

**HEARING SCHEDULE  
CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS BEGINNING JANUARY 29 2001**

Monday, January 29, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Wednesday, January 31, 2001	12 noon	The Human Services Committee will hold a public meeting to receive an update on the pilot after school program at the Harrington School, the youth center program and to consider other business that many come before the committee. <b>(Ackermann Room)</b>
Monday, February 5, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Wednesday, February 7, 2001	8:45 A.M.	The Government Operations, Rules and Claims Committee will hold a public meeting to evaluate the City Council's goal setting process. <b>(Ackermann Room)</b>
	4:00 P.M.	The Housing Committee will hold a public hearing to received information from affordable housing providers on programs and issues for affordable housing in Cambridge. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
	6:15 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss and commence the hiring process for the position of City Auditor for the City of Cambridge. <b>(Ackermann Room)</b>

**City of Cambridge does not discriminate on the basis of disability. The City Council will provide auxiliary aids and services, written materials in alternative formats, and reasonable modifications in policies and procedures to person with disabilities upon request. Contact the Office of the City Clerk 349-4260, tty/TDD 349-4242.**

Monday, February 12, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Tuesday, February 13, 2001	6:15 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss in lieu of tax payments by universities and institutions as well as removal of taxable property from the tax rolls. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Wednesday, February 14, 2001		The Ordinance Committee will conduct public hearings as follows:
	4:30 P.M.	To consider proposed amendments to the following sections of the Municipal Code to comport with amendments to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 30B, the Uniform Procurement Act. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
	5:00 P.M.	To consider proposed amendments to the Responsible Employer Ordinance to include public works contracts such as roadways and sewers. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Thursday, February 15, 2001	5:30 P.M.	The Transportation, Traffic and Parking Committee will receive a presentation from Ben Hamilton Baillie, a Loeb Fellow at Harvard on traffic calming measures used in Europe. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>

	6:30 P.M.	The Transportation, Traffic and Parking Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss the issue of traffic enforcement in the City. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Wednesday, February 21, 2001	5:30 P.M.	The Housing Committee will hold a public hearing on the Community Preservation Act. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, February 26, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, March 5, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, March 12, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Friday, March 16, 2001	10:00 A.M.	The Public Safety Committee will conduct a round table meeting to discuss public safety issues in coordination with the FY02 budget <b>(Grainger Room – Police Station 5 Western Avenue)</b>
Monday, March 19, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Wednesday, March 21, 2001	6:30 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a round table meeting with the School Committee to discuss the FY02 School Budget. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, March 26, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>

Monday, April 2, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, April 9, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, April 23, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, April 30, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Tuesday, May 1, 2001	10:30 A.M. – 5:30 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss the FY02 City Budget. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Monday, May 7, 2001	5:30 P.M.	Regular City Council Meeting <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Tuesday, May 8, 2001	10:30 A.M. – 5:30 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss the FY02 City Budget. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
	6:00 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss the FY02 School Department Budget. <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>
Thursday, May 10, 2001	10:30 A.M. – 5:30 P.M.	The Finance Committee will conduct a public meeting to discuss the FY02 City Budget. <b>(IF NECESSARY)</b> <b>(Sullivan Chamber)</b>

## JANUARY 29, 2001

1. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to **Awaiting Report Item Number 00-141**, regarding the status of planned improvements to Russell Field.
2. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to an order requesting the appropriation of \$50,000 in the Public Investment Fund Community Development Extraordinary Expenditures Account to be used to conduct additional testing at Russell Field.
3. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to the appointment of James Monagle of 17 Greenough Avenue as the temporary City Auditor.
4. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to **Awaiting Report Item Number 00-100**, regarding a report on clarifying the 15% affordable housing component to the inclusionary zoning ordinance.
5. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to **Awaiting Report Item Number 00-70**, regarding a report on conducting a traffic study on Windsor Street between Cambridge Street and the Somerville line.
6. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to an order requesting the transfer of \$875 in the General Fund Women's Commission Travel & Training to the Other Ordinary Maintenance to provide funds to develop a database of Cambridge women's history.
7. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to an order requesting the transfer of \$100,000 from the Employee Benefits Salary & Wages (Salary Adjustment) Account to the Police Department Travel & Training (Judgement & Damages) Account to pay medical services rendered to officers required in the performance of duty and for indemnified retired officers.

**JANUARY 29, 2001**

**PAGE 2**

8. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to **Awaiting Report Item Number 00-126**, regarding a report on services for seniors who are in need of minor home repair jobs.
9. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to **Awaiting Report Item Number 00-140**, regarding a report on the legal basis for denying public comment at City Council roundtables.
10. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to the technical zoning language that implements the recommendations of the Planning Board with regard to the Citywide Rezoning Petition.
11. Transmitting communication from Robert W. Healy, City Manager, relative to an order requesting the appropriation of \$13,451 in the General Fund in reimbursements from ERI to the Human Services Salary & Wages Account to cover a portion of additional expenditures in the Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program.

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please find attached a response to Awaiting Report Item No. 00-100, regarding a report on clarifying the 15% affordable housing component to the inclusionary zoning ordinance, received from City Solicitor Russell B. Higley.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Attachment

January 22, 2001

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager  
City Hall  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Re: *City Council Order #12, dated October 23, 2000, Seeking a Report  
Clarifying the 15% Affordable Housing Component to Inclusionary Zoning*

Dear Mr. Healy:

I am writing in response to the City Council's request for an explanation of how the 15% affordability requirement of the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance is determined and applied.

Section 11.203.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, entitled Requirements for Inclusionary Housing, provides in subsection 11.203.2(a) as follows:

(a) Any Inclusionary Project shall provide fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of dwelling units up to the maximum allowed as of right as Affordable Units....

Section 11.203.2(b)(i) provides further that:

(i) The FAR normally permitted in the applicable zoning district for residential uses shall be increased by thirty percent (30%) for Affordable Units....

Applying these provisions to a proposed project where one hundred units would be allowed as of right and the developer is proposing to build one hundred (100) units, the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance would require that the developer provide fifteen (15) affordable units, and the FAR would be increased by thirty percent (30%). This would mean that the final project would contain one hundred and thirty (130) units, fifteen (15) of which would be affordable.

Section 11.203.2(c) provides in relevant part that "For any Inclusionary Project that includes a number of dwelling units that exceeds the maximum allowed as of right, the number of affordable housing units shall be no less than fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of dwelling units in the project...." For example, at a site where the total number of units permitted as of right is fifty (50), and the developer proposes to build one hundred (100) units (by obtaining a special permit, for example), fifteen (15) of the units would be required to be affordable units. There is no additional FAR bonus since the project has already received a bonus by being permitted to build more units than would have been permitted as of right.

If we can be of further assistance please let us know.

Russell B. Higley

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please find attached a response to Awaiting Report Item No. 00-70, regarding a report on conducting a traffic study on Windsor Street between Cambridge Street and the Somerville line, received from Traffic, Parking & Transportation Director Susan Clippinger.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Attachment

**To:** Robert Healy, City Manager  
**From:** Susan E. Clippinger, Traffic Director  
**Date:** January 23, 2001  
**Re:** Council Order September 11, 2000 (00-70) /report of traffic study on Windsor St.

---

On January 17, 2001, The Traffic Engineering Division conducted a site investigation on Windsor Street from Cambridge Street to the city line. Below you will find the Division's evaluation on the existing conditions and recommendations to improve the overall operation and safety of Windsor Street.

### **Current Conditions**

Windsor Street is 28-feet wide with parking on the west side and no parking on the east- side. The existing parking is located on the commercial side of the street and is unrestricted. The parking condition allows for vehicles to park without a time limit. The no parking side of Windsor Street runs along the Roosevelt Towers Housing Development. The traffic pattern is for two-way traffic.

### **Evaluation of Current Conditions**

The current 8-foot parking lane and two 10-foot travel lanes are adequate for two-way traffic to operate safely on Windsor Street. It was observed during the investigation, that Windsor Street is being used greatly by cut-thru traffic accessing the Boynton Yards Industrial Park in Somerville. The existing narrow 10-foot travel lanes reduce speeds.

Most of the businesses in this Industrial Park contain large fleets of commercial vehicles (RCN, DHL, Bell Atlantic, and Gental Giant Moving). Windsor Street is the preferred route for these commercial vehicles over Willow, Harding and Hunting Streets because Windsor Street causes less impact on the residents. The Windsor Street commercial property and housing development are constructed in brick, and as a result, noise and vibration is less than they would be on the small residential wood framed construction on Willow, Harding and Hunting Streets.

### **Recommendations**

With the high volume of vehicles using Windsor Street to access the Boynton Yards area, it has caused some lengthy vehicle queue and some heavy vehicle turning movement (at Cambridge and Windsor Streets) at both morning and late afternoon peak hours. Scheduled for the summer of 2001, city staff will paint a 75-foot long double yellow centerline on Windsor Street at the approach to Cambridge Street. The yellow centerline will keep right vehicles exiting Windsor Street and allow for an adequate lane width for entering Windsor Street. This will improve the operation of the intersection of Cambridge Street and Windsor Street.

The existing 12" parallel line crosswalks are not adequate for the heavy turning vehicles at the intersection. Also scheduled for summer of 2001, city staff will be upgrading all three crosswalks to the more visible 24" wide international/zebra type crosswalks.

During the site investigation, it was observed that vehicles were parking on the east-side of the street, while running into the housing development. This illegal parking caused a back up on the street and as a result decreased the safe operation of Windsor Street. To reduce this problem, the existing “No Parking” signs posted on the east side of Windsor Street are scheduled to be replaced with the more enforceable “No Stopping” signs.

The current operation of Windsor Street functions in a safe manner, with no report of motor vehicle or pedestrian accidents over the past two years. The Department believes that Windsor Street should remain a two-way street with parking on the west side. When implemented this summer, the recommendations mentioned above should improve the current conditions.

January 29, 2001

To the Honorable, the City Council:

I am hereby requesting a transfer of \$875.00 in the General Fund from the Women's Commission Travel and Training Account to the Other Ordinary Maintenance Account. The Women's Commission is developing a database of Cambridge women's history, the research of which will contribute to the development of a permanent public art piece depicting women who have contributed to the history of the city of Cambridge. The Commission will also hold a series of public meetings to present the collected history. The transferred funds will be used to offset the costs of hiring a research assistant to help with information gathering.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please be advised that pursuant to Chapter 41, Section 6A of the General Laws of Massachusetts, I have appointed James Monagle of 17 Greenough Avenue, Cambridge as the temporary City Auditor. This appointment is effective Monday, January 29, 2001.

I have enclosed a copy of Mr. Monagle's resume for your information.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Enclosure

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

I am hereby requesting the transfer of \$100,000 from the Employee Benefits Salary and Wages (Salary Adjustment) Account to the Police Department Travel and Training (Judgement & Damages) Account. These funds will be used for the payment of medical services rendered to officers required in the performance of duty and for indemnified retired officers.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec

January 29, 2001

To the Honorable, the City Council:

I am hereby requesting an appropriation of \$50,000.00 in the Public Investment Fund Community Development Department Extraordinary Expenditures Account. This appropriation will be used to conduct additional testing at Russell Field as required by the Asbestos Protection Ordinance. The funds will enable the city to prepare the required response to the subsurface soil contamination and to prepare the necessary documents to be filed with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the Cambridge Public Health Department. This appropriation will be funded by Free Cash.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please find attached a response to Awaiting Report Item No. 00-126, regarding a report on services for seniors who are in need of minor home repair jobs, received from Assistant City Manager for Human Services Jill Herold.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Attachment

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

In response to Awaiting Report Item No. 00-141, regarding an update on the status of planned improvements to Russell Field, Assistant City Manager for Community Development Beth Rubenstein reports the following:

Environmental remediation of Russell Field in accordance with Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MADEP) regulations and the City's Asbestos Protection Ordinance is currently expected to be completed by July 2001. Proposed improvements to Russell Field have been on hold as the City works to comply with these regulations.

While no immediate hazards exist, testing performed by the City from 1997 to 1999 found soil contamination below the surface of Russell Field at levels requiring remediation. The contaminants include certain heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), and asbestos.

Since the discovery of contamination, additional issues have arisen which have delayed the remediation process, including:

- Passage of the Asbestos Protection Ordinance establishing more stringent testing requirements which requires the City to collect additional soil samples for asbestos analysis. A supplemental testing program in conformance with the Asbestos Protection Ordinance has been developed and, following approval of the sampling plan, sample collection is anticipated to take place late winter.
- The need to resolve which laboratory methods to use to analyze soil for asbestos. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) which sets standards for laboratory tests does not specify a testing methodology for asbestos as it does for other contaminants. The MADEP also has not been able to provide specific guidance regarding laboratory testing. The City has asked its consultants to recommend a protocol to be used in lieu of a regulatory standard.

- The EPA initiated an investigation of the W.R. Grace site and Russell Field under its Superfund Removal Program during the summer of 2000 at the request of the Alewife Study Group. The City is still awaiting the results of this testing which may indicate additional locations of contamination on the field and will determine whether the EPA will continue to be involved. We expect these results to be released by EPA soon.

The next steps in the process are:

- Asbestos testing in conformance with the Asbestos Protection Ordinance to take place this winter.
- Following the analysis of the results, the City will develop a final Release Abatement Measure (RAM) Plan, which most likely will involve some excavation of contaminated soil from the top 3 feet of Russell Field and replacement with clean soil. The City's current approach is to remediate Russell Field prior to the commencement of any renovation work. However, depending on the results from the next round of asbestos soil testing, it is possible the City may decide to combine the remediation and renovation work if it provides advantages in terms of cost and logistics.

Following the confirmation that the contamination has been remediated in accordance with the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP), the City will file a Response Action Outcome Statement with DEP to conclude the MCP process.

The City has retained Brown & Rowe as landscape architects for improvements to Russell Field which include field renovations as well as the construction of a changing facility. The firm is under contract and ready to complete the community process and finalize the design once the remediation plan has been developed.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please find attached a response to Awaiting Report Item No. 00-140, regarding a report on the legal basis for denying public comment at City Council roundtable meetings, received from City Solicitor Russell B. Higley.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Attachment

January 24, 2001

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager  
City Hall  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dear Mr. Healy:

The City's Charter, G. L. c. 43, section 98, provides that

The city council shall fix suitable times for its regular meetings. The mayor, or the vice-chairman of the city council, or any four members thereof ... may at any time call a special meeting by causing written notices, stating the time of holding such meeting and signed by the person or persons calling the same, to be delivered in hand to each member of the city council, or left at his usual dwelling place, at least twelve hours before the time of such meeting. Meetings of the city council may also be held at any time when all members of the city council are present and consent thereto. Except in the case of executive sessions authorized by section twenty-three A of chapter thirty-nine, all meetings of the city council shall be open to the press and to the public, and ***the rules of the city council shall provide that citizens and employees of the city shall have a reasonable opportunity to be heard at any such meeting in regard to any matter considered thereat*** (emphasis added).

The Rule of the City Council as Amended, Rule 23 C "Public Comment" provide, pursuant to the provisions of the above referenced statute, that at regular business meetings

a. ***Citizens and employees of the city shall have a reasonable opportunity to be heard at any meeting of the City Council in regard to any matter considered thereat.*** Opportunities for citizens and employees to be heard at all regular meetings, except for working/roundtable meetings, shall be provided directly after the reading of the record, if requested by the City Council (submission of the record of the previous meeting) (emphasis added)....

The Rules further provide that at regular roundtable/working meetings

***Public comment shall not take place at working/roundtable meetings of the City Council, where no matter being discussed may be finally considered, in that no votes may be taken.*** Written comments will be accepted and made part of the record of the meeting. ***The opportunity for the public to make oral comments on items discussed at working/roundtable meetings shall be at the regular meeting at which the item may be considered for action by the City Council*** (emphasis added).

We interpret the Rules of the City Council as Amended to be both consistent with and fully compliant with the provisions of the City's Charter. Working/roundtable meetings are designed for the City Council to be provided information by the City Manager and his staff, and do not permit the Council to "consider" any matter, in that no votes may be taken, and any item discussed may thus not be "considered for action" by the Council. As set forth above, the Rules further provide that the opportunity for the public to make oral comments on items discussed at working/roundtable meetings is provided at the regular meeting of the City Council at which any such item may be considered for action and voted upon by the Council. Moreover the Rules provide that while public comment is not permitted at working/roundtable meetings, written comments are, in fact, accepted and provided to the Council, and made part of the record of the meeting. Thus, members of the public are provided ample opportunity to provide comments, both in writing prior to a working/roundtable meeting, and afterward, at the regular meeting where any items discussed at the working/roundtable meeting are considered for action or voted upon by the Council.

Please do not hesitate to let me know if you would like any additional information.

Very truly yours,

Russell B. Higley

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

Please find attached for your consideration the technical zoning language that implements the recommendations of the Planning Board with regard to the Citywide Rezoning Petition, received from Assistant City Manager for Community Development Beth Rubenstein.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec  
Attachment

January 2, 2001

**To the Honorable, the City Council:**

**Subject: Initial Citywide Rezoning Petition Recommendations: Residential Zoning Districts (Part I (a) of the Petition) and Revisions to Parking Requirements (Part IV of the Petition)**

**Recommendation**

The Planning Board has begun detailed deliberations on the Citywide Rezoning Petition. To facilitate the City Council's consideration of the proposal, the Planning Board will forward its recommendations as decisions are reached on parts of the Petition. For Parts I (a) and IV the Board is now prepared to make a recommendation. The substance of the recommendation is contained herein; the additional technical zoning text that is necessary to implement the recommendation will be forwarded separately.

***Part I (a): Residential Zoning Districts***

---

The Planning Board recommends eliminating two Areas from consideration as residential districts: Area P (at Concord Avenue) and a portion of Area D (the Industry A-1 along Second Street) as new residential districts. In the Second Street portion of Area D, housing is unlikely to be constructed and existing manufacturing operations (as at Biopure) would possibly be severely impacted. Housing is a more likely possibility along Concord Avenue in Area P. However, given the Area's somewhat remote location and strong commercial environment, the Board would prefer to utilize incentives to encourage housing here rather than mandating it through residential rezoning.

All other areas proposed in the petition are recommended for adoption, as they offer the potential for significant numbers of new residential dwelling units in mixed-use environments. While housing is the preferred use in new construction in each of these Areas, many are already very diverse in their pattern of land uses. In most cases that diversity is a positive feature that will make residential living more pleasant in the future.

In recognition of desire for mixed use areas, several of the zoning districts proposed in the Petition contain provisions that allow a continued presence of commercial and retail activities even as new housing is constructed; the Planned Unit Development overlay districts in Areas A, E, and Q do that. Area H's Special District 8 has similar regulations.

To achieve the same objective in several other Areas – Areas B, C, D at Charles Street, G at Main Street, M, N, and O - the Board is recommending the creation of a new **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District**. It would allow existing businesses in the overlay areas to expand as-of-right by 15% of gross floor area in a building up to the allowed commercial density that would have been permitted if the Area had not been zoned residential, whichever is less. Commercial expansion greater than 15% and limited retail use up to 25% of the gross floor area of a development would be permitted by special permit from the Planning Board.

### **Summary of PB Recommendations on New Housing Districts**

#### **Delete**

Area D: Second Street portion

Area P

#### **Adopt with Overlay District Provisions allowing Commercial Expansion & Retail Activity**

Area B

Area C

Area D: Bent Street portion

Area G: Main Street portion

Area H

Area M: Rindge Avenue portion

Area N: New Street portion

Area O

Area Q

#### **Adopt with Modification**

Area F

#### **Adopt as Proposed in Petition**

Area A

Area E

Area G: Albany Street portion

Area I

Area J

Area K

Area L

Area M: interior portion

Area N: Concord Avenue portion

A more detailed discussion of each Area follows.

**Area A: North Point base zone and PUD.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Board recommends adoption of this district with only minor technical modifications. For traffic congestion reasons the district is poorly situated for extensive commercial development. It does, however, offer the possibility for significant numbers of new housing units. The base district and PUD as proposed allow mixed uses to be accommodated. As the Area is within the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study (ECaPS) area, refinements to these districts' regulations may be proposed at the end of that Eastern Cambridge planning process. Nevertheless, at this time the current proposal is consistent with the policy direction for this Area being developed by the ECaPS Committee.

**Area B: Industry B-1 zone at Binney Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with overlay district***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Residence C-2A district as proposed in the Petition. The Area offers the opportunity for substantial numbers of new housing units on a limited number of sites. Recognizing the highly diverse mix of uses present here, the Board recommends application of the proposed **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** to the Area. As with Area A, this Area B is within the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study area so that refinements to the district's regulations may be proposed at the end of that planning process. This recommendation, however, is consistent with the policy direction being developed by the ECaPS Committee, which is encouraging housing as a major future land use in the Area.

**Area C: Industry A-2 zone at Cambridge and First Streets.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with new PUD overlay district.***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the proposed Residence C-2A district. However, recognizing the desirability of redeveloping the site for a mix of uses, the Board recommends the creation of a new **PUD overlay district** to apply to the Area. The PUD district allows commercial and retail uses, permits a waiver of the residential district's setback requirements and provides other development benefits, provided at least fifty percent of the proposed development is devoted to housing use. The building on the site is well suited for conversion to housing and a significant number of units could be reasonably expected. This Area C is also within the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study area so that further refinements to these regulations may be proposed at the end of that planning process. This recommendation is consistent with the policy direction being developed by the ECaPS Committee for this Area, where a mixed-use development with housing as a major component is being encouraged.

**Area D: Industry A-1 zone along Charles Street in East Cambridge; Second Street between Charles Street and Spring Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt portion along Charles Street, with new overlay district. Delete portion along Second Street.***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the new Residence C-1A district for that portion of Area D that lies along Charles Street. It is a district directly abutting the residential neighborhood of East Cambridge and is a logical area in which to encourage the expansion of housing. As with the adjacent Area B, this Area D is a mixed-use environment. Therefore, the Board recommends application of the **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** to the Area. Area D is also within the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study area so that refinements to the recommended districts may be proposed at the end of that planning process. This recommendation is, nevertheless, consistent with the policy direction being developed by the ECaPS Committee, which would like to see a significant expansion of housing in this Area.

As indicated above the Board recommends that the portion of Area D abutting Second Street be deleted as it is not likely to produce significant numbers of housing units and it would impose a hardship on an important Cambridge research and manufacturing firm.

**Area E: Office 3A zone at the N-Star and DOT sites in East Cambridge.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition's proposal to rezone this area to a base Residence C-2A district with a PUD-3A overlay district, without modification. The Area offers the opportunity for substantial numbers of housing units in the future in a very central location. The proposed PUD would allow the mixed-use support services that would be desirable here. Again, as with the preceding Areas, this Area E is within the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study area so that refinements to these regulations may be proposed at the end of that planning process. However, this recommendation is consistent with the policy direction being developed by the ECaPS Committee, where housing and significant open spaces are major objectives of the Committee for this Area.

**Area F: MXD District.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with modifications***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition proposal that at least 150,000 square feet of housing be constructed within the MXD district. The Board proposes one modification that would require the housing to be built in the area south of Broadway so that the future build-out of Biogen facilities in the District would not be compromised. The Board continues to find that housing would be a very positive addition to the mix of uses at Kendall Square.

Nevertheless, the Board is cognizant of the complicated regulatory and contractual environment that guides development within the redevelopment area. Therefore, while the Board considers housing a desirable, appropriate and feasible use in the District that could be achieved with the passage of this recommendation, the Council may choose to weigh that desirable planning goal against other policy considerations. As with all the previous Areas,

the MXD district is within the ECaPS planning area and may be the subject of recommendations growing out of the Committee's deliberations.

**Area G: Industry B zone along Main Street and Albany Street (MIT campus).**

***Recommendation: Adopt with overlay district at Main Street***

As proposed in the Petition, this area would be rezoned to a new Residence C-3B district with a one hundred foot area along Main Street zoned to a Business B district to allow retail uses along Main Street. The Board recommends that the entire Area be rezoned to the new Residence C-3B district with that portion of the Area previously proposed to be a Business B district be designated instead as the **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** so that retail uses would continue to be allowed.

This Area is entirely within the MIT campus. The new Residence C-3B district recognizes its institutional character, and eliminates any commercial or industrial uses that would have been permitted in the Industry B district that currently applies.

**Area H: Special District 8 zone in Cambridgeport.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with modifications reflecting overlay district provisions***

The Planning Board recommends the revisions to Special District 8's provisions that convert the district to a predominately residential one, as proposed in the Petition. While the district as proposed in the Petition allows for mixed uses including retail activity, the Board recommends modifications that would make Special District 8's regulations regarding retail use and expansion of other non-residential uses consistent with those proposed in the Mixed Use Residential Overlay District.

**Area I: Office 1 zone along Broadway.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition proposal to designate this Area as a Residence C-1 zone. This Residence C-1 district will prevent further loss to office use of existing residential units, will encourage conversion of existing office uses to residential use over time, and will assure that any future development in the area will be housing. The Residence C-1 district currently applies to the residential neighborhood that surrounds this Area I.

**Area J: Business A zone between Cambridge Street and Gore Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition's proposal to rezone this Area to a Residence C-2B district. The Area is now entirely housing; the change would protect those units from conversion to commercial use in the future.

**Area K: Industry A-1 zone along Richdale Avenue in Neighborhood 9.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition's proposal to rezone this Area to the newly created Residence C-1A district. The Area has been slowly shifting over the last two decades from industrial use to housing. The remaining vacant or industrial sites are appropriately converted to housing in the future. That change can be expected to occur naturally with time.

**Area L: Industry A zone along Sherman Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt as proposed in the Petition***

The Planning Board recommends that this Area be rezoned as proposed in the Petition: the lot currently containing a rehabilitated industrial building now used for office and retail uses be designated as an Industry A-1 district. Lots currently built-out to medium density residential uses are designated Residence C-2B. Each district designation is consistent with the current scale of building construction and the uses present.

**Area M: Industry A-1 zone along Rindge Avenue at Jerry's pond.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with overlay district at Rindge Avenue***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the new Residence C1A district for this Area. A considerable number of new residential units might reasonably be expected to be built in the district in the future. To facilitate retention of neighborhood accessory retail uses currently located in the district along Rindge Avenue, the Board recommends imposition of the **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** for that portion of the Area along Rindge Avenue.

**Area N: Industry A-1 zone along Concord Avenue at New Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with overlay district***

The Planning Board recommends this Area be rezoned as proposed in the Petition: The small area at Concord Avenue at the Sozio Circle is designated Business A. The remainder of the Area is designated as the new Residence C-1A district. While the area over the long term is likely to be the location of significant numbers of new housing units, the current land use pattern is highly diverse. For that reason the Board recommends imposition of the new **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** over that portion of Area N designated Residence C-1A.

**Area O: Business A-1 zone on Mt. Auburn Street.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with overlay district***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition proposal to rezone this Area to a Residence C-1 district. To accommodate concerns of the owners of the recently constructed office building, the Board recommends imposition of the proposed **Mixed Use Residential Overlay District** to the Area. The Residence C-1 is intended to preserve the significant inventory of residential units currently present, to protect adjacent residential districts from

commercial construction at inappropriate locations, and to encourage, over time, conversion of existing non-residential uses to residential use.

**Area P: Office 2 zone on Concord Avenue (Tennis Petition area).**

***Recommendation: Delete***

The Planning Board recommends deletion of this area from consideration. The Board would instead encourage housing in this Area through the incentive for housing construction that would follow from the proposed changes to the FARs permitted in the Office 2 district: an FAR of 1.25 for commercial uses and 2.0 for housing uses. The strong commercial nature of this Area and its somewhat removed location suggest to the Board that housing should be encouraged here but not mandated.

**Area Q: Office 2 zone and PUD 5 district at Cambridgepark Drive.**

***Recommendation: Adopt with modifications reflecting overlay district provisions***

The Planning Board recommends adoption of the Petition proposal to rezone Area Q to a Residence C-2 district with a modified PUD-5 overlay district. The PUD-5 has been modified so that a mix of uses would be permitted, with an emphasis on housing. Three hundred units of housing are now under construction in the Area and a significant number of additional new units can be reasonably expected. The Board would recommend modifications to the provisions of the PUD-5 district as proposed in the Petition to bring the provisions for retail use and expansion of non-residential use into line with those proposed in the Mixed Use Residential Overlay District.

In summary, the Board recommends adoption of all but two of the proposed residential zoning districts as set forth in the Petition. Each area recommended offers the opportunity for securing additional housing in the future, or in some cases prevents the erosion of existing of housing. And while the heavily commercial nature of some of these Areas may seem at first glance to present an inhospitable environment for housing, experience over the past two decades in Cambridge suggests that housing will be constructed in each Area over time, allowing residents to live, work and shop in close proximity.

***Part IV: Revisions of Parking Requirements***

---

The Planning Board recommends adoption of this proposal as presented in the Petition with only minor corrective wording changes. The proposal modifies the minimum and maximum parking requirements for general office and research and development uses to bring them in line with current city policy seeking to minimize the use of single occupancy vehicles as the preferred mode of travel by employees in the city. A special permit process is also instituted where it is proposed to exceed the maximum parking ratio permitted.

Respectfully submitted for the Planning Board

Larissa Brown, Chair

January 17, 2001

**To the Honorable, the City Council:**

**Subject: Planning Board Citywide Rezoning Petition Recommendations on**

- **Conversion of Non-residential Buildings to Residential Use** (*Part I (b) of the Petition*),
- **Adjustments to Amount of Development Allowed** (*Part II of the Petition*), and
- **Project Review** (*Part III of the Petition*).

### **Recommendation**

The Planning Board has concluded its detailed deliberations on the Citywide Rezoning Petition. On January 2, the Board forwarded to the City Council its recommendations on **Residential Zoning Districts** (*Part I (a) of the Petition*) and **Revisions to Parking Requirements** (*Part IV of the Petition*). At its subsequent meeting of January 9, 2001, the Board reviewed the remaining sections of the Petition, and now makes the additional recommendations that are described below. The substance of these recommendations is contained herein; the additional technical zoning text that is necessary to implement the recommendations will be forwarded separately.

### **Part I (b): Conversion of Non-residential Buildings to Residential Use**

---

The Planning Board recommends that this section of the Petition be enacted as submitted. In summary, these provisions have been developed to facilitate the conversion of existing large, non-residential structures to residential use, both to increase the supply of housing and to reduce potentially incompatible non-residential uses in residential neighborhoods.

### **Part II: Adjustments to Amount of Development Allowed**

---

The Petition includes the following mechanisms:

- a. Changes to FAR and Height Provisions,**
- b. Inclusion of Structured Parking in FAR, and**
- c. Limiting Mechanical Equipment on Roofs.**

The Planning Board recommends that **Part II (a)** and **Part II (b)** be enacted as submitted. **Part II (a)** is essential to limit overall density and reduce the future growth in vehicles on city streets by limiting the amount of new commercial building, a significant generator of traffic impacts. **Part II (b)** is important because it would require that all new parking located in aboveground structures be included in the calculation of FAR, since such parking contributes to the bulk of building observed when development occurs on a lot.

The Board recommends that the provisions of **Part II (c)** be modified to address concerns that the original submission would have made it difficult for existing businesses to adjust their mechanical equipment to meet changing needs and requirements. The Planning Board proposes revising the Petition to allow modifications, as-of-right, to existing mechanical equipment within an imaginary rectangle that would encompass the existing equipment. A special permit would be required if either the new equipment would not fit within this rectangle or if it would rise above the height limits set in the original citywide proposal.

### **Part III: Project Review**

---

The Board recommends that the provisions of **Part III** be modified to address concerns that Table 1 (thresholds triggering traffic study) should be simplified, that there should be lower trip generation thresholds for many uses, and that all larger projects should be subject to urban design review through a Planning Board special permit process.

The new Project Review process would work as described below.

- Projects of less than 25,000 square feet would be subject to no review.
- Projects of 25,000 to 60,000 square feet that do not require a traffic study would be subject to the administrative review process outlined in the original submission (staff reviews project in public forum for compliance with standards).
- Projects of 25,000 to 60,000 square feet that do require a traffic study would be subject to a Planning Board special permit review for traffic and urban design, with review criteria as outlined in the original submission.
- All projects of 60,000 square feet or higher would be subject to a Planning Board special permit review for traffic and urban design, with review criteria as outlined in the original submission, except that the traffic review threshold would be 100,000 square feet for residential uses, dormitories, and certain religious uses.
- General institutional uses would be subject to traffic review if a project adds 150 or more parking spaces or relocates 250 or more parking spaces.

Respectfully submitted for the Planning Board,

Larissa Brown, Chair

January 29, 2001

To The Honorable, The City Council:

I am hereby requesting the appropriation of \$13,451 in the General Fund in reimbursements from Employment Resource, Inc. (ERI) to the Human Services Salaries and Wages account to cover a portion of additional expenditures in the Mayor's Summer Youth Employment Program which were the result of the number of participants increasing from 401 in the previous two years to 506 in 2000. This increase is attributable to changes in federal legislation which resulted in severe funding cuts for youth services in the region and a movement away from stand-alone summer employment programs as well as reductions in state funding historically used to support youth programs in Cambridge.

Very truly yours,

Robert W. Healy  
City Manager

RWH/mec



## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

6. Proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinances to amend the zoning relating to lodging houses in Residence C and C-1 districts. The question comes on passing to be ordained on or after December 18, 2000. **The deadline for this petition is January 30, 2001.**
  
7. Proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinances to amend the zoning relating to the Citywide Rezoning petition. The question comes on passing to be ordained on or after February 5, 2001. **The deadline for this petition is February 12, 2001.**

**APPLICATIONS AND PETITIONS -  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

---

1. Two applications were received from Michael Owu, for MIT Graduate Dormitory requesting a curb cut at the premises numbered 70 Pacific Street and Sidney Street; said petition has receive approval from Inspectional Services, Historical, Public Works, Traffic, Parking and Transportation and abutters approval. Three neighborhood association letters sent. Response has been received from the Ward Five Committee disapproving the curb cut application.

1.

**CONSENT COMMUNICATIONS -  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

---

- |  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. A communication was received from Paula Evans, Principal of Cambridge Rindge and Latin School, transmitting thanks for the resolution adopted by the City Council.  | 1. |
| 2. A communication was received from Richard M. Lamkin, transmitting concern on the proposed Citywide Rezoning petition as a resident and an employee of Alkermes Inc.   | 2. |
| 3. A communication was received from Richard F. Pops, Chief Executive Officer and James M. Frates, Chief Financial Officer of Alkermes, transmitting concern on the proposed Citywide Rezoning petition.                 | 3. |
| 4. A communication was received from David Roby, Member, Cambridge Research Park, LLC, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>364 Third Street and 364R Third Street.</b>      | 4. |
| 5. A communication was received from David Clem, Manager/Agent, O & T Realty, LLC, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>320 Bent Street.</b>                                 | 5. |
| 6. A communication was received from David Clem, Manager/Agent, MBA-Cambridge, LLC transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>301 Binney Street.</b>                               | 6. |
| 7. A communication was received from David Roby, Trustee, 325 Vassar Street Realty Trust, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>323R Vassar Street and 323 Vassar Street.</b> | 7. |

**CONSENT COMMUNICATIONS -  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

---

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| 8. A communication was received from David Roby, Trustee, 270 Albany Street Realty Trust, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>270 Albany Street.</b>                             | 8.  |
| 9. A communication was received from David Roby, Trustee, 21 Erie Realty Trust, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>21-33 Erie Street, 14 Merriam Street and 47 Erie Street.</b> | 9.  |
| 10. A communication was received from David Roby, Trustee, Fort Washington Realty Trust, transmitting written opposition to the Citywide Rezoning Petition as owner of <b>200 Sidney Street and 130 Waverly Street.</b>       | 10. |
| 11. A communication was received from Roy Bercaw, Editor, Enough Room, regarding the site of the Mayor's State of the City address.   | 11. |
| 12. A communication was received from Robert J. LaTremouille, regarding the Magazine Beach plan.  | 12. |
| 13. A communication was received from Charles R. Laverty, Jr. and Paul Lohnes, Area B property owners, urging the deletion of Area B from the Citywide Rezoning.  | 13. |
| 14. A communication was received from Leo O. Pelletier, Fall River City Councilor, transmitting a resolution adopted unanimously regarding the regulation of cable television rates.  | 14. |
| 15. A communication was received from Roy Bercaw, Editor, Enough Room, regarding MIT and Harvard PILOT. (payment in lieu of taxes)  | 15. |
| 16. A communication was received from William F. Schreiber et al., regarding Swiss House Violation of Special Permit.   | 16. |

**RESOLUTION LIST FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

1. Resolution on the death of Edlin L. Ambrose. 1.  
**Mayor Galluccio and entire membership**
2. Resolution on the death of William J. Horgan. 2.  
**Councillor Sullivan and entire membership**
3. Resolution on the death of M. Louise Janowicz. 3.  
**Mayor Galluccio and entire membership**
4. Resolution on the death of Florence R. Nichols. 4.  
**Councillor Sullivan and entire membership**
5. Resolution on the death of Jeannette Walsh. 5.  
**Mayor Galluccio, Councillor Sullivan, Vice Mayor Maher and  
entire membership**
6. Resolution on the death of Samuel "Sandy" Wiley. 6.  
**Mayor Galluccio and entire membership**
7. Happy 80<sup>th</sup> Birthday Wishes to Edward J. Sullivan, Clerk of Courts. 7.  
**Councillor Sullivan**
8. Speedy recovery wishes to Jackie Sullivan. 8.  
**Councillor Sullivan**
9. Congratulations to Keith Pearson on being voted Boston's Concierge 9.  
of the Year.  
**Councillors Reeves and Sullivan**
10. Resolution on the death of Frank L. Marshall. 10.  
**Mayor Galluccio and entire membership**
11. Speedy recovery wishes to Joseph Cusack. 11.  
**Councillor Sullivan**
12. Second Anniversary of the Bengali Language Collection which will 12.  
be held at the Central Square Branch of the Cambridge Public  
Library.  
**Mayor Galluccio**

**RESOLUTION LIST FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 13. Welcome to the John F. Kennedy School of Government 2001<br>Spring Fellows and Visiting Fellows.<br><b>Mayor Galluccio</b> | 13. |
| 14. Resolution on the death of Theodore S. Polumbaum.<br><b>Councillor Davis and entire membership</b>                         | 14. |

**POLICY ORDER AND RESOLUTION LIST FOR CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
OF MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 2001**

1. Increase enforcement in the vicinity of Sparks Street. 1.  
**Councillor Toomey**
2. Status of trash pick-up from condominium associations. 2.  
**Councillor Toomey**
3. Petition the Legislature to enact the Home Rule petition entitled "AN 3.  
**ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE POPULAR ELECTION OF  
THE MAYOR AND VICE-MAYOR IN CAMBRIDGE."**  
**Councillors Toomey and Braude**
4. Work with the MDC, public and private interests to improve the 4.  
Hells Half acre and thank the Charles River conservancy for its  
efforts.  
**Councillor Davis**
5. Thanks to citizens, Public Works employees and Parking Control 5.  
officers for their efforts regarding snow and ice removal.  
**Councillor Davis**
6. Develop a plan to implement extended evening hours of operation of 6.  
City Hall.  
**Councillor Sullivan**

O-1.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR TOOMEY

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to instruct the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Director and the Police Commissioner to increase enforcement in the vicinity of Sparks Street.

O-2.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR TOOMEY

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to report to the City Council on the status of trash pick-up from condominium associations.

O-3.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR TOOMEY  
COUNCILLOR BRAUDE

ORDERED: That the City Council go on record petitioning the Legislature to enact the attached Home Rule petition entitled "**AN ACT TO PROVIDE FOR THE POPULAR ELECTION OF THE MAYOR AND VICE-MAYOR IN CAMBRIDGE.**"

O-4.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR DAVIS

WHEREAS: The Charles River Conservancy's goals to improve open space in Cambridge along the Charles River comport with the City's Green Ribbon Committee objectives; now therefore be it

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to insure that the Community Development Department coordinate with the Charles River Conservancy's efforts to work with the MDC, public and private interests to improve the Hells Half acre; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the City Council go on record extending congratulations to the Charles River Conservancy on the successful launching of the public process to improve Hells Half acre.

O-5.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR DAVIS

RESOLVED: That this City Council go on record thanking all Cambridge residents who took the time and energy to clear the sidewalks in front of their residences of snow and ice; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the City Council go on record extending its congratulations to the Public Works employees and to the Parking Control officers for their vigorous enforcement of sidewalk snow and ice clearance; now therefore be it

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to report back to the City Council on the following:

1. The effectiveness of the snow hotline (349-4903) in the Public Works Department;  
and
2. Clarification of the procedure dealing with complaints by the public, including who or what department should be contacted when the public has a complaint.

January 29, 2001

COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN

WHEREAS: The Cambridge City Council has designated the goal of making city services more user/customer friendly as one of its top priorities; and

WHEREAS: Many Massachusetts municipalities have adopted extended evening office hours as one way to improve customer service; and

WHEREAS: These municipalities, which include Malden, Medford, Lynn and Woburn, among others, typically keep offices open one evening until 7:00 p.m. or 7:30 p.m., and close early on Friday afternoon; now therefore be it

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to report to the City Council on development of a plan to implement such an adjustment of hours in Cambridge.

