, 170:9,
218:14

finishing [1] - 185:15

firm [1] - 43:17

firmly [1] - 43:2

first [29] - 21:10, 32:17,
38:4, 45:2, 55:9, 56:2, 64:7,
65:10, 65:12, 65:18, 77:1,
87:9, 89:1, 91:5, 94:2,
107:2, 112:5, 120:3, 129:6,
154:5, 162:13, 167:3, 177:5,
183:6, 218:16, 227:13, 228:3,
228:7, 228:12

first-floor [1] - 162:13

fish [1] - 82:18

fit [6] - 7:16, 78:3, 122:6,
161:19, 169:14, 242:11

fits [1] - 60:5

fitting [1] - 191:17

five [33] - 12:11, 15:5,
34:14, 34:16, 34:19, 35:4,
35:18, 50:12, 51:18, 58:5,
109:19, 113:15, 113:16,
123:5, 123:9, 123:15, 123:16,
123:18, 123:19, 124:15,
127:14, 127:16, 129:15,
129:16, 131:1, 131:2, 138:8,
139:3, 147:17, 171:17, 172:6,
240:5, 240:9

five-acre [4] - 34:14, 34:16,
34:19, 35:18

five-minute [1] - 109:19

five-something [1] - 147:17

five-story [4] - 124:15,
129:15, 131:1, 131:2

fix [1] - 28:18

fixed [1] - 135:6

fixes [1] - 188:12

fixing [1] - 155:17

flagpoles [1] - 125:12

flank [1] - 128:4

flanking [1] - 129:5

flat [2] - 204:13, 237:3

flatter [1] - 239:7

flexibility [1] - 204:1

flexible [1] - 36:2

flip [1] - 96:5

floor [35] - 3:5, 44:12, 67:3,
121:5, 121:9, 125:9, 125:16,
129:6, 129:9, 133:7, 133:14,
137:16, 145:6, 148:16,
161:13, 162:4, 162:13,
171:10, 173:6, 174:10,
174:13, 174:19, 179:7, 184:7,
184:15, 188:17, 189:3, 193:7,
202:11, 204:15, 223:15,
227:13, 231:4

Floor [3] - 1:6, 2:14, 110:10

floor-to-area [1] - 67:3

floors [6] - 113:17, 120:3,
120:5, 122:3, 197:11, 230:10

flourish [1] - 87:17

flow [1] - 197:6

flowers [1] - 163:15

flush [2] - 205:7, 205:8

focus [13] - 4:11, 21:11,
22:5, 22:6, 30:19, 73:1,
79:9, 121:8, 166:15, 174:6,
174:19, 181:11, 199:6

focused [2] - 55:10, 181:10

focusing [2] - 48:3, 154:1

fold [1] - 143:11

folk [1] - 38:17

folks [11] - 6:6, 40:4, 40:10,
41:19, 89:10, 92:12, 97:16,
195:19, 196:1, 246:5

follows [2] - 133:16, 190:9
food [2] - 73:16, 245:8
foods [1] - 242:17
foot [15] - 25:8, 35:11, 53:11, 59:17, 59:18, 128:18, 131:15, 137:17, 139:17, 146:6, 161:18, 171:13, 190:17, 191:2, 197:10
footage [1] - 46:1
footprint [2] - 131:7, 131:8
forbidding [2] - 195:13, 195:15
Force [1] - 8:10
force [1] - 8:19
forces [1] - 63:11
foregoing [1] - 250:11
FOREGOING [1] - 251:15
foreground [1] - 129:17
forges [1] - 70:18
form [6] - 215:1, 221:18, 236:13, 237:17, 239:15, 239:17
formal [2] - 114:15, 189:7
formed [1] - 56:13
forms [1] - 221:13
formula [3] - 147:5, 147:7, 147:18
formulation [1] - 242:13
forth [11] - 19:8, 21:1, 22:10, 23:1, 41:9, 44:11, 46:6, 128:1, 129:8, 153:14, 251:8
forthright [1] - 62:16
fortress [1] - 194:17
fortress-like [1] - 194:17
fortuitous [1] - 122:4
fortunately [1] - 53:5
forward [24] - 7:1, 8:4,

27:12, 28:13, 47:15, 58:9, 123:14, 126:1, 149:17, 151:3, 151:8, 151:10, 151:14, 179:6, 179:10, 182:17, 187:16, 187:18, 188:15, 190:14, 197:14, 201:5, 205:13, 207:13
fountains [1] - 73:17
four [7] - 12:11, 46:18, 48:8, 70:1, 100:12, 127:15, 171:14
fourth [3] - 133:7, 133:14, 137:16
frame [2] - 112:2, 121:11
framed [3] - 111:15, 124:11, 156:18
framework [2] - 56:6, 104:11
Frank"-A-double [1] - 93:19
frankly [3] - 112:19, 120:16, 169:4
free [1] - 180:9
frequently [1] - 239:5
Fridays [1] - 112:8
friendly [2] - 29:19, 77:19
friends [1] - 78:15
front [23] - 74:2, 86:11, 94:16, 111:5, 119:17, 125:12, 127:15, 131:9, 131:10, 139:19, 142:6, 142:7, 144:6, 148:8, 168:18, 182:13, 186:3, 186:8, 204:6, 205:11, 210:1, 218:8, 233:7
frontage [1] - 118:5
frozen [1] - 80:3
fulfills [1] - 46:4
full [3] - 73:18, 170:1, 222:14
fully [3] - 177:16, 226:14, 228:8
fun [1] - 196:10

function [1] - 34:14
fund [1] - 214:2
Fund [3] - 116:7, 116:9,
 207:17
funding [1] - 19:8
Funds [2] - 157:5, 166:15
funds [8] - 18:19, 207:2,
 210:14, 211:13, 212:1, 214:1,
 215:18, 217:7
funky [1] - 121:14
future [8] - 10:13, 12:2,
 24:9, 58:10, 66:16, 80:11,
 179:18, 236:19

g

G-O-R-S-K-Y [1] - 111:4
gain [1] - 172:11
garage [18] - 118:9, 118:13,
 118:16, 121:12, 127:5, 130:2,
 139:4, 140:7, 149:17, 170:1,
 189:13, 189:14, 225:17,
 226:16, 227:15, 228:19,
 229:15
Garage [1] - 119:4
Garden [1] - 132:2
garden [1] - 117:7
gardens [1] - 244:17
gas [3] - 8:15, 229:5, 245:11
gate [4] - 131:12, 132:10,
 141:8, 165:15
gateway [3] - 155:1, 155:2,
 155:3
Gee [1] - 91:4
GENERAL [1] - 1:3
general [8] - 4:19, 39:8,
 87:16, 88:10, 159:12, 173:15,
 216:9, 246:1
General [3] - 2:3, 3:2, 6:14

generally [7] - 59:19, 65:1,
 149:18, 176:4, 183:4, 219:4,
 233:19
generate [1] - 52:18
generated [1] - 107:19
generates [2] - 18:12, 197:8
generating [2] - 19:9, 44:9
generous [1] - 167:8
gentleman [1] - 247:3
geometries [1] - 191:14
geometry [2] - 120:7, 139:14
germane [1] - 144:19
given [15] - 7:3, 7:13, 47:19,
 48:2, 68:12, 98:15, 109:15,
 109:16, 115:14, 122:11,
 143:3, 151:15, 173:5, 177:15,
 209:16
glad [1] - 104:8
glass [13] - 222:5, 222:9,
 223:15, 229:9, 229:10, 230:1,
 230:3, 230:11, 230:13,
 230:17, 234:4, 234:8, 238:12
glazed [2] - 226:14, 228:8
glazing [3] - 227:1, 228:2,
 228:12
gliding [1] - 190:1
go-round [1] - 45:3
goal [7] - 28:15, 31:15, 33:4,
 38:11, 71:5, 71:13, 90:10
goals [6] - 32:2, 33:15,
 44:11, 54:6, 119:11, 215:5
goods [2] - 245:2, 245:6
Gorsky [8] - 111:3, 111:4,
 113:8, 114:9, 117:14, 123:11,
 123:12, 166:5
Gorsky's [1] - 201:12
gosh [1] - 42:3
gotcha [1] - 205:4

Government [4] - 13:10, 19:1,
24:18, 44:2

government [1] - 46:16

grade [5] - 112:10, 133:3,
138:10, 165:7, 177:17

graduate [1] - 108:7

graffiti [1] - 166:2

granite [1] - 195:2

grant [2] - 75:6, 243:7

granted [1] - 218:3

granting [1] - 213:18

graphs [1] - 239:5

gray [14] - 133:8, 135:14,
141:13, 142:19, 184:8, 192:2,
192:5, 193:13, 194:14,
194:17, 196:3, 196:12,
196:15, 196:16

grays [2] - 135:16, 184:1

grease [1] - 128:1

great [16] - 22:2, 22:3,
22:14, 23:5, 23:6, 39:3,
53:16, 54:1, 54:13, 114:9,
163:4, 174:6, 183:12, 184:8,
188:1, 193:9

greater [2] - 139:15, 212:9

Greater [1] - 112:6

greatly [1] - 115:6

green [7] - 22:18, 57:2,
66:11, 67:13, 69:6, 69:17,
142:9

greenery [1] - 227:5

greenhouse [2] - 8:15, 244:17

greening [1] - 163:15

Greg [1] - 58:19

Grendel [1] - 130:13

grew [2] - 40:10, 68:1

grid [1] - 185:4

gridded [2] - 226:1, 227:5

grocery [3] - 52:5, 53:8,
72:19

gross [1] - 44:12

Gross [2] - 2:13, 110:10

ground [4] - 3:5, 72:13,
133:2, 172:11

grounds [1] - 47:6

group [2] - 15:1, 58:10

groups [2] - 163:6, 166:7

grow [1] - 227:4

growing [1] - 41:8

grown [2] - 77:12, 242:10

Growth [1] - 108:1

GSA [11] - 24:9, 29:10, 31:13,
62:16, 84:15, 89:4, 89:5,
89:9, 90:4, 94:12, 101:10

guess [7] - 74:19, 95:11,
184:19, 185:12, 214:14,
218:1, 242:4

guidelines [11] - 56:7, 56:9,
57:16, 58:2, 160:15, 161:7,
161:9, 163:14, 197:19, 198:4,
199:8

Guidelines [6] - 196:19,
214:13, 214:17, 215:6,
215:19, 216:1

guilty [1] - 205:18

guys [5] - 36:6, 42:9, 97:5,
100:12, 219:3

H

half [6] - 5:2, 5:3, 15:8,
24:16, 42:16, 231:6

halfway [1] - 34:6

Hamilton [1] - 89:2

hand [2] - 232:19, 251:10

handle [3] - 26:2, 93:6,
192:17

handling [1] - 240:16
hands [4] - 10:1, 64:4, 217:16, 241:7
hangout [1] - 132:13
hangs [1] - 193:3
haphazardly [1] - 68:2
happier [1] - 238:9
happy [9] - 47:15, 50:2, 94:6, 102:17, 144:15, 145:9, 153:5, 160:4, 247:17
Happy [1] - 4:5
hard [10] - 22:19, 34:11, 36:3, 47:4, 57:1, 88:6, 140:7, 222:10, 224:16, 225:16
hard-scape [2] - 22:19, 57:1
harking [1] - 54:19
harping [1] - 86:2
Harvard [34] - 4:17, 70:6, 70:9, 110:1, 111:11, 113:3, 114:14, 114:18, 115:18, 116:6, 116:8, 119:10, 119:12, 120:11, 121:2, 122:11, 155:10, 157:5, 160:15, 161:5, 166:14, 169:8, 183:11, 196:19, 197:12, 207:16, 208:6, 208:12, 209:4, 212:13, 214:12, 214:16, 215:5, 215:19
Hasty [2] - 130:7, 138:18
HAWKINSON [2] - 74:11, 74:12
Hawkinson [1] - 74:12
head [3] - 149:15, 222:17, 224:18
hear [2] - 184:16, 195:16
heard [17] - 5:17, 18:8, 18:9, 18:10, 25:9, 25:10, 25:13, 33:18, 43:3, 81:9, 82:7, 94:3, 101:9, 123:5, 123:13, 186:18, 191:7

HEARING [2] - 1:3, 10:2
hearing [21] - 4:12, 4:13, 4:15, 5:15, 5:18, 6:1, 6:3, 6:8, 6:9, 10:5, 10:9, 10:15, 11:5, 11:17, 11:19, 12:9, 32:7, 64:11, 96:18, 109:13, 251:7
Hearings [1] - 2:5
hearings [4] - 7:7, 9:5, 100:11, 118:16
heart [1] - 19:15
HEATHER [1] - 99:2
Heather [1] - 99:2
height [34] - 16:4, 32:12, 32:14, 32:15, 32:17, 34:3, 37:11, 49:13, 50:11, 50:19, 51:6, 74:17, 74:19, 75:6, 83:13, 84:6, 85:9, 124:13, 127:1, 127:6, 140:9, 140:10, 148:1, 158:2, 158:3, 158:12, 158:14, 159:2, 159:6, 203:1, 203:13, 204:2, 222:14, 231:2
heights [3] - 67:2, 69:6, 140:4
held [2] - 1:5, 139:10
hello [1] - 71:5
help [7] - 19:1, 90:11, 92:13, 92:15, 103:4, 161:19, 203:12
helpful [5] - 55:16, 57:6, 93:1, 116:18, 194:8
helping [1] - 235:16
helps [2] - 34:4, 36:13
hereby [2] - 250:12, 251:6
herein [1] - 251:7
heretical [1] - 102:8
hereunto [1] - 251:9
hi [1] - 99:2
Hi [3] - 76:17, 84:19, 106:2

high [21] - 28:1, 38:7, 40:4,
45:1, 46:9, 84:3, 91:13,
127:2, 128:18, 128:19,
131:15, 132:7, 133:9, 135:18,
139:17, 143:6, 146:5, 146:12,
158:19, 189:17, 221:6

high-density [4] - 133:9,
135:18, 146:5, 146:12

high-income [1] - 40:4

high-tech [2] - 28:1, 38:7

higher [4] - 18:10, 127:9,
140:7, 158:18

highest [1] - 243:19

highlight [1] - 246:2

highly [1] - 170:9

Hill [1] - 170:13

himself [2] - 169:9, 169:17

historian [1] - 85:7

Historic [9] - 116:19, 134:12,
153:10, 173:17, 189:18,
190:5, 191:11, 213:9, 215:10

historic [11] - 117:2, 128:5,
128:16, 131:5, 131:18, 163:2,
171:3, 208:2, 212:5, 214:4,
217:9

historical [2] - 180:17,
180:18

Historical [20] - 114:16,
114:18, 115:1, 121:2, 121:16,
161:4, 174:12, 175:6, 179:4,
182:6, 183:11, 183:17, 191:4,
198:9, 209:5, 211:6, 211:14,
211:19, 216:8, 216:18

history [4] - 58:7, 117:2,
171:3, 174:1

hits [1] - 154:17

HOFFMAN [6] - 76:17, 77:2,
77:3, 77:5, 80:7, 99:2

Hoffman [2] - 76:18, 99:3

hold [2] - 114:8, 143:10

holds [1] - 137:8

home [7] - 60:1, 71:9, 112:3,
112:14, 206:1, 218:10, 242:10

home-grown [1] - 242:10

honey [1] - 194:19

honey-ish [1] - 194:19

hope [6] - 14:1, 64:6, 104:9,
107:1, 116:15, 145:10

hopefully [2] - 11:14, 168:8

hoping [4] - 78:3, 121:15,
143:4, 201:5

horizontal [5] - 221:11,
221:17, 224:17, 226:6, 236:5

hostile [1] - 180:8

Hotel [3] - 30:15, 138:15,
210:2

Hour [1] - 164:19

hour [1] - 206:2

hours [4] - 68:19, 69:15,
166:3, 166:9

House [3] - 112:15, 130:6,
170:13

houses [1] - 130:4

Housing [2] - 7:10, 16:2

housing [62] - 7:12, 7:15,
8:2, 14:8, 14:10, 14:15,
14:17, 15:1, 15:4, 17:14,
21:1, 29:3, 29:5, 32:9,
32:18, 33:8, 37:13, 38:12,
38:14, 39:8, 39:11, 39:13,
39:15, 41:2, 41:7, 41:18,
42:7, 52:9, 52:10, 52:15,
58:15, 59:1, 59:4, 59:6,
59:11, 59:17, 60:4, 62:1,
66:15, 69:16, 71:19, 72:1,
72:5, 73:2, 73:7, 78:5, 78:8,

84:3, 86:17, 86:19, 96:3,
96:4, 96:19, 97:2, 119:9,
119:13, 120:1, 122:15, 177:4,
177:8, 177:11, 177:16

housing-related [1] - 8:2

huge [2] - 82:9, 99:14

Hugh [14] - 1:11, 38:5, 38:13,
44:15, 49:4, 54:17, 148:14,
172:17, 175:8, 178:1, 179:8,
195:16, 217:12, 237:14

HUGH [47] - 27:15, 146:2,
148:15, 149:1, 149:8, 169:5,
171:19, 172:8, 172:18, 173:4,
175:9, 176:13, 188:2, 188:12,
189:2, 193:12, 194:10,
195:18, 200:6, 200:13,
201:19, 202:15, 209:12,
209:15, 211:7, 212:10, 213:7,
215:9, 216:15, 217:13, 220:5,
225:5, 225:13, 227:12,
228:15, 229:8, 229:12, 231:7,
232:7, 237:7, 237:15, 238:1,
238:6, 238:15, 241:3, 248:3,
248:11

human [1] - 159:5

hundred [8] - 34:10, 44:1,
45:5, 46:18, 48:8, 61:6,
210:6

hundred-story [1] - 34:10

hundreds [1] - 87:13

Hurley [2] - 75:14, 99:3

hurts [1] - 36:13

I

ice [1] - 236:13

idea [24] - 29:6, 34:10, 36:1,
36:11, 36:19, 62:7, 89:17,
98:15, 104:18, 107:11,
130:18, 132:4, 132:19, 134:4,

141:5, 143:9, 154:4, 154:19,
155:17, 156:10, 156:17,
157:6, 183:12, 184:5

ideal [1] - 20:8

ideally [1] - 84:1

ideals [1] - 40:17

ideas [5] - 78:18, 103:9,
106:10, 109:6, 109:18

identified [1] - 108:19

idly [1] - 40:7

ignore [1] - 86:5

Ihop [1] - 129:7

image [1] - 132:5

images [1] - 133:12

imagine [10] - 73:16, 103:19,
104:2, 120:15, 177:10, 178:9,
178:11, 180:8, 201:14, 206:12

immediate [2] - 24:9, 91:3

impact [8] - 24:17, 27:4,
51:2, 52:13, 52:14, 83:17,
107:11, 172:3

impacts [2] - 60:7, 248:6

imponderables [1] - 19:7

important [34] - 17:17, 19:16,
26:17, 27:14, 28:1, 28:10,
28:15, 30:14, 30:17, 32:15,
32:17, 38:14, 40:13, 43:18,
54:17, 56:13, 57:12, 57:14,
57:19, 58:13, 67:5, 67:8,
69:12, 71:16, 72:18, 73:12,
132:16, 133:19, 178:12,
191:19, 194:3, 205:15, 239:2

impossibility [1] - 13:15

impressed [1] - 32:7

impression [3] - 45:19,
186:10, 186:11

improve [1] - 93:9

improved [2] - 179:4, 212:15

Improvement [5] - 116:7,
116:9, 157:5, 166:15, 207:16
improvement [3] - 47:6, 209:1,
214:3
improvements [4] - 162:11,
208:1, 208:7, 214:2
improving [1] - 163:13
IN [2] - 251:9, 251:16
in-fill [2] - 60:17, 61:3
inasmuch [1] - 58:17
INC [1] - 1:18
Incentive [4] - 6:1, 6:3,
7:17, 15:19
incentive [3] - 74:18, 75:1,
75:3
inch [2] - 141:18, 143:19
include [3] - 45:7, 62:10,
157:1
included [5] - 34:2, 76:12,
76:13, 76:14, 101:13
includes [2] - 63:16, 207:18
including [6] - 30:3, 44:13,
48:19, 62:7, 77:7, 244:19
inclusionary [1] - 8:1
inclusions [1] - 69:5
incognita [1] - 102:13
income [19] - 14:7, 14:10,
14:15, 37:13, 39:10, 39:11,
39:13, 39:14, 40:2, 40:3,
40:4, 41:2, 41:4, 41:18,
52:9, 52:10, 52:15, 74:18,
75:4
incorporated [1] - 109:5
incorporating [1] - 188:10
increase [6] - 12:13, 12:14,
45:4, 70:3, 113:11, 132:16
increased [2] - 37:13, 74:17
indeed [1] - 191:12

indicated [3] - 11:9, 83:14,
247:7
indicator [1] - 58:7
individually [1] - 212:12
indulge [1] - 241:12
industrial [3] - 68:2, 243:2,
244:1
industrial-type [1] - 243:2
industry [3] - 49:6, 79:17,
243:19
infeasible [1] - 42:14
infilled [1] - 226:17
infinite [1] - 100:5
inflexible [1] - 43:17
inform [1] - 89:11
information [9] - 11:9, 11:11,
12:2, 13:1, 17:5, 26:18,
46:13, 98:10, 109:18
informed [2] - 109:15, 115:6
infrastructure [1] - 80:16
inherited [2] - 201:2, 201:3
initial [1] - 55:18
initialization [1] - 67:18
initiative [1] - 161:9
ink [1] - 99:11
innovation [3] - 28:3, 78:16,
78:19
input [1] - 76:8
inside [1] - 224:9
inspired [1] - 143:9
install [1] - 206:14
installed [1] - 208:7
instance [1] - 57:8
instead [5] - 19:12, 20:1,
22:17, 87:18, 222:9
Institute [2] - 130:13, 138:19
INSTRUCTIONS [1] - 250:2

integrated [1] - 71:1
integrity [1] - 131:4
intended [2] - 136:9, 208:17
intent [1] - 15:6
intention [1] - 196:14
intentions [1] - 235:5
interact [1] - 72:7
interest [10] - 6:19, 154:1,
 156:3, 156:14, 179:14,
 181:15, 209:11, 214:6,
 217:11, 239:16
interested [2] - 77:6, 180:17
interesting [11] - 7:7, 9:1,
 30:6, 104:18, 108:6, 117:1,
 143:2, 160:9, 162:18, 195:12,
 218:19
interestingly [1] - 60:10
interests [3] - 114:13,
 121:19, 212:4
interim [1] - 114:8
interior [1] - 137:10
internal [1] - 149:11
International [1] - 112:15
intersection [1] - 53:14
introduce [5] - 39:4, 120:19,
 135:14, 136:7, 189:8
introduced [5] - 106:9, 132:3,
 136:6, 141:11, 236:17
introducing [2] - 118:4,
 132:10
introduction [2] - 119:9,
 174:17
investment [1] - 180:16
inviting [4] - 67:6, 69:3,
 70:9, 70:19
involve [1] - 173:14
involved [1] - 93:11
involvement [1] - 99:8

involves [1] - 119:15
IRAM [2] - 4:9, 5:14
Iram [1] - 1:15
irked [1] - 182:19
iron [1] - 225:9
ISABELLA [4] - 65:17, 65:18,
 66:2, 68:16
Isabella [2] - 65:17, 66:9
ish [1] - 194:19
issuance [1] - 116:3
issue [24] - 4:16, 12:13,
 67:5, 68:4, 107:10, 119:15,
 149:11, 149:14, 164:13,
 164:15, 176:11, 177:1,
 177:14, 178:6, 178:13,
 184:13, 184:14, 184:15,
 202:1, 207:12, 232:18,
 241:14, 241:15, 242:19
issues [24] - 8:3, 11:6, 11:8,
 12:11, 13:4, 13:18, 14:1,
 16:3, 16:17, 17:3, 20:18,
 106:15, 115:12, 115:17,
 116:19, 120:7, 120:12,
 120:16, 161:1, 192:11, 193:6,
 221:4, 246:1, 246:2
Italian [1] - 22:17
item [4] - 5:19, 8:8, 9:2,
 108:16
items [1] - 7:9
iterations [1] - 174:9
itinerary [1] - 71:4
itself [3] - 69:3, 194:6,
 200:4

J

J-A-Q-U-I-T-H [1] - 75:13
J-O-H-N [1] - 87:11
Jackson [2] - 102:3, 152:13

JAMES [55] - 102:2, 102:5,
105:19, 110:15, 123:7, 147:5,
147:9, 147:15, 148:1, 148:5,
148:9, 152:7, 152:12, 153:12,
164:18, 165:10, 167:3, 167:6,
167:11, 167:13, 167:18,
167:19, 168:1, 168:3, 168:5,
168:7, 168:15, 172:10, 174:4,
187:15, 190:19, 195:2, 195:5,
196:17, 198:13, 199:3, 199:5,
199:15, 200:19, 201:17,
204:8, 204:12, 205:1, 205:6,
206:6, 206:12, 206:18,
209:13, 209:18, 211:18,
213:11, 218:5, 219:14,
219:17, 235:1

James [6] - 102:2, 110:17,
152:10, 152:13, 164:7, 218:6

jamming [1] - 87:19

JAN [1] - 106:2

Jan [1] - 106:2

Jane [1] - 65:8

January [2] - 5:11

Japanese [1] - 202:6

JAQUITH [1] - 75:12

Jaquith [1] - 75:13

JEFF [5] - 160:4, 207:4,
214:19, 233:12, 241:8

Jeff [8] - 1:14, 6:2, 160:18,
164:3, 207:1, 213:16, 233:11,
248:4

jelling [1] - 56:4

JFK [9] - 5:15, 128:11,
130:17, 138:6, 138:17, 139:2,
163:3, 164:16

Jill [2] - 251:5, 251:12

Jim [2] - 124:11, 129:3

job [6] - 26:12, 59:4, 68:6,

90:11, 121:18, 173:11

jobs [2] - 59:6, 78:9

JOE [5] - 232:2, 232:9,
234:16, 235:9, 236:11

Joe [2] - 218:14, 232:9

JOHN [2] - 74:11, 87:10

John [2] - 74:11, 87:10

joint [10] - 4:13, 7:11, 8:7,
10:8, 10:14, 11:5, 11:17,
12:9, 94:4, 213:8

joints [2] - 139:13

JONAH [4] - 65:14, 65:15,
66:4, 71:5

Jonah [2] - 65:14, 66:8

Joseph [1] - 218:8

Jr [1] - 1:10

judgments [1] - 42:5

jugling [1] - 106:16

JULY [1] - 1:4

July [5] - 4:5, 5:13, 5:14,
215:14, 251:10

jump [1] - 22:1

June [4] - 9:13, 100:11

jurisdiction [1] - 115:2

K

K-A-I-S-E-R [1] - 89:1

K2 [16] - 27:16, 44:16, 49:5,
50:5, 54:18, 56:10, 57:13,
58:18, 60:14, 76:1, 97:16,
98:4, 98:9, 98:11, 98:15,
100:18

KAISER [6] - 88:19, 92:6,
92:9, 92:19, 93:3, 93:16

Kaiser [1] - 89:1

keen [1] - 7:13

keep [6] - 46:7, 73:13, 85:18,
86:2, 132:9, 137:6

keeping [2] - 72:15, 238:11

keeps [2] - 100:4, 223:10

KEN [4] - 81:3, 81:6, 81:8,
84:9

Ken [4] - 81:3, 104:8, 106:11,
219:15

Kendall [52] - 2:7, 24:2,
30:3, 33:4, 33:14, 34:12,
38:16, 39:5, 48:14, 49:1,
50:9, 52:3, 53:1, 57:10,
59:1, 59:7, 60:5, 60:12,
63:15, 63:17, 66:15, 68:8,
68:13, 68:16, 69:2, 69:12,
69:15, 69:19, 70:13, 71:2,
71:7, 71:12, 72:4, 72:6,
72:9, 72:17, 73:4, 73:9,
74:5, 76:10, 76:11, 79:1,
83:1, 86:19, 88:4, 95:14,
95:18, 98:5, 98:6, 105:13,
107:4, 152:17

Kennedy [9] - 107:19, 113:6,
129:17, 137:19, 139:2, 151:4,
154:7, 175:19, 204:15

kennels [1] - 245:10

Kent [3] - 219:7, 219:15,
235:14

KENT [25] - 219:13, 219:19,
220:7, 225:8, 225:15, 227:11,
227:14, 227:17, 228:7,
228:17, 229:10, 229:13,
230:6, 230:16, 231:9, 233:3,
233:5, 234:7, 234:14, 235:3,
235:12, 236:10, 237:19,
238:3, 238:13

kept [1] - 223:12

key [1] - 166:8

kick [1] - 17:8

kid [1] - 169:8

kids [2] - 52:17, 169:16

kind [13] - 23:12, 35:19,
57:2, 125:5, 134:13, 136:16,
144:1, 153:3, 161:9, 169:14,
171:6, 182:11, 196:10

kind've [23] - 33:8, 35:10,
35:14, 85:4, 112:17, 128:8,
131:4, 133:7, 135:15, 136:13,
136:19, 137:19, 140:19,
141:12, 141:17, 143:1, 151:2,
153:4, 185:1, 185:14, 226:1,
233:19, 237:3

kinda [10] - 35:11, 36:14,
37:4, 56:3, 125:11, 144:6,
146:8, 161:17, 186:18, 219:8

kinds [2] - 194:8, 212:16

Kitchen [5] - 112:6, 117:8,
128:5, 130:5, 132:2

KNIGHT [25] - 219:13, 219:19,
220:7, 225:8, 225:15, 227:11,
227:14, 227:17, 228:7,
228:17, 229:10, 229:13,
230:6, 230:16, 231:9, 233:3,
233:5, 234:7, 234:14, 235:3,
235:12, 236:10, 237:19,
238:3, 238:13

Knight [3] - 219:13, 219:14,
219:15

knock [2] - 113:1, 204:1

knowing [1] - 25:5

knowledge [1] - 195:17

known [4] - 70:6, 70:8, 111:8,
195:8

knows [3] - 115:18, 182:12,
242:4

Korean [2] - 129:10, 142:16

Kourafas [2] - 251:5, 251:12

KS [2] - 2:7, 2:8

<u>L</u>	
<u>labs</u> [2] - 67:19, 244:9	<u>lease</u> [5] - 118:19, 134:18, 137:1, 180:2, 180:4
<u>lack</u> [4] - 18:2, 68:10, 107:9	<u>leased</u> [1] - 5:3
<u>lacks</u> [2] - 72:18, 82:13	<u>leases</u> [1] - 201:3
<u>laid</u> [4] - 129:2, 139:14, 144:19, 160:12	<u>leasing</u> [3] - 80:13, 118:14, 118:15
<u>Lakeview</u> [1] - 106:3	<u>least</u> [16] - 11:19, 20:16, 39:16, 88:11, 100:13, 126:3, 157:4, 157:19, 159:13, 165:9, 185:17, 214:5, 217:9, 227:3, 243:8, 245:4
<u>Lamplighter</u> [1] - 246:6	<u>leave</u> [2] - 85:7, 247:14
<u>land</u> [15] - 13:8, 25:14, 31:14, 46:15, 46:16, 67:9, 80:11, 80:13, 81:14, 85:16, 95:12, 95:14, 95:18, 241:17	<u>leaving</u> [2] - 202:12, 202:16
<u>landmark</u> [1] - 91:15	<u>led</u> [1] - 15:2
<u>landowner</u> [1] - 24:13	<u>LEE</u> [7] - 93:18, 96:13, 96:16, 97:9, 97:12, 99:1
<u>landscape</u> [3] - 227:6, 231:10, 231:11	<u>Lee</u> [3] - 93:18, 99:6, 100:18
<u>landscaped</u> [1] - 170:13	<u>left</u> [5] - 31:11, 127:2, 128:4, 151:8, 227:16
<u>landscaping</u> [4] - 163:15, 163:19, 217:4, 230:19	<u>legally</u> [1] - 243:7
<u>large</u> [14] - 23:7, 27:1, 27:10, 50:7, 51:19, 54:2, 60:11, 61:14, 121:12, 122:11, 125:7, 127:4, 133:15, 229:14	<u>length</u> [1] - 148:2
<u>largely</u> [2] - 4:16, 120:15	<u>lengthy</u> [1] - 179:3
<u>larger</u> [4] - 15:16, 79:7, 131:1	<u>less</u> [11] - 20:7, 20:8, 32:16, 47:12, 61:5, 91:8, 190:2, 190:4, 225:3, 239:5, 248:8
<u>largest</u> [1] - 61:1	<u>letter</u> [3] - 91:12, 247:5, 247:6
<u>last</u> [18] - 8:11, 17:12, 39:18, 55:8, 65:10, 65:15, 65:18, 74:4, 92:10, 97:9, 97:13, 99:9, 102:4, 109:9, 112:7, 112:8, 112:12, 231:4	<u>lettering</u> [1] - 245:12
<u>late</u> [6] - 10:18, 48:15, 219:16, 219:18, 232:13	<u>level</u> [11] - 56:16, 62:10, 63:1, 72:14, 134:1, 140:19, 144:2, 151:11, 151:12, 226:9, 231:3
<u>late-September</u> [1] - 10:18	<u>levels</u> [4] - 177:7, 221:6, 231:6
<u>lay</u> [2] - 8:13, 20:7	<u>Lexington</u> [2] - 35:5, 35:6
<u>layouts</u> [1] - 172:3	<u>License</u> [1] - 251:13
<u>leads</u> [1] - 177:19	<u>lieu</u> [1] - 208:19
	<u>life</u> [7] - 55:17, 59:11, 79:8,

83:17, 103:4, 169:16, 180:15
light [4] - 146:9, 159:11,
 185:12, 208:9
light-to-medium [1] - 146:9
lighter [5] - 133:13, 134:2,
 136:13, 144:7, 192:5
lightness [3] - 136:8, 189:9,
 196:10
likely [1] - 119:7
limit [1] - 74:17
limitation [1] - 16:15
limitations [1] - 187:8
limited [5] - 16:7, 78:15,
 123:17, 214:5, 243:4
limited-use [1] - 243:4
Lin [1] - 195:8
line [9] - 127:11, 131:19,
 138:11, 148:8, 150:10,
 169:19, 174:18, 190:1, 205:5
Line [1] - 208:8
LINE [1] - 250:4
lines [5] - 104:1, 126:18,
 161:16, 170:11, 193:3
Linskey [3] - 227:8, 232:8,
 232:11
lips [1] - 235:2
LISA [1] - 123:3
list [2] - 13:6, 47:11
listed [1] - 243:16
listen [1] - 211:13
listening [1] - 103:13
lists [1] - 207:17
literally [1] - 79:3
livable [3] - 35:1, 72:9,
 82:14
live [16] - 33:10, 36:16,
 36:17, 37:16, 40:12, 52:3,
 66:2, 66:4, 73:10, 77:13,

79:18, 89:2, 101:3, 103:2,
 103:16, 104:4
liveable [2] - 49:14, 50:2
lively [2] - 22:15, 71:7
lives [1] - 67:12
living [3] - 50:3, 102:11,
 105:17
LIZA [3] - 9:12, 123:1, 219:16
Liza [2] - 1:14, 9:9
LLC [4] - 2:15, 110:13, 111:2,
 111:3
loading [6] - 168:16, 214:8,
 224:2, 224:5, 224:9, 225:18
loads [1] - 29:17
lobby [2] - 122:5, 159:6
local [6] - 39:2, 69:17,
 70:16, 72:11, 72:16, 180:17
located [7] - 16:14, 16:16,
 17:1, 114:17, 124:16, 228:5,
 229:3
location [9] - 37:4, 70:7,
 111:13, 113:2, 119:10,
 122:15, 124:16, 214:10
locations [3] - 134:8, 144:9,
 169:3
lock [1] - 165:14
logic [2] - 62:3, 149:19
long-known [1] - 70:6
long-term [1] - 8:13
longest [1] - 148:5
Look [1] - 62:15
look [38] - 7:19, 21:17, 23:2,
 24:1, 31:19, 47:3, 50:17,
 58:19, 59:3, 76:10, 89:11,
 107:7, 124:1, 130:9, 138:11,
 158:11, 167:4, 176:11, 185:2,
 185:4, 188:6, 188:14, 189:19,
 193:16, 194:9, 194:11,

195:18, 196:6, 196:11,
199:13, 202:4, 204:14, 207:5,
210:16, 228:8, 240:11, 245:19

looked [10] - 58:18, 60:4,
60:6, 161:11, 161:12, 163:12,
193:12, 199:10, 199:11,
234:19

looking [31] - 12:2, 35:16,
48:15, 52:19, 55:7, 60:8,
60:14, 60:15, 60:16, 62:17,
92:5, 105:18, 106:18, 118:18,
125:4, 129:12, 151:3, 161:18,
166:4, 171:9, 178:17, 193:13,
195:13, 195:15, 205:11,
215:7, 215:13, 217:3, 218:11,
238:6

looks [15] - 67:8, 130:8,
136:10, 138:7, 138:12, 141:1,
159:4, 192:19, 193:18, 196:2,
196:3, 196:9, 196:11, 205:6,
237:6

loose [1] - 134:7

lose [5] - 153:15, 172:5,
173:7, 173:9, 235:4

losing [1] - 161:2

lost [2] - 20:11, 183:14

Lou [1] - 184:18

Louis [1] - 1:10

LOUIS [26] - 35:10, 175:16,
175:18, 176:3, 184:19,
185:11, 187:13, 199:1, 199:4,
199:12, 202:18, 203:5, 203:9,
203:12, 203:18, 204:5,
204:11, 204:18, 205:4, 205:8,
206:10, 206:16, 235:10,
236:7, 237:2, 247:19

louvers [7] - 222:1, 226:17,
227:2, 227:18, 228:5, 228:10,
229:18

love [4] - 91:5, 105:19,
163:1, 206:3

lovely [1] - 46:5

low [8] - 14:7, 14:15, 15:4,
39:11, 39:13, 39:14, 40:3,
52:8

low-income [4] - 39:11, 39:13,
39:14, 40:3

lower [5] - 18:9, 85:18,
138:10, 140:10, 140:11

Lower [1] - 218:9

luck [1] - 248:18

luxury [1] - 26:15

M

M-E-J-I-A [1] - 65:19

M-E-Y-E-R [1] - 85:1

machine [1] - 146:13

machined [1] - 136:3

Maguire [2] - 218:8, 232:9

MAGUIRE [5] - 232:2, 232:9,
234:16, 235:9, 236:11

main [3] - 85:9, 164:1, 190:15

Main [2] - 86:10, 86:11

maintain [1] - 227:3

maintenance [1] - 146:11

major [3] - 12:11, 14:1, 41:16

majority [1] - 2:7

makers [1] - 247:9

malady [1] - 40:5

mallng [1] - 149:14

Manager [1] - 4:8

MANAGER [4] - 54:11, 64:14,
96:11, 96:14

manager [1] - 111:3

Manfredi [2] - 218:10, 240:13

Manfredi's [1] - 219:7

Manhattan [4] - 33:1, 33:9,

33:10, 33:12

manufacturing [1] - 245:1

Maple [1] - 66:4

MARILEE [2] - 84:19, 85:1

Marilee [1] - 84:19

MARK [1] - 75:12

Mark [2] - 75:13, 101:3

market [1] - 86:17

markets [1] - 70:16

MARLENE [6] - 157:13, 158:6,
158:16, 159:1, 159:4, 159:10

Marlene [1] - 157:13

Marriott [1] - 30:15

Maryland [1] - 169:16

masonry [11] - 121:12, 222:9,
223:9, 223:11, 225:6, 226:7,
234:4, 234:9, 236:1, 238:4,
238:7

Mass [6] - 6:10, 6:12, 66:1,
66:3, 194:15

Massachusetts [6] - 1:7, 70:8,
74:12, 110:19, 251:3, 251:6

massing [2] - 45:17, 115:4

master [4] - 106:17, 107:1,
107:16, 108:10

match [3] - 162:7, 242:1,
242:12

matches [1] - 241:19

material [38] - 121:4, 133:10,
135:17, 135:19, 136:2,
136:12, 136:14, 137:10,
139:12, 139:13, 141:18,
142:10, 142:13, 142:19,
143:6, 145:13, 145:18, 146:3,
146:10, 146:16, 159:11,
174:17, 183:15, 185:2,
190:13, 191:5, 191:11,
192:14, 193:13, 193:18,

193:19, 194:5, 196:4, 196:11,
225:6, 228:13

materials [12] - 111:7, 115:4,
133:9, 136:1, 139:6, 139:11,
142:8, 143:19, 183:18, 220:5,
220:7, 240:17

matter [5] - 10:17, 12:1,
62:11, 155:15, 156:2

matters [2] - 64:8, 115:3

MBTA [1] - 208:8

mean [22] - 23:14, 25:7,
27:15, 34:5, 46:8, 52:19,
56:4, 84:11, 91:8, 92:1,
152:16, 155:16, 174:5,
182:11, 183:4, 188:5, 193:8,
195:12, 195:19, 198:14,
203:5, 210:16

meander [1] - 154:11

means [6] - 38:10, 45:14,
68:18, 177:8, 212:1, 243:2

meant [1] - 198:15

meantime [1] - 87:18

measure [1] - 127:5

measurement [1] - 127:3

measuring [1] - 127:7

mechanical [5] - 139:18,
140:1, 221:5, 222:2, 226:16

mechanicals [1] - 202:19

medium [6] - 133:8, 135:14,
146:9, 193:13, 225:9

meet [4] - 7:13, 26:10, 59:19,
91:10

meeting [15] - 4:5, 4:10, 5:9,
7:5, 7:6, 7:8, 9:3, 9:10,
16:1, 94:5, 121:3, 174:11,
174:14, 174:15

Meeting [3] - 1:6, 2:4, 249:1

meetings [4] - 5:10, 100:12,

114:13, 153:13

meets [2] - 190:18, 223:9

MEJIA [3] - 65:17, 66:2, 68:16

Mejia [2] - 65:18, 66:9

member [1] - 16:2

MEMBER [3] - 5:12, 148:18,
166:18

MEMBERS [1] - 1:9

members [12] - 7:10, 11:4,
58:4, 123:5, 123:9, 123:14,
123:15, 123:16, 124:4,
176:18, 191:8, 212:13

Members [3] - 110:16, 111:9,
219:19

members' [1] - 16:19

memo [8] - 116:16, 154:4,
157:4, 160:2, 160:12, 160:19,
207:14, 215:15

memorable [1] - 23:7

memorialized [1] - 166:17

memories [1] - 189:5

mention [2] - 17:18, 133:6

mentioned [18] - 54:17, 71:14,
89:15, 91:13, 106:17, 108:17,
124:11, 129:3, 133:5, 135:4,
140:5, 142:9, 144:1, 154:10,
162:3, 163:2, 187:7, 235:13

met [3] - 81:15, 91:2, 156:8

metal [9] - 141:19, 144:1,
222:13, 222:19, 223:5,
223:16, 224:17, 235:19, 236:3

metallic [1] - 237:12

metaphor [1] - 21:4

meter [1] - 229:5

meters [1] - 229:5

meticulously [1] - 195:7

MEYER [8] - 84:19, 157:13,
157:14, 158:6, 158:16, 159:1,

159:4, 159:10

Meyer [3] - 85:1, 157:13

Meyers [1] - 5:4

Michelle [1] - 218:9

micro [1] - 172:9

microbreweries [1] - 248:12

microbrewery [2] - 3:6, 243:15

microphone [1] - 124:6

microunit [1] - 172:8

mid [2] - 10:18, 49:19

mid-20th [1] - 31:18

mid-Cambridge [1] - 49:19

middle [20] - 14:9, 14:16,
14:17, 15:5, 37:13, 39:10,
40:2, 41:2, 41:4, 41:18,
50:8, 52:9, 52:10, 52:15,
74:18, 75:4, 172:1, 176:14,
184:9, 194:1

middle-income [6] - 41:2,
41:4, 41:18, 52:9, 52:10,
52:15

midst [1] - 115:8

might [32] - 5:2, 16:11, 34:8,
52:18, 88:2, 89:19, 102:19,
103:4, 103:6, 103:19, 104:6,
111:10, 116:13, 120:14,
156:4, 161:2, 166:16, 171:11,
172:2, 172:12, 173:7, 173:9,
174:19, 175:5, 177:12, 179:4,
204:16, 209:7, 241:9, 246:3,
248:10

mike [2] - 148:19, 171:8

milieu [1] - 143:5

million [8] - 18:9, 25:9,
25:10, 43:11, 44:1, 46:18,
48:8

millions [1] - 33:3

mind [4] - 38:14, 72:15,

73:14, 171:15
minded [1] - 76:5
mindful [2] - 24:15, 206:1
minds [1] - 16:19
mine [1] - 78:15
minimalist [1] - 186:3
minor [2] - 6:16, 179:13
minute [4] - 100:6, 109:19,
 135:9, 174:5
minutes [2] - 65:2, 241:13
miss [1] - 183:13
missed [1] - 62:6
missing [1] - 69:18
mistake [1] - 105:6
MIT [7] - 60:14, 60:19, 78:17,
 86:5, 86:8, 86:15, 93:7
mitigation [1] - 99:17
mix [4] - 36:3, 42:7, 44:10,
 112:19
mixed [2] - 36:3, 71:19
mixing [2] - 184:5, 194:14
mock [2] - 192:1, 225:10
mock-up [2] - 192:1, 225:10
model [4] - 70:5, 203:8,
 203:14, 235:15
modeling [1] - 223:3
models [3] - 45:19, 140:16,
 235:13
moderate [4] - 14:7, 14:15,
 15:4, 52:8
modern [1] - 125:5
modernistic [1] - 192:4
modernity [1] - 183:13
modest [1] - 219:9
modifications [4] - 7:19,
 213:13, 234:1, 246:4
modify [1] - 61:11

modulate [1] - 51:6
moisture [1] - 236:18
mold [1] - 74:5
moment [8] - 14:12, 25:4,
 46:13, 47:2, 80:3, 161:17,
 163:17, 195:14
money [6] - 33:12, 47:12,
 116:10, 155:17, 157:2, 157:4
monger [1] - 82:18
month [2] - 8:11, 93:8
monthly [2] - 118:15, 119:5
months [6] - 8:5, 12:18,
 88:11, 93:13, 100:9, 128:15
monuments [1] - 208:3
morass [1] - 19:8
mortgages [1] - 244:15
mortuaries [1] - 244:16
most [22] - 6:18, 19:16,
 28:15, 44:13, 67:16, 76:11,
 85:10, 88:3, 90:15, 109:1,
 111:9, 114:10, 114:14, 128:3,
 145:3, 151:10, 160:19,
 176:17, 182:19, 189:7, 193:8,
 197:7
mostly [2] - 33:9, 194:17
motion [6] - 9:15, 139:15,
 216:13, 233:15, 237:9, 241:2
Mount [1] - 165:1
move [17] - 7:3, 20:10, 27:11,
 41:6, 47:8, 47:15, 52:12,
 126:1, 135:7, 149:6, 155:1,
 155:3, 171:17, 179:9, 221:15,
 235:2, 236:9
moved [6] - 9:17, 25:16,
 67:18, 202:19, 216:15, 227:16
moving [7] - 49:8, 49:16,
 137:13, 179:5, 179:14, 188:4,
 204:3

MSD [1] - 60:15
multi [1] - 70:15
multi-utility [1] - 70:15
Museum [2] - 143:15, 143:16
must [3] - 40:19, 45:2, 71:13
Mya [1] - 195:8

N

name [19] - 64:19, 65:4, 65:10, 65:12, 65:14, 65:15, 65:17, 65:18, 66:7, 75:13, 88:19, 89:1, 102:4, 110:17, 124:3, 135:19, 152:11, 232:9
names [2] - 65:7, 101:12
narrow [2] - 151:6, 151:15
narrower [1] - 230:12
narrows [1] - 126:16
NASA [1] - 67:18
natural [1] - 68:9
nature [4] - 21:7, 56:19, 165:8, 225:5
near [2] - 7:1, 205:9
nearby [1] - 41:6
necessarily [1] - 86:12
necessary [4] - 14:8, 14:19, 24:12, 33:5
necessitate [1] - 16:10
necessity [2] - 67:11
need [36] - 12:12, 14:16, 17:4, 37:5, 37:11, 38:19, 39:4, 39:7, 39:11, 39:12, 42:3, 42:7, 43:6, 45:13, 49:11, 52:5, 52:7, 53:6, 54:15, 59:11, 59:14, 59:15, 75:16, 83:1, 83:2, 91:16, 95:19, 109:4, 134:12, 150:5, 165:14, 168:17, 168:19, 176:11, 233:11, 233:12

needed [4] - 15:10, 143:11, 222:6, 224:4
needing [1] - 149:6
needle [1] - 33:1
needs [19] - 35:19, 37:4, 39:19, 43:11, 44:14, 60:1, 73:4, 73:8, 81:15, 81:19, 82:6, 82:7, 83:5, 89:11, 94:13, 96:5, 100:3, 197:2, 226:16
negotiate [1] - 200:17
neighborhood [10] - 18:8, 39:3, 45:10, 82:14, 99:11, 107:6, 108:13, 214:10, 247:4, 247:7
neighborhoods [5] - 30:11, 50:1, 51:3, 103:2, 103:3
neighbors [1] - 192:12
Nelson [3] - 219:7, 219:12, 219:15
Net [2] - 8:9, 8:15
neutral [1] - 200:4
neutrals [1] - 184:1
never [7] - 15:6, 39:15, 146:14, 170:17, 189:12, 191:10, 235:1
new [21] - 6:1, 18:7, 18:18, 19:3, 20:12, 31:4, 46:19, 68:4, 71:3, 87:8, 89:17, 106:10, 129:10, 129:18, 154:9, 158:3, 201:4, 204:15, 227:18, 231:18, 238:9
New [2] - 51:10, 85:15
newbies [2] - 76:6, 101:4
next [22] - 5:8, 5:10, 19:18, 28:6, 30:2, 56:5, 58:5, 63:1, 89:19, 90:7, 93:12, 99:14, 118:7, 118:13, 127:4, 130:7,

154:7, 167:15, 170:12,
198:17, 231:8, 237:12
next-door [4] - 118:7, 118:13,
127:4, 231:8
nexus [1] - 212:9
nice [10] - 30:16, 35:6,
50:16, 125:13, 182:12,
184:10, 185:7, 186:7, 186:17,
193:9
nicer [1] - 178:14
nickel [1] - 201:16
night [3] - 66:12, 79:4, 105:5
ning [1] - 223:8
non [3] - 66:12, 111:10, 119:7
non-auto [1] - 119:7
non-descript [1] - 111:10
non-night [1] - 66:12
none [1] - 100:11
nonissue [1] - 181:3
nonprofit [2] - 208:5, 209:11
nonresidents [1] - 69:5
Norfolk [2] - 93:19, 251:4
north [3] - 30:11, 83:8, 84:9
North [3] - 6:10, 6:16, 49:18
NOT [1] - 251:16
Notary [2] - 251:5, 251:14
note [4] - 16:7, 96:6, 244:6,
250:2
noted [5] - 36:6, 115:11,
117:18, 197:1, 250:12
notice [2] - 109:15, 109:16
noting [1] - 90:18
notion [3] - 18:10, 20:9,
45:12
notions [1] - 79:5
notwithstanding [1] - 180:11
Novartis [1] - 194:15

November [1] - 55:5
nowhere [1] - 167:19
nuisance [1] - 166:1
number [15] - 16:6, 17:11,
18:1, 18:3, 18:15, 60:9,
77:6, 78:5, 111:15, 112:15,
133:11, 136:6, 174:18,
240:12, 246:16
numbers [9] - 18:8, 35:13,
42:13, 42:18, 85:8, 94:14,
95:4, 98:9, 100:5
nut [1] - 43:12

o

objection [1] - 175:4
Objective [1] - 215:3
objectives [2] - 214:11,
214:15
obligated [1] - 120:19
obscures [1] - 178:19
observation [3] - 79:14,
104:14, 200:9
observe [1] - 40:7
obvious [1] - 10:19
obviously [3] - 15:18, 49:9,
161:2
occasional [1] - 217:10
occupied [5] - 2:8, 33:9,
33:10, 129:10, 231:4
occur [4] - 13:7, 113:18,
212:7, 219:2
occurred [1] - 74:14
occurring [1] - 28:5
occurs [1] - 229:1
odd [1] - 242:7
oddly [1] - 90:19
OF [4] - 1:2, 251:15, 251:16,
251:17

off-whites [1] - 135:16
offer [2] - 82:2, 122:12
offering [1] - 155:4
offers [1] - 154:3
office [9] - 14:5, 16:7,
 50:18, 82:15, 108:14, 119:19,
 159:5, 209:19, 219:8
offices [2] - 110:18, 244:9
OFFICIAL [1] - 1:18
offset [1] - 230:11
often [1] - 243:5
old [2] - 100:8, 231:17
older [1] - 142:18
Olympic [1] - 218:13
Olympics [1] - 218:11
once [1] - 16:8
one [96] - 6:18, 7:9, 11:19,
 12:12, 12:13, 16:17, 17:16,
 19:15, 22:7, 22:12, 24:7,
 27:2, 29:1, 34:7, 35:11,
 38:6, 41:12, 41:15, 53:11,
 58:16, 59:3, 63:9, 63:10,
 67:16, 71:18, 74:4, 74:5,
 80:8, 86:2, 87:2, 90:14,
 90:17, 90:19, 93:11, 97:1,
 97:19, 100:4, 101:9, 102:16,
 105:9, 106:17, 109:1, 113:13,
 118:1, 119:1, 119:18, 121:11,
 126:6, 132:13, 136:7, 140:18,
 142:6, 145:3, 145:5, 145:6,
 147:2, 149:4, 150:11, 151:10,
 151:12, 151:19, 152:15,
 156:6, 164:4, 165:2, 166:19,
 167:1, 169:7, 170:7, 172:7,
 172:16, 178:14, 179:5, 182:3,
 182:13, 184:17, 185:5,
 189:15, 190:8, 190:17, 192:7,
 193:16, 196:17, 198:1, 198:2,
 205:1, 221:4, 223:2, 225:17,

227:16, 230:5, 236:11,
 239:12, 243:10, 247:13
one-story [3] - 140:18, 142:6,
 151:19
one-third [1] - 149:4
ones [4] - 89:6, 90:15, 125:9,
 243:9
ongoing [3] - 6:4, 7:14, 7:18
open [54] - 11:13, 14:6, 16:8,
 20:19, 22:18, 29:17, 29:19,
 30:1, 30:8, 30:9, 30:12,
 30:17, 30:18, 32:10, 34:13,
 34:19, 46:4, 46:6, 48:13,
 49:13, 49:17, 49:18, 49:19,
 50:3, 51:13, 51:16, 51:19,
 54:2, 64:2, 68:13, 73:16,
 83:3, 83:18, 88:4, 100:3,
 104:8, 104:13, 104:16, 105:7,
 129:11, 131:9, 135:3, 135:7,
 137:7, 150:14, 154:19, 162:2,
 168:4, 168:8, 189:11, 190:15,
 193:6, 212:4, 229:19
opened [2] - 112:10, 168:11
opening [6] - 75:16, 112:4,
 126:5, 126:15, 137:5, 155:5
openings [1] - 125:8
openness [1] - 151:17
operated [2] - 2:9, 118:13
operating [1] - 18:15
opinion [3] - 13:5, 22:13,
 237:17
opportunities [5] - 41:2,
 41:5, 74:4, 118:11, 118:17
opportunity [22] - 8:6, 11:16,
 19:14, 20:11, 25:3, 28:18,
 40:8, 54:7, 56:11, 64:12,
 68:13, 69:2, 74:7, 81:10,
 115:7, 116:16, 154:11,
 155:12, 156:5, 187:16,

197:13, 206:7
oppose [1] - 98:14
opposed [2] - 78:2, 78:10
opposing [1] - 247:16
opposite [1] - 138:1
optimal [1] - 59:1
option [1] - 169:4
or.. [1] - 213:5
orange [3] - 222:13, 223:5, 236:3
oranges [1] - 194:15
order [6] - 46:9, 48:6, 59:15, 139:19, 162:8, 245:7
Ordinance [12] - 6:4, 7:17, 10:6, 10:10, 10:15, 11:8, 13:2, 16:18, 26:11, 114:19, 241:18, 243:17
ordinance [4] - 8:1, 83:14, 177:3, 244:12
ordinances [1] - 245:15
organization [1] - 208:5
organized [1] - 230:9
orienting [1] - 106:12
original [5] - 134:6, 158:6, 219:12, 225:3, 235:5
otherwise [1] - 198:15
ought [5] - 46:14, 47:7, 51:15, 83:19, 84:1
ourselves [2] - 66:17, 120:2
outcome [2] - 63:14, 63:16
outreach [1] - 88:12
outside [5] - 68:18, 70:8, 135:2, 143:17, 178:14
over-priced [1] - 73:18
over-scale [1] - 225:7
overall [8] - 45:19, 72:13, 82:11, 86:5, 86:14, 132:19, 156:13, 185:13

overhead [4] - 225:17, 225:18, 225:19, 226:3
overlay [1] - 161:6
Overlay [8] - 2:7, 4:18, 6:10, 114:18, 115:18, 119:12, 120:11, 208:6
overly [1] - 192:3
owe [2] - 84:14, 84:15
own [9] - 13:8, 34:2, 42:9, 78:14, 79:5, 79:14, 100:3, 131:4, 168:17
owned [6] - 13:9, 13:11, 118:14, 208:3, 209:10, 210:5
owner [8] - 81:12, 89:5, 111:18, 118:15, 119:7, 130:10, 163:5, 201:2
owners [3] - 117:15, 156:8
ownership [1] - 80:10
owning [1] - 80:13
owns [2] - 46:15, 46:16

P

p.m [2] - 1:4, 249:1
package [1] - 76:7
packaging [1] - 245:1
Paden [2] - 1:14, 123:8
PADEN [4] - 9:12, 123:1, 123:3, 219:16
Page [1] - 215:5
PAGE [3] - 2:2, 3:1, 250:4
paint [1] - 142:2
painted [2] - 196:12, 196:13
palate [1] - 183:19
pan [1] - 223:8
pancake [1] - 201:18
Pancakes [1] - 112:15
panel [7] - 142:1, 221:14, 222:13, 223:16, 225:10,

234:4, 234:9

paneling [1] - 141:11

panels [5] - 221:15, 221:19,
222:1, 227:19, 229:6

panning [1] - 235:19

paper [4] - 5:2, 67:9, 196:1,
196:8

parallel [1] - 85:13

parcel [8] - 19:13, 23:8,
36:14, 61:8, 61:9, 61:10,
61:16, 61:18

parcels [2] - 28:5, 95:14

Parisian [1] - 112:11

Park [10] - 50:6, 51:10,
60:17, 61:6, 75:19, 85:13,
85:14, 99:16, 99:17, 130:17

park [13] - 27:1, 27:10,
34:16, 34:19, 35:19, 36:2,
50:18, 66:12, 82:16, 83:3,
85:14, 103:8, 103:10

parking [35] - 2:11, 3:6,
4:16, 80:17, 110:6, 116:1,
117:19, 118:3, 118:9, 118:11,
118:19, 119:5, 119:14,
120:16, 120:17, 120:19,
127:5, 131:11, 160:10, 181:2,
181:4, 184:12, 198:19,
207:15, 207:19, 210:12,
210:18, 213:19, 214:8, 217:7,
228:19, 229:3, 231:5, 231:7

parks [2] - 34:15, 208:1

Parkway [1] - 6:12

part [23] - 7:8, 30:6, 34:1,
35:14, 38:14, 56:5, 58:13,
70:5, 78:16, 89:8, 90:17,
96:10, 96:16, 128:16, 153:16,
190:15, 194:13, 208:8, 227:6,
230:3, 236:10, 244:3, 247:1

partial [1] - 157:3

particular [9] - 4:17, 25:4,
46:17, 61:16, 62:2, 86:3,
166:8, 179:16, 243:14

particularly [9] - 93:10,
106:7, 119:17, 121:5, 153:17,
211:14, 216:19, 239:10,
242:10

partly [1] - 48:16

parts [2] - 61:12, 248:7

passage [1] - 227:7

passageway [1] - 231:1

passed [1] - 163:9

past [4] - 68:1, 113:9, 170:7,
207:8

pastiche [1] - 125:5

path [2] - 154:11, 154:19

pathway [2] - 31:7, 156:17

patrons [1] - 114:2

pattern [2] - 226:1, 230:10

paved [1] - 163:13

pavers [1] - 126:10

pay [1] - 17:19

paying [1] - 99:19

payment [2] - 116:4, 208:18

PB#243 [1] - 3:3

PB#300 [1] - 2:11

Peabody [1] - 108:5

peak [1] - 127:9

pedestrian [2] - 165:3, 226:9

peeking [2] - 137:14, 205:2

penetration [1] - 184:6

penthouse [3] - 221:5, 223:17,
231:19

people [84] - 11:15, 15:1,
15:7, 15:13, 16:11, 32:7,
32:11, 33:9, 33:11, 33:19,
34:18, 36:16, 36:17, 37:6,
37:14, 37:16, 41:3, 41:4,

41:11, 47:3, 49:15, 50:2,
 51:9, 52:2, 52:3, 52:4,
 52:11, 52:16, 53:2, 53:4,
 58:11, 64:5, 64:15, 67:14,
 69:10, 70:2, 71:15, 73:10,
 73:19, 74:1, 77:12, 78:9,
 79:15, 80:12, 83:4, 85:8,
 87:8, 88:12, 88:13, 95:7,
 95:16, 97:19, 101:1, 101:2,
 102:12, 103:2, 103:4, 103:5,
 103:6, 103:11, 103:13,
 103:16, 104:4, 105:1, 105:17,
 107:5, 107:10, 152:18, 155:8,
 155:14, 155:15, 155:18,
 156:5, 165:16, 166:7, 186:7,
 201:18, 214:5, 217:10, 240:2,
 242:1

per [1] - 146:6

perceive [1] - 82:12

percent [18] - 15:3, 15:4,
 15:5, 15:8, 15:9, 15:15,
 19:12, 27:5, 27:7, 42:11,
 42:12, 45:5, 61:6, 96:6,
 96:8, 116:5, 245:4

percentage [6] - 14:4, 14:5,
 14:7, 14:9, 15:16, 15:17

percentages [1] - 22:10

perfect [1] - 177:17

perfectly [3] - 51:4, 119:10,
 140:15

perhaps [7] - 13:3, 54:1,
 58:6, 103:11, 103:12, 108:9,
 116:11

period [3] - 117:11, 211:10,
 242:8

periodic [1] - 180:16

perking [1] - 183:11

Permit [20] - 2:11, 3:6, 26:9,
 110:5, 116:4, 130:10, 197:5,

207:12, 210:12, 213:19,
 216:10, 218:3, 218:18,
 244:19, 245:7, 245:8, 245:9,
 245:10, 245:12, 245:13

permit [6] - 163:7, 219:2,
 219:4, 224:3, 226:18, 233:14

permits [3] - 220:13, 228:9,
 229:13

permitted [3] - 248:5, 248:7,
 248:8

permitting [2] - 198:15, 201:4

person [1] - 49:2

personal [1] - 198:7

personally [2] - 25:2, 26:14

perspective [14] - 20:1, 20:2,
 20:3, 22:14, 46:3, 87:15,
 178:8, 179:17, 181:13,
 198:16, 205:15, 209:14,
 221:1, 232:19

perspectives [7] - 190:3,
 190:11, 211:5, 220:11, 221:1,
 239:4, 239:7

Peter [12] - 104:17, 111:5,
 124:4, 124:5, 149:13, 153:8,
 162:3, 171:11, 181:10,
 185:17, 192:16

PETER [45] - 124:3, 124:9,
 144:15, 145:15, 145:19,
 146:4, 147:4, 147:7, 147:11,
 147:16, 149:4, 149:10, 150:2,
 151:1, 153:10, 158:5, 158:8,
 158:11, 158:17, 159:3, 165:9,
 172:5, 172:9, 172:12, 176:4,
 181:18, 182:4, 185:10,
 185:19, 187:4, 187:17, 188:5,
 188:14, 188:18, 189:4, 191:2,
 191:7, 192:18, 194:9, 196:14,
 203:3, 203:7, 203:10, 203:14,
 204:7

peter [1] - 152:7
petition [8] - 10:17, 11:1, 12:8, 15:14, 56:5, 74:16, 87:15, 94:8
Petition [5] - 2:6, 6:2, 6:3, 10:5, 15:19
pharmacy [1] - 72:19
phase [1] - 107:2
phasing [2] - 6:15, 6:18
photo [1] - 244:14
photos [1] - 165:19
phrase [1] - 219:1
physically [1] - 167:4
picture [6] - 95:6, 106:15, 108:16, 128:2, 146:18, 196:6
pictures [1] - 126:13
piece [10] - 36:8, 86:2, 98:7, 98:8, 153:4, 171:3, 223:16, 233:3
pieces [3] - 69:18, 82:8, 191:17
pinned [1] - 26:16
Pizza [1] - 112:5
place [34] - 5:6, 10:9, 33:11, 34:15, 34:18, 34:19, 35:6, 35:11, 35:15, 37:3, 52:2, 61:15, 73:9, 73:17, 73:18, 82:15, 86:12, 97:4, 103:15, 104:4, 104:7, 105:16, 108:14, 114:8, 150:3, 150:4, 160:15, 166:16, 174:10, 199:7, 204:17, 239:13, 245:6
Place [2] - 102:3, 152:13
placed [2] - 121:9, 135:1
places [6] - 52:13, 67:17, 71:11, 236:13, 239:4, 240:1
plan [22] - 21:17, 48:4, 54:18, 57:14, 89:13, 106:17,

107:1, 107:16, 108:10, 111:16, 111:19, 122:19, 131:6, 148:16, 149:11, 149:13, 152:8, 188:6, 193:1, 224:1, 231:10, 232:12
plane [1] - 205:13
Planned [1] - 2:6
planners [2] - 38:6, 38:13
planning [11] - 18:1, 19:9, 19:11, 22:3, 31:11, 41:17, 46:3, 79:4, 86:6, 86:14, 241:15
PLANNING [1] - 1:1
Planning [22] - 2:6, 2:9, 4:4, 4:14, 7:13, 8:18, 10:5, 23:18, 31:8, 55:9, 73:13, 110:4, 115:3, 160:11, 207:11, 207:12, 211:2, 216:7, 219:3, 222:4, 245:18, 248:19
plans [3] - 129:4, 218:2, 237:10
plant [1] - 228:13
play [4] - 16:3, 73:16, 125:19, 135:15
played [1] - 135:17
playing [1] - 18:1
plays [2] - 45:15, 108:11
plaza [9] - 22:15, 22:19, 36:1, 37:2, 67:13, 69:6, 69:17, 70:15, 83:4
Plaza [1] - 138:15
plazas [1] - 66:14
pleasant [1] - 170:1
Pleasant [2] - 76:18, 77:3
plenty [1] - 87:13
plenum [1] - 229:2
plus [2] - 61:16, 148:2
point [24] - 13:10, 23:4,

50:10, 51:11, 53:6, 79:8,
97:9, 97:13, 125:19, 134:4,
146:5, 153:2, 164:7, 167:12,
169:10, 174:5, 181:9, 181:19,
184:17, 190:8, 198:2, 201:2,
232:8, 233:18

Point [1] - 6:16

pointed [2] - 97:5, 248:4

pointing [1] - 134:14

points [2] - 95:7, 107:8

policy [1] - 72:16

politics [2] - 21:8, 44:3

Pomfret's [1] - 112:11

pompous [1] - 125:11

popularity [1] - 70:3

populated [1] - 239:5

populations [1] - 15:11

porch [1] - 129:12

portion [3] - 42:11, 181:15,
248:5

portions [1] - 23:19

posed [1] - 59:10

position [2] - 33:16, 90:9

positioning [1] - 150:1

positive [9] - 7:2, 63:8,
63:13, 63:14, 63:16, 70:18,
90:19, 156:15, 240:7

possibilities [1] - 21:18

possibility [7] - 154:2,
162:17, 163:19, 164:7, 166:6,
168:9, 217:3

possible [9] - 13:5, 48:11,
121:10, 186:13, 187:9,
187:10, 217:3, 217:6, 231:18

possibly [3] - 36:6, 161:13,
236:18

post [1] - 125:5

post-modern [1] - 125:5

posted [1] - 109:14

posterity [1] - 19:19

postponed [1] - 105:4

posts [1] - 208:9

potential [5] - 7:19, 72:13,
81:12, 87:15, 182:16

potentially [3] - 5:5, 156:10,
156:15

pound [1] - 21:3

practicable [2] - 187:10,
187:12

precisely [3] - 44:8, 188:9,
200:16

preclude [1] - 63:5

predecessors [1] - 105:15

predisposed [1] - 45:11

predominate [1] - 127:12

preexisting [1] - 244:4

prefer [2] - 37:1, 173:1

preferably [1] - 207:19

preference [1] - 234:12

preferences [1] - 45:18

preferred [2] - 162:6, 236:12

premise [5] - 18:5, 18:16,
18:17, 39:6, 77:15

premises [1] - 245:5

prepainted [1] - 146:10

prepared [4] - 10:16, 123:14,
201:12, 202:9

present [4] - 28:19, 29:2,
111:19, 115:17

presentation [6] - 55:8,
55:10, 111:6, 135:5, 144:17,
220:17

presented [2] - 128:14, 237:10

presenting [1] - 66:8

presents [2] - 115:13, 200:3

preservation [1] - 212:5
preserved [2] - 171:4, 211:9
pressure [2] - 21:7, 143:6
presumably [2] - 13:10, 77:11
presume [2] - 104:9, 111:8
presumed [2] - 46:10, 48:7
presumption [1] - 197:4
pretty [9] - 10:19, 36:5,
 37:5, 38:18, 61:17, 99:9,
 101:7, 163:18, 185:9
prevent [1] - 175:12
previous [4] - 64:6, 74:17,
 85:3, 135:5
previously [3] - 71:14,
 111:13, 178:5
price [5] - 17:18, 18:6, 20:5,
 48:7, 48:18
priced [1] - 73:18
primarily [2] - 94:12, 189:14
primary [1] - 136:10
principal [1] - 171:18
principals [1] - 36:10
principles [1] - 177:5
print [1] - 244:13
printed [3] - 196:8, 220:5,
 220:7
priorities [4] - 27:14, 90:2,
 93:12, 210:17
prioritize [2] - 13:16, 108:3
priority [2] - 72:10, 89:9
private [5] - 13:12, 19:4,
 162:2, 209:1, 209:9
privately [1] - 210:5
problem [8] - 35:13, 91:18,
 131:13, 167:5, 168:12,
 196:16, 236:18, 242:15
problematic [1] - 157:18
problems [5] - 28:18, 29:1,

156:6, 171:7, 213:18
procedurally [1] - 12:5
proceed [1] - 233:14
proceedings [1] - 251:8
process [25] - 18:2, 18:12,
 18:14, 19:9, 19:12, 20:8,
 21:9, 27:16, 31:10, 50:5,
 56:11, 58:14, 58:19, 82:4,
 86:6, 107:1, 107:8, 107:9,
 115:6, 115:8, 117:14, 157:16,
 161:3, 193:11, 211:12
produced [2] - 68:2, 245:4
productive [1] - 101:16
products [1] - 244:17
Professional [1] - 251:12
project [12] - 5:6, 33:6,
 34:13, 58:5, 107:12, 108:8,
 111:5, 113:6, 115:16, 161:8,
 173:18, 193:15
projected [10] - 30:4, 222:19,
 223:6, 223:7, 224:17, 236:3,
 236:4, 236:6, 237:18, 238:1
projecting [1] - 190:13
projection [1] - 236:17
projector [1] - 220:2
projects [6] - 87:2, 101:5,
 161:11, 207:6, 207:9, 212:16
prominent [2] - 166:14, 200:2
promote [1] - 14:15
prompted [1] - 117:14
properly [1] - 189:12
properties [2] - 26:6, 165:12
Properties [1] - 93:7
Property [1] - 118:14
property [14] - 36:8, 36:9,
 81:13, 89:5, 111:8, 114:17,
 117:15, 119:16, 131:19,
 156:8, 181:4, 193:2, 209:1,

209:9

proponent [2] - 178:10, 181:1
proportion [2] - 85:6, 179:10
proportionately [2] - 205:12, 220:4
proportions [1] - 125:2
proposal [12] - 28:12, 31:19, 32:4, 46:19, 56:16, 113:12, 156:18, 171:4, 208:14, 243:14, 246:10, 247:2
proposals [2] - 24:5, 73:15
propose [1] - 90:5
proposed [9] - 12:17, 69:8, 83:14, 115:10, 121:18, 128:14, 132:19, 179:12, 237:11
proposing [4] - 129:14, 130:12, 144:5, 226:5
prospective [1] - 138:11
protect [2] - 132:11, 132:12
protection [1] - 155:4
proud [1] - 112:14
provide [15] - 14:19, 30:9, 31:6, 41:1, 52:6, 122:1, 131:12, 162:2, 162:18, 187:11, 222:2, 223:1, 223:3, 227:5, 244:11
provided [4] - 213:16, 214:14, 214:19, 245:3
provides [1] - 117:1
providing [5] - 30:13, 111:6, 151:2, 175:11, 239:16
provision [2] - 115:19, 207:19
provisions [1] - 6:11
proximate [1] - 119:1
proximity [1] - 118:12
psychologist [1] - 169:15
Public [3] - 2:5, 251:5,

251:14

PUBLIC [1] - 10:2
public [60] - 10:4, 11:13, 11:14, 11:19, 13:1, 14:3, 27:1, 31:10, 32:13, 33:19, 46:5, 56:1, 64:2, 66:14, 68:11, 73:13, 77:11, 77:17, 94:4, 97:17, 100:10, 100:14, 100:15, 100:16, 107:8, 107:9, 109:12, 117:5, 118:8, 152:4, 155:6, 156:3, 156:9, 156:14, 162:15, 163:4, 163:13, 163:17, 164:6, 165:12, 166:4, 177:9, 179:13, 180:7, 180:9, 181:12, 181:16, 191:8, 192:17, 207:19, 208:1, 208:4, 209:11, 210:15, 210:18, 211:12, 212:4, 212:15
public's [1] - 17:6
PUD [4] - 2:7, 2:8, 56:16, 219:12
PUD-KS [2] - 2:7, 2:8
Pudding [2] - 130:7, 138:18
pull [4] - 135:10, 202:14, 229:17
pulled [1] - 241:11
pulling [1] - 192:4
pumpkin [7] - 186:19, 187:1, 187:5, 200:1, 200:3, 213:1
purchase [5] - 17:18, 18:5, 20:5, 48:7, 195:6
purpose [3] - 41:19, 79:7, 234:15
pursue [2] - 11:6, 111:19
push [3] - 26:3, 205:14, 227:2
pushed [1] - 48:5
put [11] - 8:14, 28:12, 73:8, 84:5, 90:12, 149:6, 152:8,

168:13, 207:13, 220:9, 225:2

putrid [1] - 153:5

putting [4] - 118:6, 151:7,
217:4, 236:7

puzzle [1] - 69:19

q

quality [6] - 83:17, 91:3,
91:10, 91:11, 92:1, 180:6

quarry [1] - 195:6

quarter [2] - 178:16, 178:18

questions [14] - 7:12, 16:13,
89:14, 122:18, 144:16, 145:9,
147:1, 160:5, 164:2, 175:5,
237:14, 246:9, 246:12, 246:14

quick [1] - 147:2

quickly [4] - 10:17, 20:9,
20:10, 68:1

QUINN [45] - 124:3, 124:9,
144:15, 145:15, 145:19,
146:4, 147:4, 147:7, 147:11,
147:16, 149:4, 149:10, 150:2,
151:1, 153:10, 158:5, 158:8,
158:11, 158:17, 159:3, 165:9,
172:5, 172:9, 172:12, 176:4,
181:18, 182:4, 185:10,
185:19, 187:4, 187:17, 188:5,
188:14, 188:18, 189:4, 191:2,
191:7, 192:18, 194:9, 196:14,
203:3, 203:7, 203:10, 203:14,
204:7

Quinn [7] - 111:6, 121:5,
122:19, 124:4, 124:5, 174:8

quite [16] - 21:16, 29:13,
49:10, 55:13, 125:1, 138:3,
154:4, 156:15, 161:11, 164:5,
165:5, 172:4, 176:3, 176:4,
182:14, 202:3

quote [1] - 69:15

R

rack [1] - 229:5

racks [1] - 229:5

RAFFERTY [44] - 110:15, 123:7,
147:5, 147:9, 147:15, 148:1,
148:5, 148:9, 164:18, 165:10,
167:3, 167:6, 167:11, 167:18,
168:1, 168:5, 168:15, 174:4,
187:15, 190:19, 195:2, 195:5,
196:17, 198:13, 199:3, 199:5,
199:15, 200:19, 201:17,
204:8, 204:12, 205:1, 205:6,
206:6, 206:12, 206:18,
209:13, 209:18, 211:18,
213:11, 218:5, 219:14,
219:17, 235:1

Rafferty [2] - 110:18, 218:6

rail [1] - 143:12

rain [1] - 139:12

raise [2] - 13:19, 20:19

raised [2] - 94:4, 164:7

raising [1] - 11:5

Raj [3] - 154:6, 154:15, 168:8

ramp [2] - 228:19, 229:19

ran [1] - 235:13

range [7] - 60:11, 61:14,
61:15, 122:8, 145:1, 197:9,
245:14

rapid [1] - 67:18

rapidly [1] - 69:18

rate [4] - 28:4, 86:17,
114:12, 116:12

rather [7] - 30:1, 67:9,
94:12, 159:8, 170:3, 199:9,
208:18

ratio [3] - 67:3, 96:4, 220:2

re [2] - 133:1, 133:6

re-cladding [2] - 133:1, 133:6

reach [1] - 121:15
reached [1] - 198:1
react [1] - 24:13
reaction [1] - 122:18
read [6] - 5:2, 147:13,
 224:16, 225:16, 236:1, 250:11
reading [3] - 204:12, 223:10,
 250:2
reads [1] - 223:6
ready [2] - 153:18, 213:15
real [8] - 5:6, 7:2, 7:12,
 97:4, 206:4, 239:9, 240:17,
 242:14
Real [2] - 218:7, 232:10
realistic [1] - 73:8
reality [1] - 24:13
realize [1] - 172:3
realized [2] - 48:17, 125:4
really [69] - 18:14, 19:9,
 19:13, 19:14, 22:15, 38:6,
 39:17, 40:13, 43:17, 51:2,
 55:4, 56:13, 56:18, 57:5,
 57:6, 57:14, 57:17, 58:12,
 62:14, 63:4, 63:10, 77:5,
 77:8, 80:1, 85:5, 86:15,
 92:11, 94:6, 94:19, 95:2,
 95:9, 95:11, 95:19, 98:12,
 98:14, 99:10, 102:10, 102:12,
 104:12, 105:13, 106:5,
 107:10, 115:12, 117:4, 117:8,
 118:1, 130:19, 132:11,
 146:14, 152:19, 155:1,
 155:15, 156:2, 156:15,
 156:17, 173:11, 183:7, 184:1,
 184:7, 186:16, 187:2, 193:6,
 200:9, 223:3, 226:3, 235:14,
 236:19, 242:6
realm [4] - 73:14, 163:13,

163:17, 212:15
Realm [1] - 143:15
rear [1] - 147:16
rearview [2] - 138:16, 142:4
reason [11] - 46:8, 97:3,
 105:13, 119:8, 122:14,
 132:10, 235:17, 236:2, 236:7,
 241:11, 250:3
REASON [6] - 250:5, 250:6,
 250:7, 250:8, 250:9, 250:10
reasonable [2] - 42:4, 118:12
reasonably [3] - 60:5, 61:14,
 122:7
reasons [8] - 38:15, 97:1,
 111:18, 155:3, 223:2, 235:12,
 235:18, 236:11
rebalancing [1] - 33:17
recede [1] - 161:16
received [4] - 13:1, 97:10,
 160:2, 210:11
recently [2] - 113:5, 117:7
recess [8] - 110:2, 125:13,
 158:15, 158:19, 172:1,
 217:17, 222:7, 222:15
recessed [4] - 126:2, 137:5,
 150:12, 150:16
recognize [1] - 63:2
recognizes [1] - 171:7
recognizing [1] - 123:15
recollection [2] - 194:18,
 195:9
recommend [2] - 202:15, 214:1
recommendation [7] - 62:4,
 202:14, 217:6, 247:15,
 247:18, 248:4, 248:17
recommendations [2] - 8:9,
 8:12
recommended [1] - 171:9

reconfigured [1] - 224:7
reconsider [1] - 13:3
RECORD [1] - 1:18
record [6] - 75:13, 101:19,
 110:17, 123:11, 250:13, 251:8
recreated [1] - 137:5
recreation [1] - 245:9
recycling [1] - 132:8
Red [2] - 130:6, 208:8
redesign [3] - 173:6, 176:7
Redevelopment [1] - 93:4
redevelopment [1] - 186:14
reduce [5] - 3:6, 132:16,
 203:1, 203:12, 231:5
referred [1] - 165:13
referring [2] - 228:2, 234:7
refiled [3] - 11:1, 87:16,
 94:6
refiling [1] - 93:11
refinement [3] - 55:18, 56:9,
 56:16
refining [1] - 55:14
refinished [1] - 137:9
reflect [3] - 72:7, 95:18,
 210:17
reflects [3] - 23:5, 40:16,
 220:12
regard [5] - 10:7, 49:12,
 212:18, 216:19, 237:12
regardless [2] - 67:10, 69:6
Registered [1] - 251:12
regular [3] - 72:1, 72:8,
 95:19
rehabilitated [1] - 141:19
reinvent [1] - 69:2
reiterate [1] - 85:5
relate [2] - 11:7, 217:1

related [3] - 8:2, 44:14,
 160:10
relates [3] - 149:14, 158:13,
 178:6
relationship [5] - 63:1, 63:8,
 63:12, 189:13, 234:3
relative [4] - 149:13, 177:14,
 181:3, 205:10
relatively [2] - 31:9, 200:4
relax [1] - 70:10
release [1] - 157:2
relevant [2] - 151:15, 153:3
reliable [1] - 41:14
relief [7] - 2:12, 110:7,
 115:15, 160:7, 160:9, 197:4,
 243:5
relocate [1] - 43:12
remain [5] - 73:7, 123:16,
 223:18, 247:1, 247:12
remains [1] - 210:15
remarks [1] - 75:16
remember [5] - 22:12, 44:17,
 128:13, 218:9, 240:5
remembering [1] - 240:6
remembers [1] - 238:15
remind [3] - 15:13, 97:15,
 99:15
reminder [1] - 160:8
remodeled [1] - 185:3
removed [2] - 223:1, 235:11
render [1] - 196:16
rendered [1] - 225:3
rendering [13] - 193:19,
 194:3, 194:5, 195:19, 196:6,
 196:7, 203:2, 221:10, 225:13,
 230:7, 230:16, 232:18, 239:18
renderings [6] - 193:14,
 194:12, 194:19, 222:12,

230:4, 240:15
rental [1] - 244:15
repair [3] - 3:6, 246:17,
 246:19
repairs [2] - 117:16, 245:11
repeat [1] - 181:7
replace [1] - 200:14
report [2] - 93:8, 246:1
REPORTER [8] - 65:3, 65:9,
 76:19, 77:4, 81:5, 81:7,
 102:4, 251:17
Reporter [2] - 251:12, 251:13
REPORTERS [1] - 1:18
represent [1] - 94:11
representation [1] - 204:19
representative [2] - 8:18,
 247:4
representatives [1] - 43:15
represented [2] - 71:11, 72:4
representing [1] - 69:9
REPRODUCTION [1] - 251:16
request [1] - 177:15
requested [2] - 160:8, 197:5
require [7] - 115:15, 120:4,
 120:5, 123:19, 146:11,
 164:13, 245:13
required [2] - 213:12, 217:7
requirement [7] - 3:7, 119:17,
 120:9, 147:3, 148:17, 149:1,
 190:16
requirements [11] - 2:11,
 2:12, 7:16, 110:6, 110:7,
 116:1, 116:3, 122:2, 169:2,
 177:18, 222:2
Research [3] - 2:8, 60:17,
 61:5
reside [1] - 75:14
Residence [1] - 244:4

residences [1] - 130:14
resident [2] - 152:15, 178:17
residential [21] - 2:12, 2:13,
 14:4, 27:5, 34:4, 42:11,
 49:11, 53:7, 59:16, 61:7,
 86:16, 96:6, 110:8, 110:10,
 136:13, 148:10, 169:2,
 184:14, 185:4, 216:4
residents [16] - 39:2, 39:5,
 59:19, 66:17, 68:10, 69:4,
 71:1, 95:19, 98:12, 99:10,
 100:4, 118:18, 122:16,
 132:12, 133:18, 162:16
resources [1] - 212:5
RESPECT [1] - 251:16
respective [2] - 98:1, 178:2
respond [1] - 90:4
responds [1] - 161:8
response [1] - 174:8
responsibility [2] - 61:15,
 61:18
rest [9] - 47:13, 61:2, 73:6,
 83:11, 83:18, 144:17, 159:14,
 186:9, 205:17
restaurant [7] - 112:4,
 112:10, 112:19, 125:17,
 129:11, 202:6, 246:15
Restaurant [1] - 130:6
restaurants [8] - 53:3,
 112:16, 112:18, 113:19,
 114:1, 125:15, 244:10
rested [1] - 124:1
restoration [6] - 180:12,
 182:16, 208:2, 210:4, 210:14,
 214:3
restore [1] - 217:8
restored [2] - 182:8, 211:9
results [1] - 214:8

retail [21] - 2:15, 7:1, 16:19, 17:2, 53:8, 59:14, 59:16, 59:18, 60:1, 66:12, 72:14, 83:3, 84:2, 86:17, 97:4, 110:12, 129:6, 130:4, 177:7, 244:13, 245:5

retained [2] - 59:6, 131:9

retaining [6] - 154:2, 155:7, 155:13, 155:16, 156:11, 177:7

return [2] - 110:1, 222:8

reveal [1] - 237:12

reveals [1] - 221:17

revenue [1] - 70:4

reversed [1] - 83:15

revert [2] - 235:6, 235:7

reverted [1] - 224:10

review [10] - 115:9, 115:16, 161:3, 174:3, 199:2, 213:3, 213:8, 213:13, 225:12, 233:13

reviewed [7] - 15:12, 74:14, 123:10, 173:18, 215:16, 215:17, 219:6

reviewing [1] - 108:9

reviews [1] - 153:11

revisit [1] - 192:7

revisited [1] - 226:19

revolve [1] - 79:13

rework [1] - 227:1

Reynolds [1] - 138:19

rezoning [2] - 7:15, 103:19

RFP [1] - 90:4

rhythm [2] - 184:11, 230:11

right-hand [1] - 232:19

rightly [1] - 156:7

ringed/runged [1] - 51:12

ripple [1] - 107:4

RIS [1] - 93:19

risk [1] - 179:2

river [3] - 103:12, 136:11, 151:3

roadmap [1] - 8:13

Robert [1] - 111:18

ROBERTS [5] - 160:4, 207:4, 214:19, 233:12, 241:8

Roberts [3] - 1:14, 197:1, 210:17

robust [1] - 161:3

Rogers [3] - 50:6, 75:19, 99:16

role [3] - 17:19, 89:4, 97:18

roles [1] - 31:8

Roman [1] - 225:8

roof [3] - 140:3, 205:5, 231:19

Room [1] - 1:6

room [2] - 30:2, 243:15

roughly [4] - 5:3, 29:4, 60:9, 60:10

round [2] - 37:18, 45:3

row [2] - 111:5, 218:9

rules [1] - 215:11

running [2] - 42:13, 221:17

runs [1] - 176:14

RUSSEL [1] - 228:15

Russell [1] - 1:11

RUSSELL [46] - 27:15, 146:2, 148:15, 149:1, 149:8, 169:5, 171:19, 172:8, 172:18, 173:4, 175:9, 176:13, 188:2, 188:12, 189:2, 193:12, 194:10, 195:18, 200:6, 200:13, 201:19, 202:15, 209:12, 209:15, 211:7, 212:10, 213:7, 215:9, 216:15, 217:13, 220:5, 225:5, 225:13, 227:12, 229:8, 229:12, 231:7, 232:7, 237:7,

237:15, 238:1, 238:6, 238:15,
241:3, 248:3, 248:11

s

S-C-H-W-A-R-T-Z [1] - 65:16

S-T-E-P-H-E-N [1] - 89:2

sad [1] - 178:16

salary [1] - 49:2

sale [1] - 245:13

sales [2] - 244:15, 244:16

SAME [1] - 251:16

sample [2] - 141:14, 146:1

samples [1] - 133:12

SANZONE [2] - 87:10, 87:11

Sanzone [1] - 87:10

sat [1] - 143:17

satisfy [1] - 39:18

satisfying [1] - 156:3

saw [4] - 113:5, 131:16,
165:18, 235:1

scale [12] - 37:6, 107:13,
136:14, 139:15, 159:5,
171:14, 191:18, 225:7,
239:16, 240:17, 242:18, 243:1

scape [2] - 22:19, 57:1

schedule [2] - 6:15, 89:13

scheduled [1] - 9:6

scheme [3] - 30:4, 30:5, 30:6

schemes [1] - 191:6

School [8] - 107:19, 113:6,
129:17, 137:19, 139:2, 151:4,
154:8, 175:19

school [3] - 52:17, 77:11,
169:15

schools [2] - 52:13, 77:17

SCHWARTZ [3] - 65:14, 66:4,
71:5

Schwartz [2] - 65:15, 66:8

screen [15] - 139:12, 139:18,
141:1, 142:10, 144:2, 194:16,
195:13, 202:5, 202:18, 204:3,
204:16, 204:17, 204:19,
232:1, 232:3

screen-type [1] - 139:12

screening [1] - 203:7

sculptural [2] - 221:8, 221:12

Season [1] - 235:14

seated [1] - 111:4

seating [1] - 141:4

second [22] - 8:8, 9:18,
37:18, 59:10, 85:2, 91:7,
94:9, 106:11, 108:16, 119:14,
122:5, 125:9, 125:16, 129:9,
162:3, 162:13, 170:10,
174:14, 174:15, 223:14,
241:2, 247:19

Second [2] - 1:6, 220:19

second-floor [1] - 162:13

secondary [1] - 125:9

Section [7] - 2:6, 2:12, 2:13,
10:6, 110:6, 110:8, 216:10

section [3] - 36:13, 140:18,
142:6

secure [2] - 132:9, 169:19

security [3] - 131:13, 132:16,
155:4

see [96] - 13:7, 14:1, 14:6,
22:16, 27:1, 27:3, 28:4,
30:2, 33:19, 37:12, 40:5,
45:13, 45:14, 46:12, 47:4,
48:10, 56:6, 70:12, 79:1,
88:7, 91:5, 94:12, 95:4,
97:2, 116:7, 116:16, 117:10,
121:7, 124:10, 127:4, 127:17,
128:9, 131:16, 133:8, 136:8,
136:18, 137:14, 138:16,

139:7, 139:8, 140:13, 141:10,
 145:5, 150:3, 150:6, 155:14,
 156:5, 158:12, 172:6, 173:1,
 173:4, 182:10, 185:3, 185:14,
 185:16, 185:18, 186:6,
 186:16, 188:15, 192:19,
 193:1, 196:1, 199:9, 201:6,
 201:19, 202:7, 203:11,
 203:15, 203:17, 204:5,
 204:11, 204:16, 204:17,
 205:2, 205:4, 206:3, 213:4,
 219:4, 221:10, 221:17,
 222:10, 222:11, 222:18,
 223:12, 224:15, 226:13,
 229:8, 230:17, 233:1, 239:10,
 239:13, 240:10, 240:19,
 242:14

seeing [7] - 144:10, 146:16,
 183:6, 189:13, 214:6, 233:8,
 240:12

seek [1] - 243:6

seem [2] - 53:5, 198:10

seemingly [1] - 248:7

segment [1] - 39:10

selected [1] - 30:5

selling [1] - 62:1

senators [1] - 43:15

send [2] - 77:10, 77:17

sending [1] - 52:17

sense [10] - 82:13, 82:14,
 139:15, 150:12, 155:13,
 177:17, 180:15, 191:18,
 202:13, 224:10

sensible [1] - 51:4

sent [2] - 101:11, 247:5

separated [1] - 149:3

September [1] - 10:18

series [2] - 114:12, 226:4

serious [2] - 125:3, 192:4

serve [5] - 33:15, 41:19,
 114:2, 136:6, 150:9

served [1] - 112:3

serves [1] - 168:16

services [1] - 60:2

serving [1] - 15:10

session [1] - 64:6

set [14] - 55:1, 58:4, 90:1,
 110:4, 150:13, 160:19, 179:9,
 187:17, 219:2, 219:4, 224:3,
 226:18, 251:7, 251:10

setback [36] - 119:15, 119:17,
 119:18, 120:1, 120:4, 120:5,
 120:9, 139:18, 147:3, 147:6,
 149:14, 149:18, 161:13,
 171:10, 171:14, 172:17,
 173:2, 174:16, 177:2, 177:4,
 177:10, 177:15, 178:7, 179:2,
 179:7, 184:13, 184:15, 189:3,
 193:7, 193:9, 198:19, 202:11,
 204:10, 204:14, 205:11, 216:3

setbacks [4] - 115:5, 148:11,
 160:10, 178:1

sets [1] - 223:15

setting [1] - 161:14

seven [3] - 50:13, 123:13,
 148:2

seven-story [1] - 50:13

several [6] - 12:18, 24:5,
 128:15, 129:15, 198:10,
 244:18

shade [1] - 36:4

shades [1] - 136:4

shading [1] - 223:1

shadow [1] - 144:11

shadows [1] - 83:12

shaft [1] - 229:14

shame [2] - 153:15, 171:2
shape [5] - 7:4, 200:18, 221:7, 221:8, 221:12
shaped [2] - 101:14, 169:9
shapes [2] - 69:7, 125:6
shaping [1] - 99:10
share [1] - 117:13
shared [5] - 42:9, 107:18, 115:2, 117:12, 175:1
sharing [2] - 79:13, 117:16
shed [2] - 132:3, 170:16
sheet [4] - 64:3, 65:5, 250:3, 250:3
SHEET [1] - 250:1
shelter [1] - 132:4
shoji [1] - 202:5
shop [2] - 246:18, 246:19
shopping [2] - 52:5, 72:11
shops [6] - 53:3, 53:4, 66:12, 82:17, 130:4, 244:13
short [4] - 62:1, 110:2, 131:11, 208:1
Short [1] - 217:17
short-term [2] - 131:11, 208:1
Shorthand [1] - 251:13
shot [2] - 99:10, 100:4
shots [1] - 100:5
show [15] - 10:1, 101:4, 101:5, 123:11, 126:13, 133:12, 135:8, 144:18, 203:1, 217:16, 224:11, 225:14, 229:14, 241:7
Show [1] - 95:5
showed [2] - 222:17, 224:3
showing [4] - 124:15, 144:3, 221:3, 228:9
shown [4] - 34:7, 139:3, 145:18, 179:12

shows [5] - 34:13, 130:8, 176:13, 178:18, 220:3
shut [2] - 100:17, 135:3
shutter [4] - 134:19, 139:8, 141:6, 143:8
shutters [8] - 135:8, 135:9, 136:15, 137:15, 138:4, 142:3, 162:4, 202:3
side [54] - 14:11, 38:12, 82:1, 83:6, 83:8, 83:9, 83:10, 83:16, 83:19, 84:9, 104:19, 121:12, 121:13, 126:4, 126:8, 129:6, 131:11, 136:16, 140:14, 141:15, 141:16, 142:5, 145:13, 148:6, 149:17, 149:18, 150:15, 151:8, 151:9, 151:16, 151:17, 154:16, 162:14, 163:9, 167:9, 167:14, 176:8, 179:1, 181:13, 181:15, 185:16, 185:17, 187:3, 188:13, 188:15, 190:18, 220:10, 222:3, 222:9, 232:19, 237:18, 238:14, 239:14
side-by-side [1] - 220:10
side-view [1] - 141:15
Sidel [1] - 112:10
sides [7] - 31:5, 84:2, 132:7, 133:3, 136:5, 162:7, 237:16
sidewalk [7] - 118:6, 175:12, 176:2, 176:15, 177:12, 206:11, 224:5
sidewalks [1] - 208:9
Sieniewicz [2] - 1:11, 8:17
SIENIEWICZ [9] - 149:12, 150:18, 152:1, 152:6, 176:17, 188:16, 200:11, 205:10, 211:16
sight [2] - 138:11, 169:11

Sign [1] - 250:3
sign [4] - 64:3, 65:5, 137:8, 137:9
sign-up [2] - 64:3, 65:5
signage [1] - 135:1
signature [4] - 23:7, 86:13, 91:15, 91:17
significance [2] - 88:9, 117:17
significant [7] - 6:18, 31:4, 34:13, 61:17, 62:6, 83:2, 171:15
significantly [1] - 172:4
silly [1] - 41:16
similar [4] - 59:6, 142:14, 221:3, 224:14
similarly [2] - 119:3, 228:5
simple [1] - 81:15
simply [4] - 108:13, 179:16, 182:15, 193:17
simultaneously [1] - 36:7
single [2] - 49:2, 223:6
sister [1] - 173:17
sit [4] - 40:7, 129:18, 130:19, 139:3
site [57] - 10:7, 13:7, 14:5, 14:6, 19:5, 21:2, 21:12, 25:9, 28:2, 28:15, 29:5, 30:10, 31:3, 42:12, 45:13, 46:2, 47:12, 47:13, 48:11, 57:4, 57:12, 57:18, 61:6, 63:6, 66:10, 67:1, 68:12, 69:1, 70:2, 70:6, 71:3, 73:15, 77:16, 83:6, 83:7, 83:10, 83:11, 83:18, 83:19, 84:10, 84:16, 86:13, 88:5, 88:9, 90:5, 94:13, 94:15, 104:3, 118:12, 124:17, 131:6,

169:1, 177:6, 193:1, 210:6, 225:11
site's [1] - 193:2
sites [1] - 61:11
sits [3] - 129:19, 138:9, 140:11
situation [3] - 24:3, 93:6, 120:2
six [5] - 8:5, 50:13, 139:17, 229:14, 231:6
six-by-ten [1] - 229:14
six-foot [1] - 139:17
Sixth [2] - 31:1, 31:2
size [2] - 115:14, 145:1
sized [1] - 122:7
sizes [2] - 69:7, 125:6
sketching [1] - 179:8
skew [1] - 59:8
slabs [1] - 184:8
slats [5] - 139:9, 141:6, 143:10, 226:4, 226:6
sleeker [1] - 237:6
sleekness [2] - 238:10, 238:11
slender [1] - 34:7
sliced [1] - 59:2
slide [1] - 136:2
slides [1] - 136:9
slight [3] - 45:4, 106:8, 165:6
slightly [6] - 91:12, 124:16, 127:9, 140:6, 178:9, 232:18
slits [1] - 230:12
slope [3] - 138:3, 165:4, 165:7
slot [1] - 234:8
small [11] - 6:17, 22:7, 85:13, 118:5, 122:10, 137:8, 240:7, 242:10, 242:18, 243:1,

243:3

smaller [3] - 47:12, 131:4,
145:7

smallest [1] - 145:3

smart [1] - 36:5

smooth [1] - 221:19

soft [1] - 206:18

soften [1] - 206:16

sold [1] - 245:4

solicit [1] - 115:9

soliciting [1] - 114:10

solid [2] - 39:17, 146:14

solution [2] - 173:13, 205:17

someday [1] - 182:7

someone [4] - 48:19, 107:18,
109:9, 170:2

Somerville [1] - 108:5

sometime [2] - 225:11, 232:12

sometimes [3] - 186:6, 207:9,
235:3

somewhat [9] - 24:7, 99:6,
111:9, 118:5, 125:11, 133:15,
134:9, 189:9, 195:10

somewhere [4] - 25:8, 122:8,
165:8, 193:19

son [1] - 48:17

sorry [7] - 96:13, 147:18,
151:11, 161:1, 179:19,
219:15, 219:18

sort [19] - 16:15, 17:2,
18:12, 22:16, 36:2, 39:1,
40:14, 42:8, 54:14, 56:9,
70:17, 72:3, 97:1, 143:5,
162:8, 162:19, 186:11, 234:11

sort've [29] - 50:12, 59:2,
78:1, 79:13, 96:8, 102:9,
128:11, 134:5, 151:6, 153:5,
153:18, 161:12, 162:12,

163:6, 163:9, 163:14, 163:16,
163:18, 164:14, 184:1, 186:5,
188:3, 188:9, 194:19, 202:5,
207:8, 225:9, 229:14, 238:8

sorts [1] - 136:3

sought [1] - 114:11

sources [1] - 19:1

south [9] - 83:6, 83:8, 83:10,
83:19, 222:3, 224:15, 234:5,
237:18, 237:19

sovereignty [1] - 62:12

space [76] - 14:5, 14:6, 16:7,
16:9, 20:19, 22:18, 23:6,
23:7, 28:1, 28:8, 29:17,
30:1, 30:8, 30:9, 30:13,
30:17, 30:18, 31:4, 31:18,
32:10, 35:1, 46:4, 49:7,
49:13, 49:17, 49:18, 49:19,
50:4, 51:17, 51:19, 54:2,
57:1, 66:12, 67:7, 67:12,
67:13, 68:5, 69:4, 69:6,
69:10, 69:17, 70:19, 71:15,
73:16, 73:19, 83:3, 83:18,
86:1, 88:5, 100:3, 104:8,
104:13, 104:15, 104:16,
105:1, 105:7, 118:19, 129:7,
129:13, 137:6, 151:7, 151:16,
159:3, 162:2, 170:8, 173:8,
180:10, 186:1, 190:16, 212:4,
229:11, 229:19

spaces [15] - 3:7, 34:14,
46:6, 51:13, 56:1, 68:11,
77:16, 79:1, 103:10, 116:6,
125:7, 129:6, 162:13, 163:14,
170:6

speaker [2] - 85:3, 109:10

special [2] - 35:15, 115:19

Special [20] - 2:11, 3:6,
26:9, 110:5, 116:3, 130:10,

197:5, 207:12, 210:12,
213:18, 216:10, 218:3,
218:18, 244:19, 245:7, 245:8,
245:9, 245:10, 245:12, 245:13

specific [1] - 81:16

specifically [3] - 97:3,
99:17, 243:16

specifics [3] - 20:17, 38:4,
87:12

spectacular [1] - 53:15

speculating [1] - 47:9

speculative [2] - 20:15,
186:13

speed [1] - 21:8

spell [5] - 65:4, 65:7, 65:10,
76:19, 102:4

spend [5] - 52:2, 117:6,
155:17, 197:16, 201:17

spent [5] - 48:14, 113:9,
114:9, 116:10, 116:13

spirit [1] - 211:17

spoken [3] - 43:14, 64:5, 87:6

spot [1] - 225:9

spotted [1] - 188:16

Square [84] - 2:7, 4:18, 24:2,
30:3, 33:4, 33:15, 34:12,
38:16, 39:5, 48:15, 49:1,
50:9, 51:10, 52:3, 53:1,
59:2, 59:7, 60:5, 60:13,
63:15, 63:17, 66:16, 68:8,
68:13, 68:16, 69:2, 69:15,
69:19, 70:13, 71:2, 71:7,
71:12, 72:4, 72:6, 72:9,
72:18, 73:9, 76:10, 76:11,
79:1, 83:2, 86:19, 88:4,
95:14, 95:18, 98:4, 98:5,
98:6, 105:13, 110:1, 111:11,
113:3, 114:14, 114:18,
115:18, 116:7, 116:9, 119:4,

119:10, 119:12, 120:11,
121:3, 122:12, 130:16,
152:17, 155:10, 155:11,
157:5, 160:16, 161:5, 166:15,
169:8, 183:12, 196:19,
197:12, 207:16, 208:6,
208:13, 209:4, 212:13,
214:12, 214:17, 215:5, 215:19

square [15] - 2:13, 25:8,
31:17, 46:1, 59:17, 59:18,
72:12, 73:7, 110:9, 113:15,
122:9, 132:14, 136:16, 158:4,
169:11

squeezed [1] - 220:4

Squibb [1] - 5:4

ss [1] - 251:4

stabilization [1] - 214:3

stabilize [1] - 217:8

stabilized [1] - 211:9

staff [22] - 26:11, 26:18,
46:12, 47:3, 54:9, 58:4,
62:9, 105:14, 115:9, 148:12,
160:1, 160:2, 161:4, 163:2,
213:4, 213:8, 213:10, 215:15,
215:16, 216:18, 219:7, 220:14

STAFF [1] - 1:13

stage [3] - 55:1, 56:6, 57:7

staggered [3] - 138:17,
140:14, 141:16

stair [2] - 149:2, 167:11

stairs [6] - 122:6, 155:9,
164:14, 167:6, 167:14, 168:12

stairway [7] - 129:5, 149:6,
154:16, 167:8, 167:16, 172:11

stand [6] - 37:4, 68:7, 124:7,
182:11, 212:18, 240:2

standalone [1] - 36:1

standard [4] - 91:14, 117:19,

141:17, 146:7

standards [1] - 91:11

standing [1] - 150:8

stands [3] - 72:17, 73:5,
91:19

Staples [1] - 5:16

staring [1] - 86:8

start [11] - 4:7, 12:6, 17:15,
72:6, 102:7, 104:7, 104:12,
107:6, 128:4, 188:3, 242:2

started [8] - 54:17, 77:15,
99:12, 157:17, 178:5, 189:8,
189:11, 236:8

starting [4] - 7:3, 107:1,
121:13, 131:8

starts [3] - 128:17, 131:14,
131:18

startups [1] - 78:19

state [5] - 43:15, 43:16,
64:19, 117:11, 152:10

statement [2] - 75:19, 211:14

statement(s) [1] - 250:13

station [1] - 7:1

stations [1] - 245:11

statistics [1] - 41:14

status [1] - 210:10

stay [5] - 37:15, 49:15,
52:12, 78:11, 180:1

staying [1] - 52:16

steel [1] - 124:11

steel-framed [1] - 124:11

stenographer [1] - 65:1

step [8] - 55:14, 131:3,
133:14, 137:16, 138:4, 138:9,
145:7, 190:17

step-back [5] - 133:14,
137:16, 138:4, 145:7, 190:17

STEPHEN [6] - 88:19, 92:6,

92:9, 92:19, 93:3, 93:16

stepped [1] - 127:14

steps [2] - 126:3, 189:17

Steve [6] - 75:15, 82:5,
94:10, 104:1, 106:7, 181:5

Steve's [1] - 30:19

Steven [2] - 1:10, 88:19

STEVEN [38] - 9:17, 17:10,
37:18, 38:2, 44:6, 47:14,
101:19, 147:2, 148:3, 148:7,
164:4, 164:17, 167:1, 167:5,
167:9, 172:16, 173:3, 176:1,
181:6, 185:15, 186:2, 187:5,
187:19, 188:8, 192:16, 193:5,
199:19, 201:14, 202:10,
203:16, 204:10, 206:8,
212:19, 213:6, 234:12,
246:12, 247:17, 248:15

Stewart [1] - 234:18

stick [2] - 47:7, 200:17

still [14] - 45:5, 49:2, 53:6,
76:9, 137:6, 157:18, 159:12,
168:11, 221:16, 228:13,
230:8, 237:14, 244:12

stone [6] - 146:15, 195:3,
195:6, 195:11, 223:14

stone-type [1] - 146:15

stonewall [1] - 217:9

stop [2] - 7:6, 9:5

storage [3] - 168:18, 228:16,
229:7

store [2] - 72:19, 168:19

storefronts [1] - 68:11

stores [2] - 53:8, 246:16

stories [3] - 113:13, 114:3,
177:16

story [24] - 2:14, 2:15,
34:10, 50:13, 110:11, 110:12,

112:2, 113:14, 124:15, 128:4,
128:19, 129:15, 129:16,
130:11, 131:1, 131:2, 138:17,
139:3, 140:18, 141:2, 142:6,
151:18, 151:19, 167:2

straight [1] - 163:3

straightforward [1] - 31:9

Street [56] - 2:11, 2:15, 3:3,
4:15, 5:1, 5:16, 31:1, 31:2,
50:6, 75:14, 75:19, 76:18,
77:3, 81:4, 81:8, 82:17,
82:19, 83:16, 86:10, 86:11,
89:2, 94:1, 99:3, 99:16,
104:15, 106:13, 110:5,
110:13, 111:2, 111:12, 117:6,
128:7, 130:17, 137:18, 138:2,
142:13, 157:14, 164:19,
165:1, 170:8, 170:12, 175:15,
178:19, 183:3, 217:5, 218:2,
218:12, 220:19, 226:14,
227:7, 230:9, 230:17

street [17] - 113:7, 118:5,
131:3, 133:16, 154:12,
163:18, 170:4, 175:11, 176:7,
176:12, 190:10, 192:12,
239:7, 239:8, 239:12, 239:15,
246:15

streets [2] - 59:12, 59:14

Streets [1] - 138:6

streetscape [1] - 162:1

strength [1] - 223:10

stressing [1] - 33:7

striated [1] - 221:19

strictly [1] - 68:17

strident [1] - 239:15

strikes [2] - 20:14, 78:4

stripe [1] - 222:13

strong [6] - 14:13, 119:5,
165:3, 184:17, 212:15, 221:17

stronger [6] - 205:13, 222:6,
223:6, 223:11, 236:1, 236:3

strongest [1] - 17:13

strongly [3] - 98:14, 191:8,
193:10

structural [1] - 120:7

structure [4] - 112:3, 139:4,
141:2, 216:6

structures [2] - 111:15, 208:2

struggled [2] - 125:1, 192:14

struggling [2] - 169:3, 198:1

Stuart [1] - 1:16

stuck [2] - 185:6, 185:12

student [1] - 108:8

students [1] - 69:4

studied [1] - 173:10

studies [7] - 21:19, 29:14,
34:7, 45:14, 45:17, 45:18,
232:4

studio [1] - 145:8

studios [2] - 244:14

study [12] - 7:18, 24:4,
27:16, 27:18, 44:16, 44:18,
49:5, 70:11, 76:1, 103:9,
144:11, 173:11

studying [1] - 241:14

stuff [2] - 169:13, 197:16

stunned [1] - 76:9

stupid [1] - 76:5

style [1] - 201:12

subdivide [1] - 87:1

subject [8] - 17:13, 20:6,
42:2, 44:8, 46:8, 148:11,
174:6, 182:5

subjective [1] - 197:8

submitted [1] - 220:13

subscribe [1] - 250:12

subsidized [2] - 15:3, 42:8

subtle [1] - 190:10
suburban [2] - 50:18, 82:15
Subway [1] - 208:8
succeed [1] - 79:16
success [1] - 89:16
suddenly [1] - 183:5
sufficient [1] - 165:5
suggest [5] - 115:2, 152:16, 187:9, 198:14, 199:16
suggested [3] - 157:6, 157:7, 210:8
suggesting [5] - 59:13, 181:1, 199:6, 212:19, 226:1
suggestions [1] - 211:11
suggests [2] - 42:10, 186:5
Sullivan [6] - 6:5, 116:17, 117:18, 156:7, 156:19, 211:17
Sullivan's [1] - 154:3
summarized [1] - 215:15
summarizes [1] - 164:1
summary [3] - 215:1, 215:3, 215:4
summer [1] - 9:3
sunlight [1] - 194:6
supplied [1] - 229:3
supply [1] - 229:15
support [16] - 19:2, 20:5, 28:2, 28:16, 29:6, 38:10, 43:11, 46:9, 48:7, 49:6, 53:8, 59:15, 97:4, 161:7, 247:18
supported [1] - 43:19
supporting [3] - 95:13, 95:15, 247:16
supports [1] - 59:17
supposed [3] - 81:17, 93:7, 107:3
surface [1] - 208:7

surpasses [1] - 240:14
surrounded [3] - 52:1, 84:2, 85:17
surrounding [1] - 66:19
survey [1] - 176:13
suspect [1] - 166:13
SUZANNAH [9] - 160:18, 164:12, 171:16, 172:2, 176:9, 214:16, 215:4, 233:18, 234:18
Suzannah [10] - 1:15, 92:13, 160:5, 164:3, 171:9, 171:12, 172:19, 233:16, 234:7, 234:17
Suzannah's [1] - 202:13
Sydney [1] - 104:15
symmetry [2] - 134:5
system [9] - 132:10, 134:19, 139:8, 142:1, 143:8, 143:12, 227:5, 236:16, 241:16
Systems [1] - 2:8

T

T-A-Y-L-O-R [1] - 81:6
table [1] - 240:16
Table [1] - 241:18
tall [12] - 33:2, 36:3, 50:11, 51:1, 51:12, 67:3, 83:9, 85:15, 86:13, 129:12, 138:12
taller [6] - 16:11, 16:14, 50:16, 51:5, 138:7, 138:8
tallest [1] - 83:15
tampering [2] - 179:3, 179:14
tangential [1] - 193:2
tanned [1] - 124:2
tap [1] - 243:15
task [1] - 8:18
Task [1] - 8:10
Taste [1] - 105:3
taught [1] - 80:18

TAY [1] - 81:5
TAYLOR [4] - 81:3, 81:6, 81:8, 84:9
Taylor [3] - 81:3, 104:9, 106:12
tech [9] - 28:1, 38:7, 49:6, 67:19, 79:10, 82:10, 95:13, 95:15, 108:15
technique [1] - 230:7
technological [1] - 28:8
technology [2] - 28:3, 28:16
Ted [7] - 17:18, 38:5, 75:18, 77:7, 94:5, 123:1, 185:1
TED [1] - 4:3
Teddy [1] - 238:15
teenage [1] - 169:8
ten [16] - 13:11, 15:4, 15:9, 21:3, 24:2, 28:7, 58:6, 81:14, 105:12, 128:18, 141:18, 143:19, 165:9, 165:10, 165:11, 229:14
ten-foot [1] - 128:18
ten-inch [2] - 141:18, 143:19
ten-pound [1] - 21:3
tenant [6] - 5:5, 89:7, 141:3, 162:13, 229:11, 229:19
tenanted [1] - 113:18
tenants [5] - 134:18, 201:3, 201:6, 201:10, 201:14
tend [2] - 239:4, 242:18
tenth [1] - 231:3
term [3] - 8:13, 131:11, 208:1
terms [18] - 7:14, 12:8, 27:19, 30:16, 54:13, 54:16, 58:15, 78:4, 79:11, 80:17, 89:12, 115:16, 122:12, 150:18, 161:14, 223:13, 234:2, 242:8

terra [1] - 102:13
terrace [1] - 152:9
territory [1] - 102:14
testify [1] - 247:10
text [1] - 91:18
textered [1] - 222:1
texture [1] - 225:14
TGIF [1] - 112:7
that.. [1] - 199:11
THE [12] - 1:18, 65:3, 65:9, 76:19, 77:4, 81:5, 81:7, 102:4, 251:15, 251:16, 251:17, 251:17
theaters [1] - 245:8
Theatre [1] - 164:19
theme [1] - 112:12
themselves [3] - 41:5, 135:10, 139:11
Theodore [1] - 1:9
THEODORE [100] - 9:9, 9:15, 9:18, 10:3, 23:14, 37:19, 44:4, 46:11, 48:9, 64:1, 64:18, 65:6, 74:9, 75:10, 76:16, 80:5, 81:2, 84:7, 84:18, 87:4, 88:18, 92:4, 92:7, 92:16, 93:2, 93:14, 93:17, 97:7, 97:10, 98:18, 101:18, 105:9, 109:8, 110:3, 123:2, 123:6, 124:7, 144:13, 145:12, 145:17, 146:19, 148:12, 152:3, 152:10, 157:9, 158:9, 159:7, 159:16, 164:2, 168:10, 172:14, 175:3, 175:14, 175:17, 176:16, 181:5, 182:2, 182:18, 188:11, 188:19, 191:3, 194:13, 195:4, 195:9, 198:5, 198:18, 199:18, 202:2, 204:3, 207:1, 212:17,

213:2, 213:14, 214:18, 215:7,
215:12, 216:16, 217:14,
217:19, 227:9, 227:15, 228:4,
230:2, 230:14, 231:16, 232:5,
232:17, 233:4, 233:9, 233:16,
235:7, 237:5, 237:8, 241:1,
241:4, 246:13, 248:1, 248:9,
248:13, 248:16

thereafter [1] - 17:5

therefor [1] - 250:3

therefore [2] - 19:3, 73:12

thereto [1] - 214:5

they've [1] - 239:1

thinking [15] - 57:11, 78:12,
79:4, 79:6, 79:11, 80:1,
80:18, 104:10, 104:13, 125:2,
171:13, 171:17, 177:2,
200:12, 210:18

third [5] - 149:4, 174:11,
184:7, 188:17, 236:2

Third [1] - 53:14

thirds [4] - 158:13, 227:1,
228:3, 228:12

THIS [1] - 251:15

Thompson [1] - 124:14

thorough [1] - 178:2

thoughts [7] - 17:6, 38:3,
80:8, 116:13, 164:11, 185:16,
246:3

thousand [5] - 29:5, 33:2,
35:11, 53:11, 61:16

thousand-foot [2] - 35:11,
53:11

three [28] - 2:14, 3:7, 46:18,
59:2, 64:8, 65:2, 84:2, 86:9,
110:11, 113:13, 113:17,
114:3, 114:15, 117:13, 120:4,
122:3, 128:4, 128:19, 130:11,

138:9, 138:17, 140:13, 146:6,
151:18, 178:16, 178:18,
197:11, 225:19

three-quarter [2] - 178:16,
178:18

three-story [6] - 2:14,
110:11, 128:19, 130:11,
138:17, 151:18

throughout [5] - 40:6, 66:13,
70:13, 71:11, 208:6

throughway [1] - 85:9

thunder [1] - 85:4

Thursday [1] - 105:4

tier [2] - 74:19, 75:7

tight [2] - 169:1, 170:7

timing [1] - 87:14

tinge [1] - 194:4

tiny [1] - 125:8

tipping [1] - 53:6

tired [1] - 184:1

TO [1] - 251:16

today [9] - 17:16, 56:4, 66:7,
68:3, 69:14, 116:16, 224:14,
246:14, 247:3

today's [1] - 4:10

together [10] - 63:11, 67:14,
69:11, 70:15, 72:1, 139:10,
143:11, 191:17, 220:9, 239:2

Tom [4] - 1:11, 8:17, 151:9,
176:16

TOM [9] - 149:12, 150:18,
152:1, 152:6, 176:17, 188:16,
200:11, 205:10, 211:16

Tom's [2] - 181:9, 200:8

tone [1] - 144:8

tonight [18] - 10:12, 29:11,
33:16, 64:7, 64:11, 81:10,
87:8, 89:4, 89:16, 89:18,

103:14, 109:7, 109:10,
113:12, 121:7, 123:16,
179:12, 199:13
tonight's [1] - 123:9
took [10] - 10:9, 34:5, 85:4,
94:9, 100:13, 127:5, 134:4,
141:5, 158:18, 195:6
tools [1] - 58:8
top [14] - 20:7, 74:19, 75:6,
120:4, 121:5, 121:9, 127:6,
134:1, 139:19, 145:6, 173:6,
179:7, 231:3, 231:4
topic [2] - 64:12, 192:9
TOPICS [2] - 2:2, 3:1
topics [1] - 54:14
total [1] - 171:17
totally [1] - 43:17
touch [1] - 192:7
touched [1] - 176:18
tough [1] - 172:7
tour [2] - 163:6, 166:7
tourists [1] - 71:3
toward [2] - 106:13, 136:10
towards [2] - 49:8, 210:4
tower [1] - 35:11
towers [2] - 53:18, 86:16
towns [1] - 41:6
track [3] - 14:11, 106:19,
218:11
tracked [1] - 76:8
tradeoff [1] - 51:16
traditional [1] - 68:19
traffic [3] - 80:17, 85:10,
85:11
trajectory [1] - 8:14
transcript [3] - 250:2,
250:12, 250:13
TRANSCRIPT [1] - 251:16

Transcript(s) [1] - 2:4
transcripts [2] - 9:10, 9:12
transformer [1] - 229:4
transit [7] - 89:14, 89:15,
90:6, 90:14, 92:12, 93:6,
93:10
translucent [1] - 230:13
Transportation [4] - 2:8, 2:9,
31:16, 43:18
transportation [4] - 18:7,
60:7, 92:14, 122:13
trash [5] - 127:19, 129:8,
132:8, 169:1, 170:16
treatment [1] - 230:19
treatments [1] - 238:18
trees [12] - 163:18, 175:11,
175:15, 175:18, 176:12,
187:7, 187:8, 187:11, 206:3,
206:15, 206:19, 217:4
tremendous [1] - 99:8
trend [1] - 68:14
Triangle [1] - 99:16
triangular [1] - 149:16
tried [4] - 103:14, 134:6,
159:13, 182:8
trim [7] - 153:8, 222:19,
223:5, 235:10, 235:19, 236:3,
236:8
trims [1] - 224:17
Trinity [1] - 118:14
trouble [1] - 89:12
truck [2] - 224:4, 224:8
trucks [1] - 73:16
true [2] - 134:10, 251:8
truly [1] - 47:4
trumps [1] - 62:12
trust [1] - 18:13
Trust [2] - 7:10, 16:2

trusting [1] - 62:19
truth [1] - 41:13
try [12] - 13:13, 25:3, 26:16, 27:13, 35:15, 37:9, 46:1, 61:10, 92:12, 105:2, 137:2, 146:4
trying [24] - 21:1, 26:1, 30:9, 57:3, 59:5, 61:7, 62:5, 62:14, 62:18, 87:8, 90:3, 92:19, 93:5, 132:8, 135:19, 141:3, 150:2, 150:4, 182:15, 196:16, 198:16, 212:14, 237:17, 242:2
tucked [1] - 132:6
TUESDAY [1] - 1:4
tune [1] - 54:7
turn [5] - 63:8, 97:18, 98:3, 98:4, 131:17
turned [1] - 98:7
turning [1] - 73:9
turns [2] - 131:18, 196:8
twice [2] - 99:19, 182:1
two [46] - 2:15, 7:9, 10:9, 15:10, 31:5, 36:16, 38:14, 44:1, 53:18, 80:7, 84:2, 87:1, 87:7, 93:12, 106:14, 109:3, 110:12, 112:2, 113:9, 115:12, 115:17, 117:15, 120:3, 120:12, 129:19, 141:2, 143:2, 145:5, 146:6, 158:13, 177:7, 177:16, 181:8, 184:8, 186:8, 221:6, 221:16, 223:2, 227:1, 227:3, 228:3, 228:12, 230:10, 231:6, 235:12, 235:18
two-dimensional [1] - 186:8
two-story [4] - 2:15, 110:12, 112:2, 141:2
two-thirds [4] - 158:13,

227:1, 228:3, 228:12
twofold [1] - 118:1
twos [1] - 145:4
type [9] - 51:15, 73:9, 119:6, 139:12, 146:15, 166:10, 166:17, 197:16, 243:2
types [5] - 242:1, 242:9, 242:10, 242:13, 243:4
typically [1] - 129:2

u

U.S [1] - 2:9
ugly [1] - 200:9
ultimate [2] - 186:14, 211:4
ultimately [4] - 44:11, 70:3, 121:17, 183:18
unaffordable [1] - 49:3
unanimous [2] - 217:16, 241:7
Unanimous [1] - 10:1
unanswered [1] - 89:14
uncertain [1] - 20:15
uncertainties [1] - 48:2
uncertainty [2] - 20:6, 21:7
uncivic [1] - 76:5
uncivic-minded [1] - 76:5
unconditionally [1] - 75:6
UNDER [1] - 251:17
under [9] - 5:8, 6:10, 6:14, 18:5, 101:11, 127:12, 147:12, 171:5, 176:10
undergo [1] - 216:17
underlying [1] - 43:9
understood [2] - 181:9, 212:6
unduly [1] - 48:5
unfortunate [1] - 188:3
unfortunately [2] - 134:16, 165:18
unhappy [1] - 100:16

UNIDENTIFIED [3] - 5:12,
148:18, 166:18
uniform [2] - 137:2, 223:8
Union [1] - 51:10
unique [6] - 19:13, 19:14,
23:6, 72:2, 112:17
unit [3] - 172:6, 173:6, 173:8
Unit [1] - 2:6
units [18] - 2:14, 16:6, 29:5,
59:16, 60:12, 61:16, 78:2,
96:3, 110:11, 113:16, 119:9,
122:3, 122:7, 122:11, 144:19,
145:1, 172:3, 181:11
universe [1] - 38:8
unknowns [1] - 19:6
UNLESS [1] - 251:17
unless [1] - 97:19
unlike [2] - 186:17, 238:19
unlimited [1] - 39:12
unquote [1] - 69:15
unrelated [1] - 120:16
unsettling [1] - 21:6
unsought [1] - 114:11
unusual [1] - 81:10
unwelcoming [1] - 68:9
up [107] - 11:13, 12:15,
23:19, 24:5, 25:3, 27:9,
27:13, 30:5, 32:16, 32:18,
33:1, 34:5, 36:12, 36:14,
40:11, 40:14, 42:10, 47:1,
48:13, 48:16, 57:10, 60:9,
62:4, 64:2, 64:3, 64:18,
65:5, 68:13, 77:12, 80:6,
80:9, 80:12, 80:16, 84:8,
88:13, 89:17, 90:12, 92:8,
92:17, 93:15, 97:8, 98:18,
99:18, 101:4, 101:5, 101:6,
105:12, 110:4, 121:6, 125:15,

126:5, 128:6, 129:11, 134:19,
135:7, 136:1, 136:19, 137:7,
138:2, 138:14, 142:2, 143:16,
144:8, 146:10, 147:17, 152:8,
153:18, 154:5, 154:12,
154:17, 154:19, 155:9,
155:17, 158:13, 159:15,
164:15, 168:4, 168:8, 169:9,
170:11, 173:7, 178:1, 181:19,
182:5, 183:11, 184:5, 186:3,
187:14, 189:11, 190:8, 192:1,
194:16, 194:17, 201:1,
206:16, 221:4, 225:10,
229:19, 232:14, 238:7, 239:6,
241:10, 243:13, 246:1, 246:8,
247:14
up-zoning [1] - 99:18
Update [1] - 2:3
update [2] - 4:7, 9:7
updated [1] - 96:18
upfront [1] - 62:15
upgrade [1] - 217:8
upper [3] - 140:19, 141:1,
144:2
urban [7] - 22:3, 40:5, 46:3,
160:13, 161:1, 176:7, 214:15
Urban [2] - 215:3, 216:1
usable [3] - 29:18, 51:19,
162:2
useful [2] - 118:8, 180:15
users [1] - 208:1
Uses [1] - 241:18
uses [6] - 112:4, 207:17,
241:17, 242:5, 244:18, 245:14
utilities [3] - 142:5, 175:12,
176:10
utility [1] - 70:15

<u>v</u>	
<u>vacant</u> [1] - 28:8	<u>viewing</u> [1] - 225:12
<u>Valentine</u> [1] - 104:17	<u>views</u> [7] - 137:13, 151:15, 178:11, 181:11, 181:12, 224:13, 239:10
<u>valid</u> [1] - 201:2	<u>Village</u> [1] - 142:17
<u>valley</u> [1] - 192:12	<u>Virginia</u> [1] - 227:4
<u>valuable</u> [1] - 32:18	<u>visible</u> [2] - 181:16, 200:3
<u>value</u> [6] - 19:8, 20:4, 41:7, 175:1, 208:16, 211:10	<u>vision</u> [18] - 23:5, 54:16, 55:18, 56:3, 56:10, 58:9, 74:1, 82:6, 84:4, 84:10, 84:12, 84:16, 95:8, 95:12, 107:16, 108:9, 230:1, 230:11
<u>values</u> [1] - 40:16	<u>visit</u> [1] - 71:4
<u>variance</u> [2] - 3:5, 243:6	<u>visual</u> [3] - 57:17, 85:6, 181:14
<u>varied</u> [1] - 210:8	<u>vital</u> [2] - 66:15, 72:17
<u>varies</u> [2] - 147:4, 150:3	<u>voice</u> [2] - 161:2, 212:14
<u>variety</u> [5] - 111:17, 112:4, 114:13, 121:19, 122:16	<u>volatile</u> [2] - 39:17, 79:16
<u>various</u> [4] - 82:8, 155:2, 169:10, 237:16	<u>Volpe</u> [42] - 2:8, 4:11, 10:7, 12:7, 18:17, 24:6, 25:7, 25:13, 27:18, 28:11, 29:5, 31:3, 36:7, 43:12, 45:7, 45:8, 46:14, 47:11, 60:16, 60:19, 62:8, 63:16, 66:10, 67:1, 68:12, 69:1, 70:2, 70:6, 73:15, 74:4, 81:17, 86:4, 86:13, 89:7, 89:17, 95:12, 100:2, 103:18, 104:3, 107:7, 108:12
<u>vault</u> [1] - 229:4	<u>volume</u> [1] - 234:3
<u>vehicles</u> [1] - 118:6	<u>vote</u> [2] - 202:9, 213:15
<u>ventilation</u> [1] - 229:16	<u>votes</u> [2] - 123:17, 123:19
<u>venting</u> [1] - 135:7	<u>vulnerability</u> [1] - 108:18
<u>venue</u> [1] - 218:13	<u>vulnerable</u> [1] - 109:1
<u>verbiage</u> [1] - 210:3	
<u>version</u> [1] - 224:2	<u>w</u>
<u>versus</u> [4] - 14:4, 57:2, 108:3, 198:7	<u>W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S-O-N</u> [1] - 102:6
<u>vertical</u> [7] - 221:14, 222:1, 222:5, 222:13, 223:5, 230:12, 236:2	
<u>Veterinaries</u> [1] - 245:10	
<u>viable</u> [1] - 169:4	
<u>vibrant</u> [2] - 71:8, 77:9	
<u>view</u> [23] - 15:9, 22:13, 36:12, 128:8, 137:18, 138:5, 138:13, 141:15, 150:9, 150:19, 151:1, 151:3, 161:16, 164:8, 166:4, 178:17, 178:18, 211:2, 220:18, 238:13, 238:14, 239:11	

wait [2] - 46:11, 100:6
waive [5] - 2:11, 110:5, 120:9, 123:13, 213:19
waiver [5] - 4:16, 177:18, 207:15, 216:3, 217:7
waivers [1] - 118:1
walk [15] - 64:15, 66:13, 69:14, 121:6, 122:19, 155:9, 155:10, 170:3, 170:16, 170:17, 174:9, 219:8
walked [1] - 246:14
walking [1] - 183:2
walkway [2] - 126:11, 169:14
wall [48] - 117:2, 117:4, 117:9, 117:13, 117:16, 117:17, 126:12, 127:15, 128:10, 128:16, 128:19, 131:14, 131:16, 131:18, 132:11, 141:7, 154:2, 154:14, 154:18, 155:7, 155:13, 155:16, 156:11, 163:2, 164:8, 166:15, 167:10, 167:14, 167:17, 168:2, 168:4, 171:3, 180:7, 180:12, 182:9, 182:19, 183:8, 211:8, 212:8, 214:4, 214:6, 228:1, 230:8, 234:1, 238:7, 238:8, 238:12
walls [1] - 132:7
want.. [1] - 147:8
wants [7] - 13:17, 25:1, 26:4, 46:14, 46:15, 70:10, 160:5
warm [2] - 187:13, 196:15
warmer [5] - 193:18, 194:2, 194:7, 196:3, 196:4
warmth [1] - 185:8
washes [1] - 245:11
waste [1] - 74:6
wasteland [1] - 105:14

Water [1] - 142:12
water [1] - 73:17
ways [7] - 56:2, 59:3, 103:10, 122:4, 178:11, 179:9, 219:10
website [1] - 55:7
week [1] - 154:7
weekend [1] - 38:19
weeks [4] - 4:12, 9:7, 10:9, 87:7
weigh [3] - 56:12, 98:13, 169:6
weighs [1] - 146:5
weight [1] - 136:13
welcome [2] - 4:4, 102:18
welcomed [1] - 71:2
welcoming [1] - 72:16
well-considered [1] - 179:15
well-known [1] - 70:8
well-rested [1] - 124:1
Wellington/Harrington [1] - 103:5
west [8] - 30:10, 217:2, 222:3, 226:12, 227:6, 231:1, 234:6, 237:19
western [1] - 142:7
wetlands [1] - 104:11
whereas [4] - 10:17, 146:11, 150:15, 233:1
WHEREOF [1] - 251:9
white [5] - 222:18, 224:17, 235:10, 236:8, 237:16
whites [1] - 135:16
whole [9] - 21:5, 50:13, 67:7, 82:11, 101:15, 155:12, 158:19, 187:17, 188:12
wholesale [1] - 245:6
wide [4] - 85:12, 176:1, 176:3, 176:5

wider [1] - 191:2
width [1] - 137:10
widths [1] - 69:7
wife [1] - 205:19
wild [2] - 169:8, 183:15
WILLIAMSON [11] - 102:2,
 102:5, 105:19, 152:7, 152:12,
 153:12, 167:13, 167:19,
 168:3, 168:7, 172:10
Williamson [3] - 102:3, 102:5,
 152:13
willing [1] - 123:4
willingly [1] - 201:9
willingness [1] - 24:18
wind [1] - 232:4
window [12] - 125:7, 125:8,
 134:7, 136:10, 158:14,
 182:14, 186:3, 222:19, 223:8,
 224:18, 236:1, 236:16
windows [17] - 134:13, 135:4,
 135:6, 135:15, 136:17, 144:4,
 158:19, 162:4, 162:6, 162:7,
 162:18, 178:4, 184:6, 186:4,
 189:10, 222:17, 230:2
winners [1] - 88:5
winter [1] - 232:13
Winthrop [5] - 117:6, 128:6,
 130:16, 130:17, 155:10
wire [1] - 227:5
wisdom [1] - 177:3
wish [8] - 11:6, 13:6, 22:5,
 41:4, 47:10, 47:11, 51:8,
 160:3
wishes [3] - 75:11, 157:10,
 159:17
wishing [1] - 74:10
WITNESS [1] - 251:9
wonder [7] - 43:13, 75:2,

77:14, 91:4, 100:15, 102:9,
 198:3
wonderful [2] - 53:12, 178:15
wondering [3] - 153:7, 183:16,
 241:9
wood [15] - 111:15, 112:2,
 121:11, 135:17, 135:18,
 136:2, 139:9, 141:11, 141:14,
 143:6, 143:13, 144:8, 185:10
wood's [1] - 185:11
wood-frame [2] - 112:2, 121:11
wood-framed [1] - 111:15
wood-like [1] - 144:8
word [3] - 89:15, 92:5, 167:8
wording [1] - 91:13
words [2] - 79:5, 157:2
workable [1] - 47:1
works [2] - 148:3, 176:8
worth [4] - 90:18, 108:8,
 243:12, 247:2
Wow [1] - 22:2
wow [1] - 46:1
wrap [7] - 80:5, 92:7, 92:16,
 93:14, 97:7, 98:18, 232:14
wrapping [2] - 128:6, 190:17
written [3] - 97:11, 97:14,
 208:11
wrote [3] - 101:11, 101:12,
 102:1
www.reportersinc.com [1] -
 1:19

 Y

yard [2] - 2:12, 110:7
Yard [2] - 70:6, 70:9
yards [1] - 210:6
year [5] - 24:16, 89:19,
 113:9, 197:15, 232:14

year-around [1] - 197:15

years [19] - 19:19, 24:2,
24:5, 28:7, 28:12, 35:17,
58:6, 68:1, 96:7, 102:11,
105:11, 105:12, 111:17,
169:9, 200:1, 200:2, 240:5,
240:9, 240:19

York [2] - 51:11, 85:15

young [3] - 77:12, 88:12,
95:16

younger [1] - 78:15

youth [1] - 68:5

z

ZBA [2] - 247:9, 247:14

Zero [3] - 8:10, 8:15, 164:19

zone [4] - 68:2, 83:2, 216:5,
229:2

zones [1] - 245:13

Zoning [10] - 3:4, 6:1, 7:17,
10:6, 15:19, 26:8, 114:19,
207:11, 241:18, 243:17

zoning [27] - 8:1, 13:12,
23:19, 44:13, 55:5, 55:11,
56:5, 56:8, 76:7, 83:13,
88:15, 89:12, 90:6, 90:18,
91:19, 94:11, 98:2, 98:3,
98:4, 98:7, 99:18, 101:6,
147:12, 160:7, 207:5, 245:15,
246:10

ZURI [4] - 65:12, 66:1, 66:6

Zuri [1] - 66:7