



CITY OF CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

PLANNING BOARD

CITY HALL ANNEX, 344 BROADWAY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

2014 MAR 17 PM 12 32

NOTICE OF DECISION OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Case Number:	285
Address:	10 Essex Street
Zoning:	Business B / Central Square Overlay District
Applicant:	3MJ Associates LLC 585 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139
Owner:	3MJ Realty Trust and 3MJ Associates LLC 585 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139
Application Date:	October 21, 2013
Date of Planning Board Public Hearing:	December 3, 2013
Date of Planning Board Decision:	February 18, 2014
Date of Filing Planning Board Decision:	March 17, 2014

Application: Construction of a mixed-use building with 46 dwelling units and ground-floor retail uses. Special permits sought under the provisions of the Central Square Overlay District (Section 20.300): Building Height (20.304.2-2), Waiver of Bulk Control Plane (20.304.2-3), Waiver of Setback Requirements (20.304.4), Waiver of Parking Requirements (20.304.6, with reference to Section 6.35.1). Special permit sought under Green Roof provisions of Section 22.30.

Decision: GRANTED, with conditions.

Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17 of Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 40A, and shall be filed within twenty (20) days after filing of the above referenced decision with the City Clerk. Copies of the complete decision and final plans, if applicable, are on file with the Community Development Department and the City Clerk.

Authorized Representative of the Planning Board: Jeffrey C. Roberts JCR 3/17/14.

For further information concerning this decision, please contact Liza Paden at 617-349-4647, or lpaden@cambridgema.gov.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED

Application Documents and Supporting Material

1. Special Permit application; summary of application; dimensional form; survey; proposed site plan; floor plans; elevations; landscape plan; photographs; ownership certificate; and project narrative dated 9/4/13, filed with the City Clerk on 10/21/13.
2. Essex Street Revisions dated 1/15/14, with cover memo and revised dimensional form from Stephen Hiserodt of Boyes-Watson Architects.
3. Revised Ownership Certificate, dated 2/18/14
4. LEED Certification form, dated 9/30/13, from Perkins Eastman
5. Memorandum to Morris Naggar, 3MJ Realty, LLC, from Amos Fernandes, P.E., PTOE, AICP, Transportation Manager, Design Consultants, Inc., dated 1/16/14.
6. Memorandum to Susan Clippinger, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation, from James J. Rafferty, dated 2/13/14.

Other Documents

7. Memorandum to the Planning Board from Susan Clippinger, Director of Cambridge Traffic, Parking and Transportation dated 2/18/14
8. Notice of Extension of Time, filed February 19, 2014.
9. Email to the Planning Board from Michael Proscia, dated 2/11/14.
10. Email to the Planning Board from Greg Heidelberger, dated 2/13/14.
11. Email forwarded to the Planning Board from Fred Salvucci, dated 2/18/14.
12. Email to the Planning Board from Carrie Burke, dated 2/18/14.
13. Letter to the Planning Board from Adam J. Costa, Blatman, Bobrowski & Mead, LLC, dated 2/18/14, representing the Cambridge Residents Alliance.
14. Email to the Planning Board from Dan Roy, dated 2/8/14.
15. Email to the Planning Board from Eugenia Huh, dated 2/9/14.
16. Email to the Planning Board from Aviva Rothman-Shore, dated 2/10/14.
17. Email to the Planning Board from Tony Kopa, dated 2/11/14.

18. Email to the Planning Board from Jeff Keating, dated 2/11/14.
19. Email to the Planning Board from Bob Woodbury, dated 2/11/14.
20. Email to the Planning Board from David A. Mellis, dated 2/10/14.
21. Email to the Planning Board from Parker Brooks Heckner, dated 2/10/14.
22. Email to the Planning Board from Rose Hanig, dated 2/10/14.
23. Email to the Planning Board from Lawrence Bluestone, dated 2/11/14.
24. Email to the Planning Board from James Madden, dated 2/11/14.
25. Email to the Planning Board from Alec Papazian, dated 2/11/14.
26. Letter to the Planning Board from Marge Amster, dated 2/11/14.
27. Email to the Planning Board from Randa Ghattas, dated 2/11/14.
28. Email to the Planning Board from Joan queer, dated 2/11/14.
29. Email to the Planning Board from Carol O'Hare, dated 2/7/14.
30. Email to the Planning Board from Lori Jobe, dated 2/6/14.
31. Email to the Planning Board from Charles Teague, dated 2/6/14.
32. Email to the Planning Board from Susan Ringler, dated 2/6/14.
33. Email to the Planning Board from Jacquelyn A. Smith, dated 2/6/14.
34. Email to the Planning Board from Gerald Bergman, dated 2/6/14.
35. Email to the Planning Board from James Williamson, dated 2/5/14.
36. Email to the Planning Board from Stephen Harrington, dated 2/4/14.
37. Email to the Planning Board from Mal Malme, dated 2/4/14.
38. Email to the Planning Board from Joann Yung, dated 1/21/14.
39. Email to the Planning Board from Paul Stone, dated 1/21/14.
40. Email to the Planning Board from Robert Hilliard, dated 1/21/14.

41. Letter to the Planning Board from Jesse Kanson Benanav, Chair, A Better Cambridge, dated 1/21/14.
42. Email to the Planning Board from Michael Parsons, dated 1/21/14.
43. Email to the Planning Board from Pam Matz, dated 1/21/14.
44. Email to the Planning Board from David Neiman, dated 1/20/14.
45. Email to the Planning Board from Justin Crane, dated 1/20/14.
46. Email to the Planning Board from Kelly Goss, dated 1/18/14.
47. Email to the Planning Board from Richard Goldberg, Area 4/Port Coalition, dated 1/17/14.
48. Letter to the Planning Board from Cambridge Residents Alliance, dated 1/17/14.
49. Email to the Planning Board from Peter Barkely, dated 1/16/14.
50. Letter to the Planning Board from Saul Tannenbaum, dated 12/1/13.
51. Letter to the Planning Board from the Cambridge Residence Alliance, undated.
52. Email to the Planning Board from Lori Jobe, dated 12/3/13.
53. Email to the Planning Board from Michael Miller, dated 12/3/13.
54. Email to the Planning Board from Randa Ghattas, dated 12/3/13.
55. Letter to the Planning Board from Carol O'Hare, dated 12/1/13.
56. Email to the Planning Board from Allen Penniman, dated 11/30/13.
57. Email to the Planning Board from Seth Taylor, dated 12/4/13.
58. Email to the Planning Board from Esther Hanig, dated 12/3/13.
59. Submittal from Heather Hoffman, 12/3/13, Ownership Certificate.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSAL

The Applicant proposes to construct a building on a portion of the lot presently occupied by surface parking. The new building is six stories with a rooftop penthouse for elevator equipment and access to a usable green roof with patio. The Gross Floor Area of the new building is 49,539 square feet and contains 4,014 square feet of retail uses at the ground floor and 46 dwelling units on upper floors. A below-grade parking garage contains 23 parking spaces and is accessed via a garage door on Essex Street. Long-term bicycle parking is provided on a first-floor mezzanine accessed via an elevator. Usable open space is provided in an entry plaza on Essex Street, a rooftop patio and a common deck on the second floor.

The remainder of the lot is occupied by multiple buildings with a total of 65,497 square feet of commercial Gross Floor Area, which will remain.

Design revisions were submitted to the Planning Board on January 15, 2014.

FINDINGS

After review of the Application Documents and other documents submitted to the Planning Board, testimony given at the public hearing, and review and consideration of the applicable requirements and criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance with regard to the special permits being sought, the Planning Board makes the following Findings:

1. Central Square Overlay District

The project is within the Central Square Overlay District and seeks several special permits pursuant to the Central Square Overlay District requirements set forth in Section 20.300 of the Zoning Ordinance.

A. General Standards. The standards for issuance of any special permit in the Central Square Overlay District are set forth in Section 20.305 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board finds that the proposed project conforms to those standards, as set forth in detail below:

(1) The proposed development is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Central Square Action Plan:

- encourage responsible and orderly development;*
- strengthen the retail base to more completely serve the needs of the neighborhoods;*
- preserve the square's cultural diversity*
- create active people oriented places*
- improve the physical, and visual environment*
- provide retail establishments that serve people of diverse economic and social groups who live in the surrounding neighborhoods;*

- *encourage the development of new mixed income housing; and*
- *promote compatible retail adjacent to residential uses.*

The proposed new building is consistent with these goals and objectives. An existing surface parking lot within steps of public transportation is an appropriate site for conversion to more active use. Residential dwellings and ground-floor retail space are compatible with nearby uses and will serve as a positive addition to Central Square by helping to support its retail base and cultural amenities, providing housing opportunities including affordable units (pursuant to Inclusionary Housing requirements), contributing to the animation of Central Square in the daytime and evening, and providing a visual improvement over surface parking.

- (2) *The building and site designs are consistent with “Urban Design Plan for Central Square” as outlined in the “Central Square Action Plan” and the “Central Square Development Guidelines”*

The proposed building design follows the framework of the above-referenced development plans and guidelines, as well as those discussed more recently in the Central Square Planning Study.

- The ground-floor façade is designed to be pedestrian-friendly with large windows, active uses and plaza space. The garage entrance on the north side of the building and an electrical transformer room on the south side, which are located fronting Essex Street by necessity, are screened with attractive materials intended to avoid stretches of blank, dark walls.
- Parking and service functions are located within the building and mostly below grade.
- The front of the building is set back to provide a more generous sidewalk space of between six and seven feet along Essex Street; however, the Board encourages the developer to explore with the City if there are ways to provide sidewalk space nearer to eight feet, as recommended in the guidelines.
- The height, scale and massing of the building are comparable to the surrounding historic context. The building is designed to continue the existing street wall towards Mass Ave, while introducing more setbacks and articulation in the façade as the building approaches the residential neighborhood to the south.
- The proposed new building has a visual character that is compatible with the adjacent contributing building, including natural accent materials such as copper and slate, without attempting to mimic that building in terms of materials and colors. The façade of the adjacent building will be restored as a complement to the proposed new development. The Board suggests continuing review by staff to assess the appropriateness of specific façade materials in the new building.

- Past and present planning objectives for Central Square both support the addition of residential uses in the “Heart of Central Square” subdistrict.

(3) *The building and site designs adequately screen the parking provided and are sensitive to the contributing buildings in the vicinity.*

The parking is provided completely below grade and will not impact any adjacent contributing buildings.

(4) *No National Register or contributing building is demolished or so altered as to terminate or preclude its designation as a National Register or contributing building; and*

(5) *No National Register or contributing building has been demolished or altered so as to terminate or preclude its designation within the five (5) years preceding the application.*

The existing buildings on the lot, which are contributing buildings, will remain unaltered with the exception of restoration improvements and business signage. No National Register or contributing building on the lot has been demolished within the past five years.

B. Specific Standards. The following modifications or waivers of base zoning requirements are proposed for approval by the Planning Board:

(1) *Additional Height (20.304.2-2).* The proposed building has a cornice line at a height of 70 feet, which is above the 55-foot height allowed by right but below the 80-foot height allowed by special permit. A small penthouse structure containing mechanical equipment and providing access to the roof is the only building element above 70 feet. Given that the design of the building meets the general standards and design objectives for the Central Square Overlay District, the Planning Board approves the height as proposed.

(2) *Waiver of Bulk Control Plane Restrictions (20.304.2-3).* Typically, portions of a building height taller than 60 feet would require a ten-foot step-back and 45-degree bulk control plane from the street line; however, the Planning Board may waive this requirement by special permit. Given that 70 feet is an appropriate height for the proposed six-story residential building, and portions of the building above the sixth story are set back significantly from the street edge, the Planning Board finds that the proposal meets the intent of such restrictions and waives the specific requirement in approving the proposed design.

(3) *Waiver of Setback Requirements (20.304.4).* The Business B base district requires residential uses to conform to the formula yard setback requirements applicable in the Residence C-3 zoning district. The Planning Board may waive yard requirements in the Central Square Overlay District so long as the yard does not abut a lot outside the Overlay District. Given that the lot is entirely within the overlay district, and that the

building design is consistent with the applicable Central Square development objectives, the Planning Board waives the yard requirements for the residential use in approving the proposed design.

- (4) *Waiver of Parking Requirements (20.304.6)*. The Central Square Overlay District allows a waiver of normal parking requirements for new buildings by special permit if the proposal meets the standards set forth in Section 6.35 and in Section 20.305 and if the waiver results in a building design that is more appropriate to the fabric of the neighborhood and is in conformance with the *Central Square Development Guidelines*.

It has been previously established in these Findings that the proposal meets the standards in Section 20.305 and conforms to the development guidelines articulated in past and present plans for Central Square.

The Planning Board also finds that the construction of more parking on the lot than proposed would have significant impacts on the design of the proposed building and/or on the existing contributing buildings that surround the development site, given that it would require either deeper or broader excavation of basement space or placement of parking above grade.

Therefore, the remaining standards to be met are those set forth in Section 6.35. Based on Parking Analysis materials provided by the Applicant in accordance with Section 6.35, comments from the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department set forth in a memorandum from Susan Clippinger dated February 18, 2014, the Planning Board finds that the proposal meets the standards set forth in 6.35, as set forth in detail below.

(Section 6.35.1) A special permit shall be granted only if the Board determines and cites evidence in its decision that the lesser amount of parking will not cause excessive congestion, endanger public safety, substantially reduce parking availability for other uses or otherwise adversely impact the neighborhood, or that such lesser amount of parking will provide positive environmental or other benefits to the users of the lot and the neighborhood, including specifically, among other benefits, assisting in the provision of affordable housing units.

The project proposes 46 dwelling units, for which the Zoning Ordinance requires off-street parking at a rate of one space per unit. The parking requirement for the retail space is waived by right pursuant to the Small Business Exemption. Other buildings on the lot are exempt from parking requirements pursuant to Section 20.304.6 of the Central Square Overlay District requirements because the structures are contributing buildings in existence before 1940. The proposed new building includes 23 off-street parking spaces for residential users within a below-grade garage.

The Applicant has provided a Parking Analysis estimating the anticipated demand for parking for residential uses on the site. The analysis studied three comparable fully-

occupied residential buildings with garage parking in the immediate area around the Central Square MBTA station and found that the demand for off-street parking from those buildings is approximately 0.5 parking space per dwelling unit or less. This information agrees with analyses done by the City as part of the Kendall Square / Central Square Planning Study, demonstrating that auto ownership rates for residents of the areas around Central Square range from 0.5 to 0.8 cars per household, with the lowest rates found at locations that are very close to MBTA stations. Based on the evidence provided, 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit will satisfy the parking demand for the residential building.

In response to neighborhood concerns about residents foregoing expensive on-site garage parking in favor of cheaper on-street resident parking, a supplemental memorandum from the Applicant provided information on the number of Cambridge Resident Parking Permits (RPPs) registered to 632 Massachusetts Avenue – a fully-occupied residential building with on-site garage parking located very close to the project site – finding a registration rate of 0.27 RPP per dwelling unit. A visual inventory of the parking garage showed that about half of the cars parked in the 632 Massachusetts Ave garage had RPP stickers. Given a garage utilization rate of less than 0.5 space per dwelling unit, these figures suggest that only a small number of households, if any, are owning cars and choosing to park them off-street rather than in the garage. However, it would appear that households with cars are choosing to park in the garage for the security and convenience, but are also choosing to purchase RPPs for the benefit of accessing open spaces, schools and other citywide amenities.

The supplemental memorandum from the Applicant also commits to a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program of incentives to encourage residents not to own cars, which are made a Condition of this Special Permit. It is the Applicant's assertion, and the Board agrees, that there will be low auto ownership among residents of the building given overall trends toward car-free urban living and the many amenities readily available within a short walking distance, including MBTA subway and bus service, carsharing services, the Hubway bicycle sharing system, secure indoor bicycle parking, grocery stores, restaurants, entertainment and other recreation.

With regard to environmental benefits, it is a City goal to reduce automobile trips overall in order to mitigate their many environmental impacts including greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution and traffic congestion. The construction of housing in a location and manner that discourages automobile travel and encourages shifts to sustainable modes of transportation is fully consistent with that policy. Controlling the creation of parking so as not to create a supply that exceeds the demand is one measure that helps promote a policy of automobile trip reduction. Areas that are very close to MBTA stations, such as this project site, are ideal locations to actively discourage automobile use and promote alternative modes of transportation.

(Section 6.35.1 continued) In making such a determination the Board shall also consider whether or not less off street parking is reasonable in light of the following:

- (1) *The availability of surplus off-street parking in the vicinity of the use being served and/or the proximity of an MBTA transit station.*

The site is within steps of the Central Square MBTA station. While other off-street parking facilities exist in the neighborhood, they would likely not be appropriate to serve the residential uses, although they might provide options for the several users of the existing surface parking lot that will be dislocated when the proposed building is built.

- (2) *The availability of public or commercial parking facilities in the vicinity of the use being served provided the requirements of Section 6.23 are satisfied.*

Public and commercial parking facilities are available in the area, which may also serve users of the existing surface parking lot that will be dislocated when the proposed building is built.

- (3) *Shared use of off street parking spaces service other uses having peak user demands at different times, provided that no more than seventy five (75) percent of the lesser minimum parking requirements for each use shall be satisfied with such shared spaces and that the requirements of Subsection 6.23 are satisfied.*

No shared-use parking is proposed on this site.

- (4) *Age or other occupancy restrictions which are likely to result in a lower level of auto usage; and*

No occupancy restrictions are proposed.

- (5) *Impact of the parking requirement on the physical environment of the affected lot or the adjacent lots including reduction in green space, destruction of significant existing trees and other vegetation, destruction of existing dwelling units, significant negative impact on the historic resources on the lot, impairment of the urban design objectives of the city as set forth in Section 19.30 of the Zoning Ordinance, or loss of pedestrian amenities along public ways.*

The negative impact of additional parking construction on the design of the proposed building and existing historic resources on the lot have been discussed further above in these Findings.

- (6) *The provision of required parking for development containing affordable housing units, and especially for development employing the increased FAR and Dwelling unit density provisions of Section 11.200, will increase the cost of the development, will require variance relief from other zoning*

requirements applicable to the development because of limitations of space on the lot, or will significantly diminish the environmental quality for all residents of the development.

The proposed project will be subject to the Inclusionary Housing requirements of Section 11.200. Increasing the parking provided on the site would likely significantly increase the cost of development, result in a design that is inconsistent with development goals and objectives for the area, negatively impact adjacent buildings, or make the project infeasible.

2. Modification to Short-Term Bicycle Parking Requirements

The project proposes fifty-four bicycle parking spaces within the building. This will satisfy the zoning requirements for long-term bicycle parking, but will not satisfy short-term bicycle parking requirements because there is not adequate space for outdoor bicycle parking on the site near the entry to the proposed retail uses. The Applicant has proposed to fulfill the requirements for short-term bicycle parking by making a financial contribution to a Public Bicycle Parking Fund in accordance with Section 6.104.2(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. The Board has learned that this is an as-of-right provision of the Zoning Ordinance, and therefore a special permit from the Planning Board is not required.

3. Green Roof Provisions

The project proposes Functional Green Roof Area on the top floor of the building, which, along with an adjacent patio, will be accessible and enjoyable by residents. Section 22.30 of the Zoning Ordinance provides that Functional Green Roof Area is exempt from the calculation of Gross Floor Area, along with an adjacent deck space no larger than 15% of the Functional Green Roof Area, but that a special permit from the Planning Board is required where the Functional Green Roof Area is proposed to be used by occupants of the building. The Planning Board approves such use of the rooftop space; however, any portion of the Functional Green Roof Area that is intended to be walked on by building occupants shall be reviewed and approved by staff to verify that the vegetation will be engineered to withstand the anticipated foot traffic without impacting the viability of the planted vegetation.

4. General Criteria for Issuance of a Special Permit (10.43)

The Planning Board finds that the project meets the General Criteria for Issuance of a Special Permit, as set forth below.

10.43 Criteria. Special permits will normally be granted where specific provisions of this Ordinance are met, except when particulars of the location or use, not generally true of the district or of the uses permitted in it, would cause granting of such permit to be to the detriment of the public interest because:

(a) It appears that requirements of this Ordinance cannot or will not be met, or ...

With the granting of the requested special permits, the Zoning Ordinance requirements will be met.

(b) traffic generated or patterns of access or egress would cause congestion, hazard, or substantial change in established neighborhood character, or ...

The traffic generated by a residential building with small-scale retail uses at this site is not different in character to other uses in the district, and will not cause congestion or hazard.

(c) the continued operation of or the development of adjacent uses as permitted in the Zoning Ordinance would be adversely affected by the nature of the proposed use, or ...

A residential building with ground-floor retail will not adversely affect the operation of adjacent uses.

(d) nuisance or hazard would be created to the detriment of the health, safety and/or welfare of the occupant of the proposed use or the citizens of the City, or ...

A residential building with ground-floor retail will not create a nuisance or hazard. All development will conform to all applicable health and safety codes.

(e) for other reasons, the proposed use would impair the integrity of the district or adjoining district, or otherwise derogate from the intent and purpose of this Ordinance, and ...

The proposed uses are permitted within the district and are consistent with the policies articulated for that area.

(f) the new use or building construction is inconsistent with the Urban Design Objectives set forth in Section 19.30.

The proposed project is consistent with the Urban Design Objectives set forth in Section 19.30, as described below.

(19.31) New projects should be responsive to the existing or anticipated pattern of development.

The location of uses, the building height, setbacks, and orientation on the lot all positively respond to the patterns of adjacent development and to the articulated development goals for the area, as described in more detail above in these Findings.

(19.32) Development should be pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, with a positive relationship to its surroundings.

The development is oriented toward the street with pedestrian and bicycle friendly entrances at the ground level, with bicycle facilities available within the building. The ground floor design has a substantial amount of window frontage, parking is located below grade, and the necessary service functions such as garage entrances and mechanical equipment are minimized and screened with aesthetically pleasing materials.

(19.33) The building and site design should mitigate adverse environmental impacts of a development upon its neighbors.

Rooftop mechanical equipment is minimized, screened, and set back from abutting properties. Service and loading functions are interior to the lot. Functional green roof space, along with other measures, are employed to manage stormwater. Abutting properties will not be adversely impacted by shadows, windows or lighting. The project will replace surface parking and not significantly disturb existing vegetation.

(19.34) Projects should not overburden the City infrastructure services, including neighborhood roads, city water supply system, and sewer system.

The project will meet all applicable standards for provision of public infrastructure. The project will be subject to Green Building requirements pursuant to Section 22.20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

(19.35) New construction should reinforce and enhance the complex urban aspects of Cambridge as it has developed historically.

Consistent with the character of Central Square, the new building includes a mix of uses with retail at the ground floor. Existing historic buildings are preserved.

(19.36) Expansion of the inventory of housing in the city is encouraged.

The project will include 46 total residential units and will be subject to Inclusionary Housing requirements.

(19.37) Enhancement and expansion of open space amenities in the city should be incorporated into new development in the city.

The project will include a small publicly enjoyable plaza space at the ground floor as well as rooftop open space as an amenity for residents of the building.

DECISION

Based on a review of the Application Documents, testimony given at the public hearings, and the above Findings, the Planning Board hereby GRANTS the requested Special Permits subject to the following conditions and limitations. Hereinafter, for purposes of this Decision, the Permittee shall mean the Applicant for the requested Special Permits and any successor or successors in interest.

1. All use, building construction, and site plan development shall be in substantial conformance with the Application Documents dated October 21, 2013, as revised by plans dated January 15, 2014, and all supplemental documents and information submitted by the Applicant to the Planning Board as referenced above. Appendix I summarizes the dimensional features of the project as approved.
2. The project shall be subject to continuing design review by the Community Development Department (CDD). Before issuance of each Building Permit for the project, CDD shall certify to the Superintendent of Buildings that the final plans submitted to secure the Building Permit are consistent with and meet all conditions of this Decision. As part of CDD's administrative review of the project, and prior to any certification to the Superintendent of Buildings, CDD may present any design changes made subsequent to this Decision to the Planning Board for its review and comment.
3. As part of the continuing design review for the project, CDD shall review the final selection of façade materials in order to assess their suitability to the character of Central Square, particularly with regard to scale, texture, and color. CDD shall also review the treatment of the façade facing Bishop Allen Drive, to assess whether it provides an appealing face to the residential neighborhood, while acknowledging that future development may occur on the adjacent corner lot.
4. The Planning Board approves for this project the reduction of accessory residential parking to a rate of 0.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. However, the Permittee shall be required to implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program with the objective of reducing the demand for parking by future residents, which shall include the following measures for a minimum of three years beginning at initial occupancy of the building:
 - a. Provide an MBTA Bike Charlie Card, with the minimum value of a combined bus/subway pass (currently set at \$70 per month but subject to future MBTA fare increases) to each adult member of a new household for the first three months of initial occupancy of a new household, up to two Charlie Cards per household, renewed each time a unit is occupied by a new household.
 - b. Provide, at a minimum, one free annual membership to a carsharing service that provides vehicles within a quarter-mile of the residential building to each adult member of a new household upon their initial occupancy, up to two memberships per household, renewed each time a unit is occupied by a new household.

- c. Provide, at a minimum, one free annual Hubway Membership to each adult member of a new household upon their initial occupancy, up to two memberships per household, renewed each time a unit is occupied by a new household.
- d. Provided, at a minimum, one fifty-dollar (\$50) credit to a bicycle shop within a half-mile distance of the residential building to each household during each year of occupancy.
- e. Provide a bicycle repair station in the building, to include air pumps and other bicycle tools.
- f. Designate a Transportation Coordinator (TC) for the site to manage the TDM program, who shall be the primary point of contact for the City in certifying compliance with these requirements. In addition to the requirements set forth above, the TC shall oversee the marketing and promotion of transportation alternatives to all residents at the site in a variety of ways including posting information in prominent locations within the building, on web sites and property newsletters, and responding to individual requests for information. The TC should participate in any TC trainings offered by the City of Cambridge or local Transportation Management Associations.

The Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department shall certify that these requirements will be met prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy for development authorized by this Special Permit.

5. The Planning Board approves the requested waiver of front yard setbacks for construction of the new building as it has been proposed. However, prior to issuance of any Building Permit for development authorized by this Special Permit, the Permittee shall meet with the Cambridge Department of Public Works to investigate possible interventions to increase the width of the sidewalk to a width that will be more comfortable for pedestrians.
6. The Planning Board approves the exemption of the proposed Functional Green Roof Area from the calculation of Gross Floor Area for the lot. However, any portion of the Functional Green Roof Area that is intended to be walked on by building occupants shall be reviewed and approved by Community Development Department staff to verify that such areas are engineered to withstand the anticipated foot traffic without impacting the viability of the planted vegetation.
7. All authorized development shall abide by all applicable City of Cambridge Ordinances, including the Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.16 of the City Municipal Code).
8. Throughout design development and construction, the project shall conform to the Green Building Requirements set forth in Section 22.20 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance.
9. The project shall be subject to the Inclusionary Housing requirements set forth in Section 11.200 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Housing Division of the Community Development Department shall certify compliance with such requirements prior to the issuance of a

Building Permit or Certificate of Occupancy for development authorized by this Special Permit.

10. The project shall comply with short-term bicycle parking requirements by providing a contribution to a Public Bicycle Parking Fund as provided in Section 6.104.2(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Voting in the affirmative to GRANT the Special Permits were Planning Board Members H Theodore Cohen, Steven Cohen, Hugh Russell, Tom Sieniewicz, Steven Winter, Pamela Winters and Associate Member Catherine Preston Connolly, appointed by the Chair to act on the case, constituting at least two thirds of the members of the Board, necessary to grant a special permit.

For the Planning Board,

Hugh Russell (JCR)

Hugh Russell, Chair.

A copy of this decision #285 shall be filed with the Office of the City Clerk. Appeals, if any, shall be made pursuant to Section 17, Chapter 40A, Massachusetts General Laws, and shall be filed within twenty (20) days after the date of such filing in the Office of the City Clerk.

ATTEST: A true and correct copy of the above decision filed with the Office of the City Clerk on March 17, 2014, by Jeffrey C. Roberts, authorized representative of the Cambridge Planning Board. All plans referred to in the decision have been filed with the City Clerk on said date.

Twenty (20) days have elapsed since the filing of the decision. No appeal has been filed.

DATE:

City Clerk of Cambridge

Appendix I: Approved Dimensional Chart

	Existing	Allowed or Required	Proposed	Permitted
Lot Area (sq ft)	34,744	5,000 min	No change	No change
Lot Width (ft)	137.7	50 min	No change	No change
Total GFA (sq ft)	65,397	Varies by use mix	113,716	113,716 ⁽¹⁾
Residential Base	0	104,232 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Non-Residential Base	65,397	95,546 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	
Inclusionary Bonus	N/A	31,269 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	
Total FAR	1.89	Varies by use mix	3.27	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Residential Base	0	3.00 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	
Non-Residential Base	1.89	2.75 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	
Inclusionary Bonus	0	0.90 max	See below ⁽¹⁾	
Total Dwelling Units	0	149 max	46	46
Base Units	0	115 max	36	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Inclusionary Bonus Units	N/A	34 max	10	
Base Lot Area / Unit (sq ft)	N/A	300 min	965	
Total Lot Area / Unit (sq ft)	N/A	233 min	755	
Height (ft)	46.8	80 max ⁽²⁾	80 ⁽²⁾	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Front Setback – Essex St (ft)	0	Per formula ⁽³⁾	As in plans ⁽³⁾	
Side Setback – Essex St (ft)	N/A	Per formula ⁽³⁾	As in plans ⁽³⁾	
Other Setbacks ⁽³⁾	As exists	N/A	No change	
Open Space (% of Lot Area)	0	3.4 % min ⁽⁵⁾	3.5 %	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Private Open Space	0	3.4 % min ⁽⁵⁾	3.5 %	
Off-Street Parking Spaces ⁽⁶⁾	28	46 min	23 ⁽⁷⁾	23 ⁽⁷⁾
Long-Term Bicycle Spaces ⁽⁶⁾	0	49 min	54	Consistent with Application Documents and applicable zoning requirements
Short-Term Bicycle Spaces ⁽⁶⁾	0	8 min	None on-site ⁽⁸⁾	
Loading Bays ⁽⁶⁾	0	None required	No change	

⁽¹⁾ Maximum permitted GFA of new construction is 48,319 square feet. Base and inclusionary housing calculations to be determined upon application of Inclusionary Housing requirements prior to issuance of a building permit.

⁽²⁾ Planning Board approves the height per Section 20.304.2.

⁽³⁾ Planning Board approves waiver of applicable yard setback requirements per Section 20.304.4.

⁽⁴⁾ Other setbacks on the lot are a condition of existing buildings on the lot to remain.

⁽⁵⁾ Private Open Space requirement for a mixed-use building calculated per Section 5.22.2.

⁽⁶⁾ Parking, Bicycle Parking and Loading requirements apply only to new residential building at 10 Essex Street.

⁽⁷⁾ Planning Board approves waiver of required parking per Section 20.304.6.

⁽⁸⁾ Short-term bicycle parking requirements to be met by public contribution per Section 6.104.2(b).