PURPOSE OF PETITION

INCORPORATE ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS INTO ZONING FOR ALEWIFE OVERLAY DISTRICT 1 (AOD-1)
1. ENVISION CAMBRIDGE / 2016-2018

2. ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN / FALL 2019

3. NAVIA, ET. AL / ORIGINAL PETITION
   1. FILED / AUGUST 2019
   2. 1ST PLANNING BOARD HEARING / OCTOBER 2019
   3. 2ND PLANNING BOARD HEARING / DECEMBER 2019

4. CDD & NEIGHBORHOOD MEETINGS TO REVISE PETITION / DECEMBER 2019 – MARCH 2020

5. SRINIVASAU, ET AL. / REVISED PETITION
   1. FILED / JULY 2020
   2. PLANNING BOARD HEARING / SEPTEMBER 2020
1. PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS TO ORIGINAL PETITION / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM PREVIOUS PETITION

2. CDD Aug. 28th MEMO / CLARIFICATIONS
PLANNING BOARD HEARING / AGENDA

1. PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS TO ORIGINAL PETITION / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM PREVIOUS PETITION

2. CDD Aug. 28th MEMO / CLARIFICATIONS
ORIGINAL PETITION / PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

• MASTER PLAN REVIEW
• ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE
• LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES
• ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
• PARKING
• TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE
• AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
• MASTER PLAN REVIEW
  • ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE
  • LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES
  • ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
  • PARKING
  • TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE
  • AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: The Board asked for a clear and delineated master plan development review process that is explicitly written in the zoning text.

RESPONSE: The revised Petition now includes Section 20.95.52 that creates a AOD-1 Master Plan Special Permit, which is similar to a PUD process.
• MASTER PLAN REVIEW

• ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE

• LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES

• ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT

• PARKING

• TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE

• AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: Demonstrate that the Alewife District Plan is addressed comprehensively and that the proposed zoning would fully enable outcomes envisioned by that plan.

RESPONSE: The revised Petition now includes Section 20.95.53 that explicitly requires the Planning Board to make findings that the development proposal is generally in conformance with the Alewife District Plan.
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

• MASTER PLAN REVIEW

• ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE

• LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES

• ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT

• PARKING

• TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE

• AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: Board members preferred to see that more than 50% of the ground floor be devoted to light industrial uses.

RESPONSE: The revised Petition adds language clarifying that the ground floor be “used predominantly” for light industrial uses and/or consumer facing businesses requiring similar space.
INTENT:

- Ground Floor “predominantly” for Light Industrial / Consumer Facing Businesses
- Except for entrances/exits, lobbies, circulation, utilities, loading and other building functions.

An alternative approach, as noted by CDD in its Aug. 28th Memo, would be to require the Board to make a finding that the ground story is exclusively devoted to light industry or consumer-facing businesses except to the extent that accessory ground-story spaces are necessary to serve other uses in the building.
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

- MASTER PLAN REVIEW
- ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES
- ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
- PARKING
- TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE
- AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: Board members asked the petitioners’ representatives to respond to neighborhood concerns about the added height and bulk from mechanical equipment.

RESPONSE: Alewife District Plan outlines Urban Form recommendations that include reducing visual bulk of building massing (pg. 115-123). Revised Petition requires that Planning Board make a finding that the building massing is consistent with these recommendations.
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

• MASTER PLAN REVIEW

• ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE

• LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES

• ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT

• PARKING

• TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE

• AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: Consider codifying the Alewife District Plan’s recommendations for stricter parking requirements, enhanced transportation demand management, improved bus service, and new infrastructure connections.

RESPONSE: The revised Petition specifically eliminates parking minimums and requires that the Planning Board make a finding that the project is consistent with the Mobility recommendations of the Alewife District Plan (pg. 124-133).
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

- MASTER PLAN REVIEW
- ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES
- ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
- PARKING
- TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE
- AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: The Board asked for clearer expectations for increasing tree canopy, permeable area, and publicly usable open space per the Alewife District Plan recommendations.

RESPONSE: The revised Petition requires that the Planning Board make a finding that the project is consistent with the Climate and Environment recommendations of the Alewife District Plan (pg. 134-143).
PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

- MASTER PLAN REVIEW
- ALEWIFE DISTRICT PLAN CONFORMANCE
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL USES
- ROOFTOP MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
- PARKING
- TREE CANOPY AND OPEN SPACE

- AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS
BOARD COMMENT: Board asked for an assessment of how other properties in the AOD-1 would be affected.
PLANNING BOARD COMMENT / AOD-1 DISTRICT ANALYSIS

LOTS WITHIN AOD-1 AND HEIGHT SETBACKS

CC&F OWNED
A  61 Mooney
B  67 Mooney
C  45 Mooney
D  13 Mooney
E  54 Mooney
F  52 Mooney
G  50 Mooney
H  127 Smith

THIRD PARTY OWNED
I  51-63 Loomis (43%)
J  60 Loomis (23%)
K  67 Smith (94%)
L  67R Smith
M  115 Smith
N  109 Smith
O  767 Concord
P  763 Concord
Q  57 Smith
R  53 Smith
S  45 Spinelli
T  39 Spinelli
U  25 Spinelli
V  765 Concord
W  42-44 Spinelli
X  36 Spinelli
Y  30 Spinelli
Z  24 Spinelli (8%)
A1  31R Spinelli (98%)

25' NO BUILD

35' HEIGHT LIMIT

45' HEIGHT LIMIT

85' HEIGHT LIMIT
1. PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS TO ORIGINAL PETITION / RESPONSE TO COMMENTS FROM PREVIOUS PETITION

2. CDD Aug. 28th MEMO / CLARIFICATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>CDD 8.28.20 MEMO COMMENT</th>
<th>PETITION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City should study bridge FAR bonus section further (pg. 8-9)</td>
<td>FAR bonus achievable by (a) Construction of bridge (b) Design buildings incorporating bridge structural elements (c) Conveyance of property interests (d) Contribution of significant funds</td>
<td>Intent was to create a mechanism where the Planning Board could make a finding that future development proposals are facilitating one or more bridge connections from Quadrangle to Triangle in a manner that takes into consideration the physical limitations of each specific property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>CDD 8.28.20 MEMO COMMENT</td>
<td>PETITION</td>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authorize Planning Board to establish parking maximums (pg. 5)</td>
<td>• Parking minimums shall not apply.</td>
<td>• Intent was for TP&amp;T and Planning Board to determine appropriate parking given (1) the proposed uses, in particular the ground-floor uses, and (2) the adequacy of the existing local public infrastructure in area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the intended effect of eliminating max height of off-street parking facilities? (pg. 6)</td>
<td>• Maximum height of off-street facilities shall not apply.</td>
<td>• Intent was to maximize off-street shared parking in a centralized location, which could necessitate taller garages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cover parking with landscaping to minimize urban height island effect. (pg. 6)</td>
<td>• Parking covering not specifically mentioned but included by reference to Alewife District Plan.</td>
<td>• Agree that covered parking could be included (landscaping &amp; solar).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THANK YOU