

MEETING	Monday, May 18, 2015
TIME	5:40 PM
PLACE	Sullivan Chamber
PRESIDING OFFICER	Mayor David P. Maher
PRESENT	Mayor Maher, Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey
ABSENT	None

Mayor Maher announced that the meeting was being recorded with visual and audio devices.

PRESENTATIONS	None
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	
MOMENT OF MEDITATION	

SUBMISSION OF THE MINUTES	On motion of Vice Mayor Benzan the submission of the Minutes for the City Council Meeting of April 27, 2015 was accepted on a voice vote of six members.
---------------------------	--

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol Bellew, 257 Charles Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that she supports the Mass + Main petition. She stated that this is not a small amount of money that the developers are giving up. She stated that it is nice to know that the developers have gone beyond the required amount of affordable housing required.

Amanda Tramont, 3 Dana Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that her point is that we simply do not need any more lab or office space in Central Square. What is really needed is affordable housing. She asked that the City Council to vote in favor of the Mass + Main project.

Jessie Kanson-Benanov, 26 Willow Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated his support for the Mass + Main proposal and inclusion of 20% of the housing units for low income and family-sized units. He urged expeditious adoption of the proposed zoning.

Kasper Bejoian, 544 Huron Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated his support for the Mass + Main zoning proposal. He stated that we have enough banks in Central Square and the fact that there are no banks in this project is excellent. He stated that the proposed development

will improve the block and enhance the neighborhood experience. He asked the City Council to vote in favor of this petition.

Jan Devereaux, 255 Lakeview Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that she is opposed to the Normandy/Twining petition and its process. She stated that the proposed height and density increases beyond those envisioned by the most recent area planning study are unprecedented. She asked the City Council to consider carefully whether they are rushing to approve a deal with compromises that future decision makers and residents will regret settling for.

Shelley Rieman, 201 Franklin Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that there are great inequities in the permitting process as it has been working in Cambridge. She stated that developers almost always get what they want while residents' concerns are given a nod and a smile. She stated that the Cambridge Residents Alliance wants more affordable housing as much as any other citizen group. She stated her belief that the City Council could have bargained for much more than Twining/Normandy offered in their plans.

Kathy Zusy, 202 Hamilton Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated her support for the Twining/Normandy proposal to build a high rise at Mass & Main. She stated that Cambridge needs more affordable and moderate-income housing units and this is the way to get them. She stated that she is impressed with Twining/Normandy and their responsiveness as well as their high quality and interesting work.

George Metzger, Central Square Business Association, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that one year ago he asked the City Council to adopt an order to implement non-zoning recommendations from the C2 report but they are still under consideration somewhere. He stated that one year ago he noted that the C2 report was approaching two years of age and the City Council had yet to accept the report. He stated that many disagree on the details of the Central Square vision and few disagree on the need to plan the future. He stated that the Twining/Normandy petition is the opportunity to build for the future. He stated that street front retail and open space can be built and in the process the City might come up with creative ways to use city-owned surface parking lots to leverage other community benefits.

Carol O'Hare, 172 Magazine Street, spoke on Policy Order #11. She stated that she is pleased and relieved that the City Council denied Citizens Bank/Leather World/Bob Slate's application for ten projecting banner signs. She stated that this is 3.6 times more signage than the Zoning Ordinance permits. She stated that this sends a unanimous message to the BZA that enough is enough.

Ellen Schachter, 346 Concord Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that other than to say that she urges support of the Twining project, she is grateful for 47 affordable units. She stated that this has been a distressing process and she has felt a great us/them dynamic. She stated that she feels that we are in a divided city. She stated that she feels great that almost everyone has uniformly been in support of more affordable housing in the City of Cambridge. She stated that if what comes out of the process is the coming together, she will feel that this was a useful time in the city.

Robin Finnegan, 31 Hubbard Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated her support for the Mass + Main proposal. She stated that this project's location will make it possible for tenants to rely on public transportation. She urged the City Council to vote favorably on this petition which will include 47 new affordable units in Central Square.

Steve Kaiser, 191 Hamilton Street, spoke on Policy Orders #4 and #6 and Calendar Item #2. He stated that he supports the concept of Policy Order #16 to urge a return to C2 planning issues and thereby to reject piecemeal zoning. He stated that he opposed any amendment by substitution that does not require an additional public hearing on those changes.

Esther Hanig, 136 Pine Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She expressed her strong support for the Normandy/Twining petition and noted that she has been disappointed that there has been no forward movement on the work to formulate a vision that sought to preserve the unique character and diversity of Central Square, foster community and vitality and create a sustainable neighborhood where people can shop, work and play. She stated that 47 affordable units and 10% family units will help to promote diversity, community and vitality in Central Square. She stated that this development will enliven an area that all too often sees little activity.

Sarah Kennedy, Chamber of Commerce, 859 Massachusetts Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that this petition aligns with the C2 Study and the Central Square Advisory Committee's recommendations of adding more housing to Central Square. She stated that the Normandy/Twining petition will transform a section of Central Square that is underutilized.

Gerald Bergman, 82 Elm Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he thinks the rhetoric on affordable housing is a Trojan horse for developers. He stated that the City could look at the budget and free cash and ask if the Normandy/twining bribe is sufficient for what the city is getting. He stated that the Nexus Study is years in delay. He stated that years have passed without an increase in inclusionary zoning. He stated that the City did nothing on MIT zoning to ensure students have their own housing. He stated that we say that the developer has to create affordable housing for the city but it is up to the city to do that. He stated that there is plenty that the city can do to create affordable housing.

Amy Nadel, 265 Gore Street, spoke on Policy Order #4. She spoke in support of this order. She stated that one thing that we know is that stress created by high stake tests do not allow children to learn in a meaningful way. She thanked Councillor McGovern and Councillor Kelley for this order.

Charles Teague, 23 Edmunds Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he opposes the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that this is not "smart growth" as there is no Master Plan for the city or for Central Square. He stated that it is silly to incentivize development in the hottest real estate market in the United States. He stated that it is unconscionable to bestow any benefits at all from the people of Cambridge to Normandy Real Estate.

Eli Yarden, 143 Pleasant Street, spoke on City Manager Agenda Item #3. He stated that all documents under discussion are supposed to be available for those who speak. He stated that law

is complex and dependent upon language. He stated that government is instituted for the common good for the protection of the people and not for the profit of any one man or family. He stated that corruption is not illegal and especially not in Massachusetts. He stated that market rate housing is one example of highly corrupt example of the word market. He stated that the price of housing in Cambridge is controlled by the need to expropriate space for the benefit of an owner. He stated that there are areas where corruption is rampant in Massachusetts.

David Chilinski, 1 Gray Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He spoke in support of the Twining petition. He stated that he believes the residential approach is much better for the community at this site. He stated that area merchants and restaurants will benefit from the infusion of people on the street throughout the week. He stated that the height and scale of this building are appropriate for this focal point along Massachusetts Avenue and Main Street. He stated that the unprecedented affordable approach that Twining is taking on this site demonstrates a clear understanding of the most challenging issue that is before the community. He asked the City Council to vote in favor of this petition.

Richard Goldberg, 170 Harvard Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he is against the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that the people who are in favor of the project point to 47 units of affordable housing. He is looking at the height. He stated that the height of this building is clearly out of scale with Central Square. He stated that there is a weapon that the City Council has at its disposal. The weapon is the existing zoning. If every building which went over existing zoning was 100% affordable housing, that would go a long way toward creating the diverse neighborhood that he wants to see maintained.

Decia Goodwin, 175 Chestnut Street, spoke on Policy Order #11. She stated that for over 25 years she and her neighbors have been fighting aviation noise in Cambridgeport. She stated that there has been a huge growth in banner planes and helicopters during events and it has been her experience that calling Mass Port's hotline is completely ineffectual. She urged the City Council to do its part at high level.

Ilan Levy, 148 Spring Street, spoke on Policy Order #11. He stated that the City Council is guilty of the division that is being created in the city as it relates to Normandy/Twining. He stated that for many years the City Council could have planned for the problems that are before us. He stated that Cambridge is not the city where everything is good. It is a very conservative city. He stated that there is no way that Normandy is not going to go through. He stated that the City Council has the power and it does not act.

Joseph Elder, 243 Broadway, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he has spoken before the City Council in the past and stated that he is for the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that the building is amazing. He stated that it will bring a lot of beauty to Central Square. He stated that it will bring a lot of life to the city. He stated that he is in construction and it is really good for the city. He asked the City Council to support this petition.

Cathy Hoffman, 67 Pleasant Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that new market rates will not shift people from current apartments because people will pursue what is cheaper. She stated that it is likely that this will draw more people to Cambridge who are able to afford the new

“market rate.” She stated that she does not believe that this project will take the City closer to the desire for families and young people being able to live and work in the city. She stated that she can only point to the challenge.

Patrick Barrett, 234 Broadway, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he is an abutter to the Normandy/Twining project. He stated that he is in support of this project for many reasons. He stated that several years ago we were ahead of a comprehensive zoning plan for Central Square. He stated that he realizes that it is great to have long conversations and now is the time to do something. He asked for City Council approval and asked that they take up C2 again. He stated that Central Square is his home and needs help. This project represents 400 more people living in Central Square. He stated that this should be the beginning of the revitalization of Central Square.

Barbara Goodchild, 41 Bowdoin Street, spoke on Policy Order #11. She stated that she has owned property in Cambridge for 19 years. She stated that due to the changes in flight paths instituted in 2013, whenever there is northwest wind the flight pattern changes and planes fly over her neighborhood. She stated that this negatively affects the quality of life and property value. Runway 33L will continue to be used but she suggested the paths be alternated so that we all share the pain.

David Slaney, 237 Norfolk Street, spoke on Committee Report #3. He stated that he is a member of the Living Wage Commission and Income Insecurity Commission. He spoke in support of Policy Order #6. He stated that there is not enough of a supply of affordable housing. He stated that he is asking the City Council to try to address the issues in whatever way possible. He stated that Cambridge has a Living Wage which is very close to the \$15.00 which is becoming the standard. He stated that he hopes the City Council will support the studies.

Lahra Tillman, 150 Dudley Street, spoke on Policy Order #11. She stated that she is woken up by planes at 5:30 a.m. She stated that noise issues have been a problem. She moved to North Cambridge in 2011 and was thrilled to find something affordable. She stated that it is not related to wind direction and she has an airplane superhighway over her house. She has timed the planes that come in approximately every 60 seconds. She stated that there is no way that she can live and work in Cambridge under these conditions. She stated that she is looking into relocation options which displaces the woman to whom she rents. She stated that people come to Cambridge but leave because of quality of life issues. She encouraged that the City do everything on this issue.

Carolyn Shipley, 15 Laurel Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that this is about a serious lack of planning. She stated that we lack a Master Plan. She stated that anyone that is for the Twining Tower is not knowledgeable about city zoning or ordinances. She stated that anyone in favor of this petition is not for affordable housing. She stated that she does not see how 40 affordable units will solve the problem of affordable housing. She stated that the city should do more to house the homeless. She stated that current zoning is being tossed aside.

Danny DeGuglielmo, 793 Cambridge Street, stated that Fresh Pond is about 7 miles from Logan Airport and Point of Pines is about seven miles. The condition of Logan Airport is a social tragedy. Something has to be done about this. He stated that he has no problem at 793 Cambridge Street

with jets. He stated that he went to the Attorney General's Office and complained. He stated the evil presence is that our children are being ruined by the burden of sound. It is not fair to the elderly. He stated that we need to go to court. He stated that if he does not see something done publicly in one month he will take out a lawsuit.

Donald Sheehan stated that he has had many conversations with City Councillors. He stated that there are some contractors in the area that are not providing health care and benefits. He stated that it is not fair to the people who live in the community. Normandy is promising to put local people to work. He asked that the City Council approve this project.

Adrienne Langlois, 26 Suffolk Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that she is a law student. She stated that affordable housing is crucial to ending homelessness. She spoke in favor of the fact that this petition poses integration. She stated that this builds a community that is vibrant and economically diverse. She stated that economic diversity is one of the reasons she chooses to live in Cambridge and where she wants to make her home.

Matt Haymer, 5 Scotland Drive, Andover, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that he and his wife are business owners in Cambridge. He stated that when he opened Café Luna, Mass and Main met close to the front door of the café. Because of Jill Rhone Park there is a vibrancy in Central Square. He stated that the City Council has the opportunity to continue what was started by the Jill Rhone Park. He stated that he employs approximately 45 individuals. He stated that this housing will greatly benefit all individuals who need it. He strongly urged the City Council to grant this petition.

Robin Lapidus, Central Square Business Association, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that the CSBA is pleased by the community benefits that will be a result of this project. She stated that Central Square desperately needs this type of diverse people living in Central Square. She stated the need for landlords to make the important kinds of changes that Central Square deserves.

James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place, spoke on Calendar Item #2. He stated that the City Council will vote on the Normandy/Twining petition. He stated that he plans to remember who voted for this proposal. He stated that regarding City Manager Agenda Item #15, that for eight years he has been begging the City Council to protect pedestrians in the city. Nothing is done to protect those who walk in the City. Regarding Normandy/Twining he stated that in Boston they are putting up a building that is 50% higher yet we are supposed to be excited for 47 units. He stated that the letter that was in the Chronicle says they have observed the housing crisis.

Marianne Nelson, 175 Richdale Avenue, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated her opposition to the Normandy/Twining project. She stated her objection to spot zoning and the excessive height of the building. She stated that this sets a precedence. She stated that Cambridge is promoting LEED type of buildings and she sees nothing to this effect in this project.

Marilee Meyer, 10 Dana Street, spoke on Calendar Item #2. She stated that tonight marks the final decision changing Central Square forever. She stated the cultural fabric is being eroded because the City Council could not get it together to get a Master Plan and because they latched onto a

private developer willing to take the responsibility for affordable housing out of their hands. She stated that the Planning Board's criteria states in part that there be consideration of the variety of vantage points from which tall buildings will be seen. This has been totally ignored by both bodies. She stated that a frenetic letter from three City Council members emphasized the need for inclusionary housing but they have yet to take inventory or study other configurations of how to get more housing while honoring the scale, history and context of the Carlone petition. She stated that affordable housing is a must and said that the City Council is shirking the basic responsibilities in zoning and good governance as a whole.

Marilyn Wellons, 651 Green Street, stated that her observation regarding the City's policies on trees is driven by the apparent to service contractors. She stated that regarding Policy Order #11, she thanked the City Council for addressing this issue of noise. Regarding the Normandy/Twining petition, she stated that she is happy to see that the parking lot issue is forthcoming. She stated that the City Council should remember that mechanical structures are exempt from the height of a structure. She stated that her neighborhood thought that they had dealt with the downside of development abutting the neighborhood but failed to think about light pollution. She stated that noise and light pollution will come from the tower that it is about to be approved. She stated these issues need to be addressed seriously.

Gary Mello, Franklin Street, stated that the Mass + Main proposal has its merits considering the present underutilization of the space but he does not feel that he will ever be comfortable with a nineteen story structure. He stated that this tower will be another 100 Landsdowne Street benefitting very few people.

Terrence Rothman stated that 13 million American families' homes were repossessed by banks. He asked how many of these 35 million Americans will be able to find housing in the affordable housing programs nationwide. He stated that statements by Ms. Hoffman saying that the proposed tower is out of scale is truth and confirmed by the development in Harvard Square. He stated that the question of poor decisions by the City Council is obvious in many areas of the city, not the least of which is the Courthouse which is empty.

Elaine DeRosa, CEOC, stated that she is in support of the Twining/Normandy petition and the affordable housing in this project. She stated that these units of affordable housing are critical. She spoke about the prioritization of 10% of three-bedroom units in this project and would like these units to be targeted for low-income families. She stated that if that 10% can be prioritized in any way it would helpful to participants that they serve at CEOC. She spoke in support of the recommendations of the Housing Committee in terms of the Nexus Study.

Lee Farris stated that she is a big supporter of affordable housing and is concerned that the urgent need in Cambridge is used to justify the huge zoning increase for the Normandy tower in Central Square. She stated that there are many other things that the city could do and has not done that would increase affordable housing while allowing development that is more appropriate for Central Square. She stated that more luxury housing is not likely to reduce market housing. She stated that a Master Plan process is needed with an immediate priority assessment of housing needs

to increase equity and socio-economic diversity in Cambridge. She stated that there should be no approval of new large developments without this analysis.

Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street, stated that regarding Order #4 regarding PARCC, please support the teachers. Regarding the results of the Nexus Study, at the very least do this. She stated that what is probably a very important part of this zoning was not known by people who were not involved in the negotiations until this evening's meeting. She stated that the City Council should allow people the opportunity to comment on this. She stated that there are major changes in the petition. She stated that land is too expensive because everyone who buys land says that their land is worth a ton more. She stated that all the land that could have had affordable housing on it is being made way more expensive. She stated that the city can do better but is afraid.

Munon Perez stated that he is in favor of the Mass + Main project. He stated that he has lived in the city for eleven years. He stated that he would like to see something better in Central Square. He noted that 47 families will be the benefit from this project.

Hasson Rashid, 820 Massachusetts Avenue, stated that violence against the homeless sector should be a hate crime. He stated that any credible measures that the policy makers take to ease and eradicate homelessness is worth its weight in gold. He stated his belief that the city is in violation of the HUD's mandates pertaining to declaring vacant city-owned property in compliance with annual and consolidated planning reporting. He stated that the Foundry building has been laying vacant and idle for several years. He asked how everything can be balanced and equal while opportunities to address homelessness and poverty are being circumvented for no reason at all.

Pam Ross, 67 Highland Avenue, stated that she supports the Mass + Main petition. She stated that there are people who are interested in the community's input. She stated that Cambridge is a place where everyone wants to live. She stated that there is a new hole every day by the CambridgeSide Galleria. She stated that this building will alleviate some housing problems. She stated that we should be working on how to fix the need for housing.

Mark Roopanian, Principle, Normandy, stated that the goal of the Mass + Main petition has been to deliver mixed-income housing to this important intersection and to help activate this area with new retail. He stated that it was made clear that housing, not office or lab, was the strong priority for this community. He stated that the City Council told them that they needed to deliver a substantial number of permanently affordable units as part of the proposal. He stated that this zoning requires 20% affordable and middle-income units and required 10% of three-bedroom units. He stated that he is proud of the community effort that went into molding this zoning. He thanked the community who attended countless meeting and weighed in to help make this a better proposal.

Monica Raymond, 59 Brookline Street, stated that when this development is built she will not see the blue sky. She stated that we are now signing on to a luxury shanty town in Central Square. She stated that she sees a scene out of Oliver Twist in the evening. She stated that the problems in Central Square is the disparity between ultra-rich and very poor and this development replicates that disparity. She stated that the current situation is dysfunctional and this project will exacerbate

the dysfunction. She stated that she does not understand how some City Councillors are going to go through with this.

Phyllis Bretholtz, 65 Antrim Street, stated that each of the City Councillors have the best interest of the city in their hearts and mind. She asked the justification for a building almost two times higher than any other existing building along the corridor between Albany and Prospect Streets. She asked how it is possible to deny other developers from being granted similar up-zoning requests. She questioned the plan in place to determine and guarantee that the apartments designated as affordable will be available to current families in Cambridge. She asked that the City Council oppose this development.

Nancy Ryan, 4 Ashburton Place, stated that she has one statement. You must delay the vote on this petition for one week. She stated that there needs better language and more explicit language. She stated that there is a bigger concern regarding micro housing.

Minka van Beuzekom, Essex Street, stated that two things that she was pleased to begin was to ban nicotinoids and pesticides to protect the bees and she is pleased that and she is glad that Councillor Mazen has expanded that. She is pleased that the city has a natural gas analyzer. She stated that Policy Order #10 needs to be expanded. She noted that this is an opportunity to get the watering truck in use. She stated that the tree ambassador is a great idea. Regarding Hubway Stations she stated that it is fabulous that city money is being used. She stated that it would be wonderful if we could continue the conversation of offering subsidies to low-income riders of Hubway. She stated that the City Council is the body that makes decisions about what the City will look like in the future. She stated that in so many cases zoning has been adopted and override what the general framework is. We need a plan that addresses all of this rather than developers and property owners coming in with their idea. She stated that it is clear that the affordable housing piece is a red herring because if we thought that affordable housing was the number one issue we would have dealt with linkage and other parcels and would have pushed MIT to house graduate students.

PF Soto, 243 Broadway, stated that she sees mission creep. It is a different city than it was forty years ago and it is getting worse in her viewpoint. She stated that an article in the NY Times spoke about an article about competition between NY and LA. She stated that all of the people that brought life to New York are moving to LA. She stated that a lot of people have the foresight to see what Cambridge is heading towards if we do not maintain the diversity.

John Sansone, 540 Memorial Drive, stated that while he respects the opinion of some that the tower in the Normandy/Twining position is out of scale, he does not see it that way. It is a unique set and the proposal enhances the lot in its corner and the human scale elements are well-conceived. He stated that the developers have showed a willingness to design well. His one complaint is the excessive parking. He stated that the Planning Board recommends language for car-sharing but it does not address this paradigm. He stated that the public process is superior but it does not have to be a black and white process. He stated a collaborative attitude is beneficial. Regarding Policy Order #8, he stated that we should shop our data and problems and ask hackers to crunch this information.

CONSENT AGENDA

- # 1 Placed on file
- # 2 Referred to the Ordinance Committee
- # 6 Placed on file
- # 8 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- # 9 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #10 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #11 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #12 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #14 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #18 Order adopted 9 - 0 - 0
- #21 Order adopted 8 - 0 - 0 - 1 (Vice Mayor Benzan)

NON CONSENT AGENDA

3 Here insert Agenda # 3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone stated that improvements on Massachusetts Avenue, south of Porter Square the work was done. He asked about the lesson learned about the soil needed for the trees and other treatment of the street scape if they would be incorporated into the work for north Massachusetts Avenue. City Engineer Kathy Watkins stated lessons are being learned about the soil volume and the desirability. She noted that there are different scales of projects and if there are small maintenance projects street maintenance, repair work and trees are planted as much as possible. She stated that soil volume is beneficial. She stated that a study is being done to identify trees planted on more traditional streets about the soil volume and the enhanced soil volume over the next 3-5 years to see what the benefits and tradeoffs are. Mr. Rossi stated that this would be a huge project in excess of \$20 million. Ms. Watkins stated that the Harvard to Porter section is a more enhanced master plan benefits are more expensive than the traditional street reconstruction. Mr. Rossi noted that this would be a huge undertaking. The City is in a study phase and is trying to use what was learned in the south of Porter Square area and other areas in the City and that this project be the beneficiary of what has been learned. He commented that tree planting is subject to a long community process. He added that new and tested ideas will be brought to the table.

Councillor Kelley understood that the plan is not to do anything extensive for this stretch of the avenue except some tree planting and sidewalk repair and some street reconstruction, but nothing major. Mr. Rossi stated that in the future if the City acquired the funding the work would be done comprehensively after an extensive community discussion and process. The City will provide all that has been learned about streetscape. He commented that all the variable happen on this stretch of roadway and it is heavily travelled with significant utility related issues. If an area of the street needs to be repaired the practices will be put into place about what has been learned. Councillor Kelley asked what the cost for the Massachusetts Avenue from Harvard to Porter Square was. Ms. Watkins responded that the section from Harvard to Porter being done currently will including paving and pedestrian ramps cost \$850,000. Councillor Kelley stated that when you pave Massachusetts Avenue it should be done completely, side to side. Ms. Watkins stated that the paving was from Everett Street to Linnaean Street. Councillor Kelley expressed his concern about the tree plantings, intersection platforms and the price tag of \$20

million and what this will cover. Ms. Watkins stated that if the work is done on Massachusetts Avenue it should be comprehensive and include utility work, water, sewer, bikes and the broader infrastructure. Councillor Kelley questioned why this was not the case for the work done for Harvard to Porter. Ms. Watkins stated that it is a balance between the broader work and the repair work. Councillor Kelley stated that he is looking at taking a section of the roadway that needs buffing up but actually functions well as a street and he hears Ms. Watkins to say rebuild the whole section. Mr. Rossi stated that there are two different situations. He explained that in the 1990's there was push to acquire funding from the state for North Massachusetts Avenue.

Another situation is to fix and spruce up a section of Massachusetts Avenue. He added that North Massachusetts Avenue has not been touched in many years in terms of the underground utilities and the infrastructure would have to be evaluated before a major investment was made. He stated that it is unlikely that there will be a major investment available in the next few years and more likely that smaller sections are dealt with but not as comprehensively done. Mr. Rossi explained that if there was a redevelopment of property along Massachusetts Avenue the City could work with the developer to rebuild a stretch of the sidewalks so the City needs to be ready with a plan if this type of an opportunity presents itself. The City needs to develop the data on what is needed to remedy on the Massachusetts Avenue from Porter Square to the Arlington line. If work is needed on Massachusetts Avenue the City will do the work to the greatest extent possible. Mr. Barr stated that from the parking issue that this is looked at and generally does not require a major investment. He further stated that in the short term if there are issues the City will address them. Councillor Kelley asked if there is a visioning plan being proposed. Ms. Farooq stated that the city-wide planning work is coming up and looking at key corridors such as North Massachusetts Avenue and Concord Avenue there are issues that may be investigated in more detail. There are a board set of issues that will be reviewed. Councillor Kelley asked what the plans for North Massachusetts Avenue are. Ms. Farooq stated that the consultant will not be on board until the fall. Alewife will be the first phase. The process will take about three years and Massachusetts Avenue will be done in the middle.

3 Placed on file.

4 Here insert Agenda # 4 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone spoke about the traffic flow during the construction of Flagstaff Park. He asked about the construction cycle. He stated that before the bad winter there were cars on the Common was this because it was the set-up area for Flagstaff Park being the first phase. Ms. Watkins stated that the first phase was on getting the paving done on Massachusetts Avenue. She stated that there was a focus on the Flagstaff Park construction first because there were issues that arose about the details in the park. The work on the Common is all part of the same DOT project and the work could progress as the outstanding design issues were addressed. Councillor Carlone stated that the first phase is successful and will be more successful when the planting is done.

Councillor Kelley stated that he is interested in how the bike part works. He asked if November 2015 is a reasonable end date. Ms. Watkins stated that the completion date from the contractor is November 2015. It is optimistic for the plantings and it may go into the spring.

4 Placed on file.

5 Here insert Agenda # 5 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone asked if 20 feet can make a difference in locating a tree from a gas leak or does the gas spread over a distance. Ms. Watkins stated that the analyzer will identify where there are hot spots with gas for the City and will coordinate with the utility company as well. The analyzer will give information on where there are high gas levels.

Councillor Kelley when the analyzer was used was there any gas leaks. Ms. Watkins stated that the intention is to use the analyzer where there will be street tree plantings. She added that there are no issues with gas mains on Western Avenue because they are all new. The analyzer has been used at spot locations and there have been no issues. The analyzer will continue to be used for the new plantings over the next couple of weeks.

Mayor Maher questioned the remediation on Quincy Street where there was an issue of a gas leak and the trees planted died. Ms. Watkins responded that there were a couple of issues on Quincy Street. There was a question about how the trees were planted and if watered after being planted. This is not a location where the City planted or plans to replant. This location has not been checked by the City Arborist yet but is on the list of continued coordination. The trees were planted by Harvard University as part of the building development.

Councillor Carlone commented that at a committee hearing an attendee stated that the leaks were high on Quincy Street. He added that Harvard University did not look into this.

5 Placed on file.

7 Here insert Agenda # 7 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor McGovern commented that report contained useful information. He stated that all that shelter beds will not end homelessness. He stated that affordable and transitional housing, wages, training, drug and mental health issues are the answers. He stated that there are people who are hungry tonight and in the short term what can be done to ensure that people have safe places to go. He was surprised by the data that the shelter beds are not full. He asked in putting the report together if the shelters were contacted to get input from them as to what their actual need is. Ms. Semonoff, Assistant City Manager for Human Services, responded that this data comes from the shelters. She explained that in order for the shelters to get any funding they are obligated to report on a nightly basis the utilization of the beds. The data about the bed utilization comes directly from the shelters. Ms. Semonoff explained that her staff coordinates with the various shelter providers. She stated that when preparing this information there was no conversation explaining that there was a Policy Order asking for this information. She stated that between the work that the police do around homelessness and the work done by First Step that reaches out to people on the street there is space for people who are willing to come into the shelters, unless the person has been banned from the shelters. She stated that there are people who find the shelters intolerable because of their circumstances. The challenge is if another shelter was created it would be for those who have been banned from other shelters because of their behavior including CASPAR which has the most tolerate of circumstances. She noted that there is a need for more services and for people to move from homelessness to being housed. She stated that the shelter beds, if additional were created, would be used not for the homeless in Cambridge but for those outside of Cambridge.

Councillor McGovern commented that many homeless come to Cambridge because of the treatment received in Cambridge. He stated that he is in favor of providing a place for the homeless. He spoke about the obstacle being that the various shelters have different criteria. He asked if there was a sense of the need for the privately run shelters. Ms. Semonoff stated that she did not know of any existing shelter with space that is unable to have additional beds within their shelter because they do not have the funding as opposed to the fact the shelter have as many beds as they can manage. Councillor McGovern stated that he would like to know if there are shelters that would provide additional beds if they had the funding. He stated that women with children and young people are a population that is need of housing. He inquired if there is more that could be done for this vulnerable population. He stated that there are only eighteen shelter beds for young people with a potential of 20-25 more beds. This is still not enough. He asked if there were any recommendations for this specific population. Ms. Semonoff responded that the youth, and once the Y2Y shelter is off the ground and operating whether it makes sense to look for more space. This will be known better after this is operating. She spoke about women without children and that the City is participating in a federally funded planning exercise that will culminate in the fall with a community wide process. She stated that one of the likely areas of focus will be women because there are special circumstances about homeless women. There will be an opportunity to bring the community and the providers together to discuss this. She added that the system is different for women with children and men with children. She explained that all family housing is done through the Department of Transitional Assistance, except for circumstances where there are domestic violence issues. The number of family housing was determined by the State a few years ago based on the number of families coming through the Department of Transitional Assistance system from Cambridge. Councillor McGovern stated that he wanted the information back about if there are shelters that have space and could use more beds he wanted the City to think about this. He added that the problem might not be solved but it may solve the problem for someone for one night.

Councillor Mazen commented about reports received and if they could be in line with the original line of questioning. This report redirected the City away from what was the original aim. There is no path open to pursue this as policy makers. Councillor Mazen stated that he still wants to add one hundred beds. Ms. Semonoff stated that the staff rejects the view that this is not local, state or federal effort to add more shelter beds. She added that this data is collected daily and that the data collected suggested that there are empty beds every night and if you do not agree then you can come back to the City Manager and state that you want to do something different.

Councillor Mazen stated that reports come back to the City Council that do not guide the City Council to their original initiated policy. He always wants the initial policy considered in the report and not just the opinion of the department. Mr. Rossi stated that he does not want to state that the City is in the middle of a budget year and this is something that will not be considered. The reports show that there are difficult circumstances and the City cannot do and be everything to everyone. The City attempts to answers the report and this represents an incredible amount of work by the departments. Mr. Rossi stated that this is something that needs to set out in the goal setting as a group. Councillor Mazen explained why he brought this matter up in this particular way. He stated that there are many things he would want to know about an additional one hundred beds before he made a decision. He stated that if the regional approach were reviewed it

may be helpful. Ms. Semonoff stated that if Cambridge wanted to become the regional homeless shelter provider it could. She stated that if a new one hundred bed shelter were opened people from outside Cambridge would come to the shelters. This is a policy choice. Councillor Mazen responded that it would be immoral to not open a new shelter with one hundred beds irrespective of what the region is doing.

7 Placed on file.

#13 Here insert Agenda #13 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Toomey asked how this would be advertised to reach the widest audience as possible. Ms. Semonoff stated that the Community Learning Center is sponsoring this program is working widely through the City to get the word out. She stated that their 600 student body is a wonderful resource as well. There is an incredible amount of research being done for people who would like to take advantage of this program in the fall and whose skill level needs to be improved are able to access the program. Councillor Toomey suggested that the multi-lingual organizations be notified as well.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT ORDER FOR AGENDA # 13)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –

Adopted.

#15 Here insert Agenda #15 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen asked if the City is doing a subsidy.

Ms. Farooq responded that the subsidy was not being recommended at this time. She stated that if the City subsidized Hubway the macro questions are why the City is not subsidizing T passes or other modes of transportation that may have broader impact. This raises a bigger policy question. Councillor Mazen commented that the fact that transportation be subsidized as a matter of social and economic justice is an important issue. He stated that if the City wanted to subsidize T passes and bike share so be it. Ms. Farooq noted that marketing was discussed. She stated that the low utilization among low income communities is that there is less information. It has been found to be more successful if there is targeted marketing done. She noted that the current Hubway posters are in many languages targeting to different ethnic groups. Councillor Mazen explained how he approach increasing the ridership. He suggested that Cambridge do a subsidy pilot with a few families and this may reveal if a subsidy is worthwhile. Mr. Rossi stated that there is a lot around bike share that the City needs to look into. He stated that there needs to be an understanding of what this would cost the City. He stated that the City has already incurred a substantial cost. He added that the City wants this to succeed. The program will grow and it is a regional program. He commented that hopefully the plans for Hubway in the future will make it more economically viable for communities. He stated that in the beginning the City stated it would not accept advertising revenue. He stated that he thinks that this is a mistake and

this will be evaluated. He added that if the cost came down there may be opportunities to increase the use. He stated that in the future all suggestions will be reviewed in an effort to make this service more viable to the community. Councillor Mazen noted that he would like to be kept abreast on what the City is doing in this regard.

Councillor Kelley questioned the funding and how many bikes and stations this covered. Ms. Farooq stated that the City currently has 33 stations and that this would allow the City to purchase an additional 15 stations to be deployed at the locations contained in the Agenda Item. She stated that the City's financial commitment to Hubway is substantial. She stated that the annual operations are \$800,000 annually a small percentage which is subsidized by sponsors. Councillor Kelley commented that his understanding is that this is a three year cycle and after three years the City has to pay for the maintenance. He asked if the new 15 stations are at the beginning or the end of the three year cycle. Ms. Farooq stated that the three year cycle refers to the initial commitment asked from sponsors. The sponsors pay for the docks and operations for three years. This is at the end of the cycle for the initial sponsors. Letters will be sent to the initial sponsors to see if they will continue to sponsor operations. Mr. Rossi stated that some letters of continuation have been received. Ms. Farooq stated that the current Hubway contract is coming to an end and the City is renegotiating the contract for a period of one year because the parent company is planning to reconfigure their management structure. The short term contract is to wait for the company to work out the details and then the City will determine how the future contract should lay out. She stated that the appropriation is for the purchase of the fifteen stations and not for the operations. Councillor Kelley noted that the City helps to fund Hubway. Mr. Rossi stated that the operation of Hubway is for the benefit of all, to see it grow and to get more funding for it. He stated that there will be more of a demand for this in Cambridge. He noted that the expense side will grow and the City wants to see if the revenue side will grow to make it more viable. He acknowledged that the difference between the expense and the revenue side the City owns. Councillor Kelley stated that there needs to be more city-wide penetration of Hubway. Specifically he noted the Alewife T station will this be expanded or will it be at another location. Ms. Farooq stated that one of the locations that is being considered is at the Alewife T and there is a development commitment at 85 CambridgePark Drive. Mr. Rossi added that this is a demand issue. Councillor Kelley wanted to understand better how the Hubway stations are located. Ms. Farooq explained that the possible locations for the additional stations need to be evaluated. Councillor Kelley suggested a location at the junction of Belmont and Mt. Auburn Street. He stated that he is impressed at how Hubway works. It is important that the stations are year round.

Councillor McGovern would be interested in seeing a pilot program with a subsidy option for low income residents to be able to use Hubway. He wanted to ensure that neighbors are notified when a location for Hubway is proposed. He asked what the timeline is for these stations. Ms. Farooq stated that the stations would be purchased now and it will take several months for the stations to arrive. The earliest that the stations could be installed is the fall. She noted that some of the stations are dependent on special permit conditions and are tied to development.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT APPROPRIATE ORDER FOR AGENDA #15)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –

Adopted.

#16 Here insert Agenda #16 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Kelley commented that the more that the City Council understands about hazardous waste and transportation the better off all are. He asked Chief Reardon to explain what the training was for and about the status of the ethanol train and the refinery in Revere or Everett and how this would impact hazardous shipments through Cambridge. Chief Reardon stated that this is a hazardous preparedness grant through Mass. Emergency. This is an annual conference that is held every year in Baltimore, MD. The conference is an education as well as a display of new materials for hazardous spills and equipment. This is one of the best conference for personnel dealing with hazardous material to attend. This is an addition to the usual annual grant because some communities could not meet this grant obligation and so Cambridge can send more people to the conference due to the extra funding. This conference is a general conference on hazardous material. Regarding the ethanol Chief explained that Global and Irving in Revere mixes the fuels for gasoline. He informed that the City Council that there have been a number of moves by the State to discourage this usage. He stated that a casino will be built in Everett and the tracks are 1,000 feet from the casino so there may be less interest to have the trains travel so near this casino as it is being built. He further stated that ethanol has been mandated by the federal government. Most of the ethanol is being transported by barge and some is transported by truck. Councillor Kelley stated that this training helps personnel on how to respond to hazardous materials. Chief Reardon stated that this is a broad based training including chemicals, detection equipment, and new evolution on training. The participants attend the educational classes and then there are vendors that demonstrate new equipment that is available on the market.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT APPROPRIATON ORDER FOR AGENDA #16)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 7
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	Vice Mayor Benzan and Councillor Simmons	- 2

and the order was –

Adopted.

#17 Here insert Agenda #17 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen asked what occurs at this Urban Area Initiative. Fire Chief Reardon stated that the Urban Area Initiative

covers a multitude of areas and different disciplines are covered. This program is to send one member of the department to Deer Island and this training covers search and rescue and knots and ropes that are used. He stated that this would be valuable if there were a construction accident or a fire situation. He stated that team is being trained which is comprised of the nine Urban Area communities. He stated that some of the equipment that is being received is specifically for search and rescue. This class was to train the trainer in knots and ropes in order to take this class. This individual will come back and train other members of the department. Chief Reardon explained that in order to be included in the FEMA training in Beverly they must take the Urban Area training to meet certain prerequisites for certified instructors. Councillor Mazen stated that this type of regional training is beneficial to City departments. He is hopeful that over time there will be a regional consolidation enterprise when it comes to armored vehicles and swat teams. He stated that he appreciated the regional work.

Councillor Kelley commented that anytime an item such as this is seen by the City Council will be discussed because training of City staff may seem like regular training but not to the rest of the population. It is important to talk about this as much as possible so there are no surprises. He felt that if Cambridge has trained personnel that it controls in situations where this training is needed is much better. He added that if Cambridge can afford the training it would do well to have these capabilities in house.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE INSERT APPROPRIATE ORDER FOR AGENDA #17)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the order was –

Adopted.

NORMANDY/TWINING ZONING PETITION

#19 Here insert Agenda #19 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone noted that the votes are heavily in favor of approving this amendment. He stated that this is a complex project and a game changer. He commented that game changers need to be analyzed in great detail. There has been no economic analysis on this project. He noted that the CRA has done an excellent analysis of development in the Kendall area. He stated that from the information of the City's open data portal there have been 4,000 housing units built with an additional 5,400 units in process. He stated that Cambridge is exceeding its share of housing. He commented on the zoning regarding the review process which will be a standard review process. He commented on the Planning Board's recommendation that it is appropriate to allow a few taller buildings in light of the benefits that may be gained. He stated that this is extremely vague. He stated that any opening will be pursued by developers. His concern is that this will become the norm for

Central Square. This goes beyond Central Square. He stated that his concern is not the particular proposal. His concern is the zoning and what it means to the whole zoning process and the neighborhood. He asked if the guidelines still have to be approved by the City Council. He stated that it is his belief the guidelines have not been approved by the City Council. He stated that the guidelines could be strengthened to include information about materials or tying this back to the historical buildings in Central Square. He commented that he is happy that the developer has seen the value on Bishop Allen Drive to include the building site where it should be included. He is concerned about the size of the building and what this precedent means for the other parking lots. He announced that he would not be voting for this zoning amendment primarily because of the precedent, the height and the density. He stated that he hoped that when the project is going through the special permit process that the whole site be looked at to maximize the benefits.

Councillor Toomey stated that a commitment letter was presented to the City Council tonight. He requested explanation of what is contained in the commitment letter so that the City Council and the public knows what is in the commitment letter before the City Council votes on this proposal.

Attorney Galluccio noted that the petition received a favorable recommendation from the Planning Board. During this process the petitioner adopted and incorporated all the Planning Board recommendations so that the petitioner could come back to the City Council with a revised zoning petition that is in concert with the Planning Board. It was important that there be coherence and in line with the Planning Board on all issues. Many of the issues related to the C2 process and incorporating the request of the City Council to increase the affordable housing. He informed the City Council that there were a few issues that were not included in the revisions because they were not appropriate for technical zoning language. The issues were commitments made in the course of the process. He outlined the issues in the commitment letter. The first issue was City purchase of additional affordability. The petitioner was asked to partner with the city for additional units as part of the covenant for affordable units. The petitioner tried to include the community benefits through the zoning provision of 20% permanent affordable units with 17% affordable; 3% middle which comes out to 47 units. This is an additional three units. The goal is to come to an agreement around pricing and value so that three additional units can be created. This would also set a precedent for other deals such as this. He stated that he thinks that agreement can be reached on this. There were concerns about the surface lot on Bishop Allen Drive and whether another use could be considered for the lot going forward. He stated that all the parking was needed to accomplish the income housing proposal. Going forward as the parking demand lowered could a different use be considered for some part of the surface lot. The petitioners have made a commitment to look at this. This did not find a place in the Planning Board recommendations. The petitioners are committing to a five year after occupancy of the residential buildings they would convey to the City the front portion of the parking lot. Access would still be needed along the side to get to the back parking. This is enough for five to six three bedroom units. The City would get a conveyance to their liking for the purpose of creating affordable housing. This allows for the street edge to be residential and creation of more affordable units. The retail and public market required by the zoning involve the community was a request from Councillor Simmons. This language was further defined to create a community advisory committee. Further refinement for the public market concept is

needed. The community would comment on a theme or context for the public market for a particular season or weekends. He stated that last commitment is micro housing and limitation on residential parking permits. This concept was included in the zoning and should be 5% not 8%. He stated that the Planning Board was now comfortable with this as a zoning provision.

The language requires that the units be 350 – 500 square feet which are the smallest units. This does not allow these units to have residential parking permits. The Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department is not prohibited from issue a residential parking permit; this is a private lease hold agreement. This is a private agreement through the lease that the lease holder of these units are agreeing not to get a residential parking permit through the lease agreement. This could be enforced within the provision of the lease hold agreement. This would be a voluntary agreement when the tenant signs the lease. This deals with the traffic and parking concerns. These are all issues that have been discussed throughout the process. He stated that the focus of the petitioners was to deliver community benefits that represents the largest number of permanently affordable units as part of the zoning. The value has been articulated. This also activates through retail and public realm an important intersection and an important edge to Central Square which can make a significant difference to the area.

Councillor Toomey noted that this zoning proposal has been before the City Council for a long period of time. He stated that he has supported this project and has attended most of the hearings on this matter. He feels that this is an opportunity to provide affordable housing for those who need it. He stated that it is getting harder for working class families to stay in the City. He explained that everyone's comfort level this information could have been crystalized sooner so that it could have been digested. Other housing options in the City are needed. This is an option that will provide affordable housing in the City and to maintain the diversity in the City. He stated that he supported the proposal and will be voting for the proposal. People want to come to Cambridge. Cambridge is a victim of its success.

Vice Mayor Benzan moved suspension of the rules to bring forward Calendar Item Number Two.

The question now came on suspension of the rules – and on a voice vote the rules were –
Suspended.

Mayor Maher read Calendar Item Number Two, the same being a communication from Donna P. Lopez, City Clerk, transmitting a report from Vice Mayor Benzan and Councillor Carlone, Co-Chairs of the Ordinance Committee, for a public hearing held on April 1, 2015 to continue discussions on the Normandy/Twining petition. The question come son passing to be ordained on or after May 11, 2015.

Mayor Maher stated that both items were before the City Council

Vice Mayor Benzan noted that the community input was broad based and came together on the issue of affordable housing. Cambridge is facing a housing crisis now. There are forty-two affordable units in Columbia Terrace and these units saved the lives of many families. He noted that it is a shame to say that the amount of affordable units in this commitment letter is insignificant. This proposal is a step in the right direction for Central Square. He stated that the

proposal provides for affordable housing units and affordable retail. He spoke about the surface lots and Lot 6 being undeveloped. This development will be a vast improvement over what exists now. He is hopeful that this proposal will continue to be shaped as it goes through the design review process and the permitting process. He thanked the Normandy/Twining staff for working with the community. He further stated that the precedent that is being set here is to help Cambridge families.

At this time Vice Mayor Benzan made a motion to amend the petition by substituting the text in the Planning Board's Recommendation as submitted by the petitioner dated April 23, 2015.

The question now came on the motion to amend by substitution – and on a voice vote the motion to amend by substitution –

Carried.

Vice Mayor Benzan moved that the Commitment Letter be brought before the City Council – and on a voice vote the motion –

Carried.

Mayor Maher stated that there is a revised zoning amendment that has been suggested by the City Solicitor to add Section 20.307.13.

Vice Mayor Benzan read the following amendment:

Section 20.307.13 Letter of Commitment

The Letter of Commitment dated May 18, 2015, signed by Stephen J. Cusma on behalf of the proponent of the "Mass and Main" Zoning Petition referred to therein as "Normandy/Twining," ("Letter") shall be binding upon any developer and/or owner of a Residential Mixed Income Project as defined herein. The issuance of any building permit or certificate of occupancy for a Residential Mixed Income Project shall be conditioned upon certification by the Community Development Department and all other relevant City departments to the Superintendent of Buildings evidencing that such Residential Mixed Income Project is proceeding in accordance and in compliance with all provisions of the aforementioned Letter.

The question now came on the amendment to add Section 20.307.13 and the language contained there – and on a voice vote the amendment –

Carried.

Councillor Mazen appreciated the consensus around the affordable housing issue. He noted that this is the best part of the project because most of it is unclear to him. He stated that there are many unresolved points. He is displeased around the level of nuance about displacement. He commented that what current standards that exist current around housing will get worse. He stated that this tower boots more people out of the neighborhood. It is crazy to

build a tower such as this and not think that it is a tradeoff scenario. He stated that displacement is a real thing. This is a nuance project with clear tradeoffs. He stated that the concerns of the neighborhood have not met with consensus building. He felt there is a better way to do this. He stated that the more that the project is discussed the more benefit he sees. He spoke about the positive aspects of the project, but why the concerns of the neighborhood could not have been addressed exhaustively. He explained that he supported C2 and then he learned that C2 was not forwarded because of the Normandy Twining petition may have been in conflict with C2. He stated that not knowing what the developer is going to do on the other parcels and knowing what this is not what he wanted. He stated that he liked the petition for all the benefit it can be and that it will be a successful project, but this was not the consensus based approach for the neighborhood. He wanted to know how the bulleted items on page four would be addressed. He wanted to know about the change in the micro housing from 5% to 8% units. He wanted to clarify the conveyance of Lot A to the City as well as the timeline. Attorney Galluccio stated that the top of the surface lot is addressed at 65 Bishop Allen Drive would be conveyed as indicated in the language should read five years from occupancy of the residential building. He explained that the original petition had 5% for the micro units, were exempt from the parking requirements and were prohibited from getting a resident parking sticker. He stated that the Planning Board was uncomfortable with dealing with these stipulations in zoning so a similar concept was articulated in the commitment letter and the micro units were increased to 8%. The petitioner felt comfortable with this number. He stated that the exact layout cannot be articulated at this time so he could not put a unit number for the 8%. He further stated that there will be no less than 10% three bedroom units and 8% micro units. There will be an array of bedrooms and unit sizes across the whole building. He noted that the 8% will not affect the sizes of the other units. Councillor Mazen expressed his concern that the 8% micro units would affect the affordable units. Attorney Galluccio noted that this petition is the first to embrace 10% three bedroom units. This does not impact the project. These micro units will not impact the one, two or three bedroom units. Councillor Mazen asked if the affordable units will be in proportion to the market rate units. Attorney Galluccio explained that the language only affected units that exempted parking. Councillor Mazen questioned the five year period on the conveyance. Attorney Galluccio stated that the petitioner was trying to estimate when the parking demand and when the parking spaces would no longer be needed. This represents a number of parking spaces that would be removed. He stated that parking is also a concern in Central Square. He wanted to present a parking ratio that would not create a burden on the neighborhood. In five years when the petitioner participate in parking demand reduction the parking will be reduced whereby this portion of the lot can be conveyed. He explained that this language did not survive the draft and should have been included in the commitment letter. Councillor Mazen wanted to understand how the Planning Board Recommendations on page four and five are reconciled in the petition. Mr. Roberts explained that changes are reflected in an underlined and stricken out version of the zoning text that is at the end of the Planning Board's recommendation. He stated that there were recommended changes to section 20.307.7. He stated that the Board felt that the language that was submitted to them at the April 28th hearing was not as clear as it could be. There are provisions of Article 19 that apply so this was reworded to clarify. He further stated that there were questions about how car sharing would work in terms of the number of required car sharing spaces and the reduction in parking that could be authorized including car sharing vehicles. This language was changed. He spoke about the point about innovation housing and innovation units. The definition of innovation housing the Planning Board found it vague as to whether the term

innovation was to refer to the size of the units, function of the units as work space or the parking provisions that applied to the units. There was an objection that residents of these units would be required by zoning be excluded from resident parking permits. The resolution was to strike this language. He stated that the parking issue is addressed in the letter of commitment. He stated that the section 20.307.11 amends the date of reference to be consistent with the reference date elsewhere. He stated that there was additional consideration for the Design Guidelines to be taken into consideration under Article 19.

Councillor Mazen commented that this project will most likely be voted in the affirmative. He stated that in the future he hopes that it will be considered how difficult this process has been. There are no right answers in this matter. He hopes that displacement is looked at in the future. He wants to look at ground floor retail and he hopes that certain units will be subsidized. He wanted more consensus in the future. This is not what he hoped for and he will not be voting in favor of this petition.

Councillor McGovern questioned the Bishop Allen lot and stated that the five year period is so that the petitioner understands what their parking needs are. He asked if this could be provided in three years. He stated that the City can build affordable housing on this lot which may take up to seven years to build. He wanted to move faster. Attorney Galluccio stated that for his client to convey this lot it is likely that it will be needed and a waiver for parking because the ratio will drop. Changing the time could be considered as long as the City Council understands that the petitioner would still have to go through this step. He stated that if the parking demands did not warrant a reduction the Planning Board would say no. There is a public step that has to take place and this may provide the leverage for the parking demand in three years. Attorney Galluccio stated that he would discuss this with his client. Councillor McGovern stated that if the letter is being amended to state five years is it possible to say 3-5 years. He wanted the three years in the letter. Attorney Galluccio stated that there would be a language change to the commitment letter before it is submitted and he will discuss this with the client to see it can be closer to the request of Councillor McGovern. Councillor McGovern stated that he was uncomfortable with the minimum of 8% of micro units because if the inclusionary units other than the 3 bedrooms need to represent the need in the building does this mean that with the inclusionary zoning that there will be more micro units. He stated that his goal is to protect the 47 affordable units. He wanted a cap on how many of the micro units could be affordable. Attorney Galluccio spoke about complying with Article 11 and that the affordable units will mirror the market rate units based on size, fixtures, kitchens and amenities. The plan is to have a mix of units. He further stated that there is an economic consequence for every decision. The building may not be occupied for three years. He stated that the petitioner has committed to 10% three bedroom units, but the mix and the lay out of the floors still requires design review. It would be challenging to make these types of commitments within the zoning context. Councillor McGovern noted that he would not be happy if the developer came back with 10% three bedroom units and all the rest micro units. He asked if the parking sticker restriction could be deeded to the land because property changes owners and if Normandy Twining sells the property he wanted the new owner to be required to comply with the restriction. Attorney Galluccio noted that the City has become expertise in attaching the commitment letter to the zoning in a way that lawyers will argue that a commitment letter is binding. He stated that the Building Department is aligned with the enforcement of these zoning commitments and the commitment

letters. If Normandy Twining has a special permit that relies on zoning that was followed and a commitment letter was attached. If a tenant received a resident parking sticker in one of these units and the lease stated that a resident parking sticker is restricted it would be an issue. People who finance a project such as this want to ensure that the developer is compliant with the special permit. Councillor McGovern stated that whatever can be done to make this legally binding should be done. He noted that the City Councillors are voting for what they think is best for the City. He spoke about the diversity in the City but somehow it is wrong to have a diversity of an opinion. He stated that 47 units means a lot to those who these units will be affordable and keep them in the City. He is not thrilled with the 19 stories, but it does make sense in this spot. He stated that he likes the idea of the City buying housing units. He would like these units to be three bedroom units. He stated that he will vote in favor of this zoning petition.

Councillor Kelley asked Attorney Galluccio what happens if this zoning does not get passed. Attorney Galluccio stated that the proposal started a year ago and the community was asked what it wanted. The petitioners heard that the community wanted affordable housing and stated with a plan that could be effectuated. He stated that it would likely that the client would move forward with an office special permit. He stated that momentum can carry one to great places and when a client buys into the long term commitment to the community it is where we are today. He stated that he has been told from the Normandy side that this is a hot office market, but it was listened that the community wanted affordable housing. He stated that the district allows up to 80 feet of office. He stated that supporters of this project support it because the affordable housing is more beneficial to the City than office. He spoke about the economic to drive this deal. This is the height and the density needed. He concluded that this is an office special permit district. Councillor Kelley stated that this is the issue whether housing or office is wanted for this area. Overwhelmingly people want housing and not office.

Councillor Cheung stated that he felt that the City is not sacrificing anything. The City gets affordable and micro housing retail and using local labor. He stated that this is going to bring life to Central Square. This will not be a monolithic of walls going down Massachusetts Avenue. This will state that Central Square is a destination and a place where people want to be.

Councillor Simmons asked Attorney Galluccio on page two of the commitment letter on the retail advisory committee she is concerned about the ground floor retail. She stated that Central Square has always been special. Residents wanted to go somewhere and buy something that they can afford. It is important to her that the ground floor retail be affordable and if it is not it is going to be a real problem. She wanted the language to state that the retail advisory committee meet not less than once annually. Central Square is supposed to be different, affordable and diverse. It is not Kendall or Harvard Squares. She further stated that diversity must include who is living in the building to who has a shop on the ground floor. Attorney Galluccio stated that there is 10,000 square feet of retail space and the commitments that have been made in the zoning and the commitment letter of 25% local independent and no banks and along with the advisory committee it will give Councillor Simmons and the community leverage to for the space and to have accountability with the petitioner. The retail space has to be popular enough to work, survive and pay the rent. He noted that the restrictions came from the C2 recommendations. He stated that retail along Massachusetts Avenue and Main Street makes a statement that retail is still part of the fabric of Central Square. Currently this space is a dead

space which had contained a low level lab space. Attorney Galluccio stated that "not less than" will be added to the commitment letter. Councillor Simmons stated that if this is passed and we move forward with the ground floor retail she wanted to see more from Community Development Department to help the City Council ensure that there is the diversity of the ground floor retail. She wanted to know what is needed to be done to encourage businesses that do not have the income that a bank would have. She stated that she did not more research and development office space at this location. She restated the importance that the affordable units be of the same type and quality as the market rate units and that the affordable units be dispersed throughout the building. She stated that she would be very displeased if all the low and moderate units were located on Columbia Street. She need the assurance that all the affordable units will be of the same quality as the market rate units. Attorney Galluccio stated for the record that all the units whether affordable or market rate will be of the same quality. Mr. Twining responded in the affirmative and stated that this is enforced by the City for previous projects that have been done. Attorney Galluccio stated that this project has 11.5%, which is different from Article 11 and all the inclusionary provisions will be complied with including disbursement throughout the building and like units. There will be no effort to circumvent this. Mr. Normandy explained that you will not be able to distinguish between a market rate and affordable unit. Councillor Simmons stated that she would vote to move the Normandy Twining proposal to move forward. Councillor Simmons submitted her remarks for the record. **(HERE INSERT COUNCILLOR SIMMONS' REMARKS FOR THE RECORD).**

Councillor Carlone stated that the low income units are permanent are the middle income units permanent as well. Attorney Galluccio responded in the affirmative. He stated that the guidelines which have not been approved by the City Council do not mention the type of materials. The drawings seem to indicate brick or terracotta on the lower level and limestone or cast metal on the tower portion. He wanted to know what the assumptions made were. Mr. Twining stated that the developers have not gotten this far. The Planning Board did not want to see designs. This comes later. Councillor Carlone stated that this building will be one of the biggest on Massachusetts Avenue and materials will make a difference. Again he stated that the guidelines have not been approved by the City Council. He commented on the minimum of 8% of the micro units. He stated that when you see a minimum of something you want to know what the maximum is. This is a need for a number of the micro units to also be affordable. He would like the 8% be the maximum. This leaves the image that this is open ended. Attorney Galluccio stated that this speaks to the parking provision. He spoke about the housing demand of the past, now and into the future. The minimum relates to the number that will be exempt from parking. The further stated that this is not an overall statement about the unit size. It is important that the units be rented to be able to provide the affordable units and a diversity of units. Councillor Carlone commented that the developers must have a sense of the percentages or you could not do a proforma. Attorney Galluccio commented that some of the assumptions have changed because of the design. The project is in a zoning phase and not in the design phase. This project needs to be financed.

Councillor Mazen commented that if you building more units you will meet the supply and demand and the demand will be less. Economists can study this in the future. He feels that the question of the parking and the innovation units may need to be disaggregated in order to be comfortable. He cannot see approving zoning like this with such an open ended element. He

stated that clarity is needed with the parking restriction and the micro unit restriction. Attorney Galluccio commented on Plan E form of government in which there is a separation of powers. The Planning Board in this instance has design review authority under Article 19. He felt that the City Council is treading close to a line and the developers are not there yet at the layout of the building. Councillor Mazen stated that this is a zoning question, not a design question. He wanted to know the percentage upon which the development will operate. Attorney Galluccio noted that the petitioners have responded to the City Council in all ways asked of them. He stated that it would not be appropriate at this time for the petitioners to commit to the amount of bedroom sized units. This team will go to those who finance such projects and make a case and then an analysis would be done. It is inappropriate for the petitioners to go deeper. He stated that the 8% micro units was workable for the petitioners. He requested a level of good faith. Councillor Mazen commented that he has seen other layouts where it was clearer.

Mayor Maher stated that this is an opportunity. The parcel can be the gateway to Central Square and transforming from lab to housing and vital retail and bring people to the ground in Central Square. Mayor Maher stated that Jackson Gardens has 45 affordable units. This is a privately built project that will contribute more units than Jackson Gardens. He further stated that Lincoln Way has 70 affordable units. He stated that the number of family units at this project is comparable to Jackson Gardens. He stated that he found the 8% confusing but now has an understanding of the matter. The goal is that this is a transient oriented development. The private developer has made a commitment that tenants will not be able to have an automobile in this project. There are different ways to look at this project. This project may help transform Central Square. He stated his support of the petition and that he is taking a leap of faith with the petitioners. He further stated that the process was inclusive. The C2 recommendations need to be reinvigorated. He stated that inclusionary units alone are not going to solve the housing crisis, nor is public housing, the affordable housing trust or the incentive zoning. Even with all these things together the housing crisis will not be solved. This will better deliver the type of housing that people are looking for. Cambridge of today will be different in 20-30 years and we need to make Cambridge a viable place for people to work, live and play in.

Vice Mayor Benzan agreed with Mayor Maher and Councillor Simmons on the totality of the issues. This project addresses how to give homes to people who do not have homes. He stated that 47 units are significant.

Vice Mayor moved passage to be ordained as amended by substituting the Planning Board recommendations and that the letter of commitment be incorporated and be made part of the zoning ordinance and by the addition of Section 20.307.13 which reads as follows:
(HERE INSERT ORDINANCE # 1368)

The question now came on passage to be ordained as amended by substitution and incorporating the letter of commitment and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Kelley, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 7	
NAYS:	Councillors Carlone and Mazen		- 2
ABSENT:	None	- 0	

and the proposed amendment was -

Passed to be ordained as amended by substitution.

CHESTNUT REALTY ZONING PETITION

#20 Here insert Agenda #20 read by Mayor Maher. The item was -
Referred to the petition.

Vice Mayor Benzan moved for suspension of the rules in order to dispense with the regular order of business to introduce a communication from Donna P. Lopez, City Clerk, transmitting a report from Vice Mayor Benzan, Co-Chair of the Ordinance Committee, for a public hearing held on May 12, 2015 to discuss a zoning petition filed by Chestnut Hill Realty to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cambridge, Section 20.600 Basement Housing Overlay District by including language to clarify the intent of the provisions to apply to multifamily structures that are wholly or partially located in Residence C, C-1, C-1A, C-2A, C-2B, C-3, C-3A or C-3B Base Zoning Districts.

The question now came on suspension of the rules and on a voice vote the rules were -
Suspended.

The question now came on acceptance of the Committee Report which reads as follows:
(HERE INSERT THE COMMITTEE REPORT # 4)

The report was -
Accepted and placed on file.

The question now came on passage to a second reading the proposed amendment which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT FIRST PUBLICATION # 3363)

The proposed amendment was -

Passed to a second reading at the City Council meeting held on May 18, 2015 and on or after June 1, 2015 the question comes on passing to be ordained.

CALENDAR

1 No action taken

#3-8 No action taken

9 Passed to be ordained as amended (See Communications and Reports from City Officers # 2).

APPLICATIONS AND PETITION

1 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

2 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

CONSENT COMMUNICATIONS

#1 - 71 Placed on file.

CONSENT RESOLUTIONS

Councillor Simmons moved adoption of the resolutions and upon adoption that the resolutions be unanimously sponsored. The motion carried on voice vote.

1 - 11 Resolutions adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
#13-30 Resolutions adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
#32-34 Resolutions adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

NON CONSENT RESOLUTIONS

#12 Here insert Resolution # 12 read by Mayor Maher. Vice Mayor Benzan congratulated Councillor Kelley on completing his course work at the JFK School of Government.

The question now came on adoption of the resolution which reads as follows:
(HERE INSERT RESOLUTION # 12)

The resolution was -

Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#31 Here insert Resolution # 31 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Simmons stated that on Wednesday, May 13, 2015 the Robert Robinson Taylor Forever Stamp was unveiled. He was the first African American to graduate from MIT. He was a member of the class of 1892. She gave an overview of Mr. Taylor's life.

The question now came on adoption of the resolution which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY RESOLUTION # 31)

The resolution was -

Adopted on the affirmative vote of nine members.

CONSENT POLICY ORDERS

1 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
2 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
3 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
5 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
7 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
8 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
#10 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
#11 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
#12 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

- #15 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.
- #16 Order adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- # 1 Report accepted and placed on file.
- # 2 Report accepted and placed on file.
- # 3 Here insert Committee Report #3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Simmons moved suspension of the rules in order to bring forward Policy Order # 6. The question now came on suspension of the rules and on a voice vote the rules were - Suspended.

Here insert Original Policy Order # 6 read by Mayor Maher.

Councillor Simmons stated that this process is outline in Policy Order # 6. She stated that she wanted to change the last two bulleted items on the recommendations by striking out the last two items and inserting in place thereof the following:

Ask the Ordinance Committee to examine the legality of similar linkage requirements for job training programs; and

Ask the City to initiate a nexus study tying the living wage ordinance to linkage to be completed within a year and to have community involvement as part of the process.

The motion now came on the adoption of Policy Order # 6 as amended which reads as follows: (HERE INSERT AMENDED RECOMMENDATIONS ATTACHED TO POLICY ORDER # 6)

The order was -
Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

The committee report was -
Accepted and placed on file.

- # 4 Passed to a second reading above.

COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS FROM CITY OFFICERS

- # 1 Recommendations approved

OFFENSES AGAINST PROPERTY

- # 2 Here insert Communications and Reports from City Officials # 2 read by Mayor Maher. He stated that the item was referred to Calendar Item # 9.

Councillor Carlone moved suspension of the rules to dispense with the regular order to business to bring forward Calendar Item # 9 to amend Calendar Item # 9 by substituting the language contained in Communications and Report from City Officers # 2.

The question now came on suspension of the rules and on a voice vote the rules were - Suspended.

The question now came on the motion to amend Calendar # 9 by substituting the language in Communications and Report from City Officers # 2 for Calendar # 9 and on a voice vote the motion to amend by substitution - Carries.

Councillor Carlone now moved passage to be ordained as amended the proposed amendment to the Municipal Code in Chapter 9.04 entitled "Offenses Against Property," which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT ORDINANCE # 1367)

The question now came on passage to be ordained as amended by substitution and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons, Toomey and Mayor Maher	- 9
NAYS:	None	- 0
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the proposed amendment was -

Passed to be ordained as amended by substitution.

NON CONSENT ORDERS

4 Here insert Policy Order # 4 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Toomey stated that he would not be voting on this Policy Order. He stated that he did not know what the answer to the issue is but he did not want to go back to the days when students were graduating with a sixth grade reading and math level because there was no type of testing at all. He stated that he has heard current upsetting statistics on minority students. There are only 20% who complete a program. He does not want students moved onto another grade without having the necessary skills to either go to college or to the workforce. He stated that to have no type of requirements for students to graduate from the high school is unacceptable to him.

Mayor Maher exercised his Charter Right on this matter.

9 Here insert Policy Order # 9 read by Mayor Maher.

Mayor Maher exercised his Charter Right on this matter.

#13 Here insert Original Policy Order #13 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Cheung moved to amend to be added as a co-sponsor and to request that the City Manager be requested to report back to the Human Services Committee. The motion to amend carried on a voice vote.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT AMENDED ORDER #13)

The order was -

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#14 Here insert Original Policy Order # 14 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Cheung moved to correct a Scribner's error by striking out the words "Public Safety Committee" in the second paragraph and substituting in place thereof the words "City Council."

The question now came on the amendment and on a voice vote the amendment - Carried.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended which reads as follows:

(HERE COPY AMENDED ORDER NUBMER FOURTEEN)

The order was -

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

LATE RESOLUTIONS

35-45 Councillor Toomey exercised his Charter Right on Late Resolutions #35-45.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Councillor Cheung the meeting adjourned at twelve o'clock and two minutes AM on May 19, 2015.

A list of documents and other exhibits used at the meeting:

City Manager's Agenda

Council Agenda

CD of meeting